Notes:

ID - Unique ID refering to an individual respondent. They may have submitted a response and/or comment in relation to more than one area, and are listed separately for each, using the same ID.

Capacity - In which capacity the respondent submitted their response/s. A \* indicates that the respondent stated this was the official response from the organisation listed.

Responses have been reviewed for personal, identifying or inappropriate content, but otherwise remain verbatim with no editing.

<b>ASHWELL</b>					
		Election dates		N Clirs	
ID Capac	city Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>47</sup> Resid	ent No	At least one council should have experience. Although	Yes	Hard enough to get volunteers. No one seems	
		I agree to reduction of number of councillors. Sounds		interested I. Where they live but complain all	
		like a cost saving excercises to me		too quickly. I served 8 years as a councillor an	
				am too deaf now sadly to contribute to a	
				meeting.	
<sup>1044</sup> Resid	ent No	5 years is too.long to ask someone to step forward	No	Due to the decisions taken by the Secretary of	
		and agree to serve.		State this village has grown significantly since	
				2015, son there are more residents requiring	
				the services of the Parish Council. At present	
				the Council does not number 12, but I see no	
				reason why it should be limited to 7 since	
				residents may step forward in the future to	
				serve and assist with the workload.	
<sup>114</sup> Resid	ent Yes		Yes		
<sup>267</sup> Resid	lent Yes	It would seem sensible to align with other elections.	Yes	Recently it has been difficult to recruit Parish	
				Councillors. 7 is good as long as others can be	
				co-opted or can volunteer to help with bigger	
·				projects	

BALDOCK					
		Boundaries		Town Council	
<sup>ID</sup> Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>25</sup> Resident	No	Having a local council will enable them to make	No	I dont see why you've decided more councillors	
		decisions on a local level and we wont have to		should cover West, draw better boundarys like	
		compete with other towns at North Herts		Baldock east and central	
<sup>137</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is too expensive as it is. Just leave it alone	No	I think this just adds more costs to residents	
<sup>180</sup> Resident	No	Civil service already bloated and incompetent	No	Civil service already bloated and incompetent	
<sup>181</sup> Resident	No	All I and most home owners are bothered about is the	No	As above.	
		yearly rise in the council tax, not adding more people			
		on to the council gravy train			

<sup>184</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>191</sup> Resident	No		No	I just wonder why we would have another layer
				of bureaucracy. The main issues that affect us
				as residents are not within the power of a local
				council. For example the roads and congestion
				within the town. Also limiting the amount of
				traffic using our road (Icknield Way) as a rat run.
				The local council has no power to make
				changes here
<sup>215</sup> Resident	No	Just another layer of burocrat to add to the others.	No	
<sup>230</sup> Resident	No	If it is going to increase our Council Tax, will we notice	No	As question 7
		any difference? It's not exactly value for money as it		
		stands.		
<sup>232</sup> Resident	No	We would prefer to stay as a District Council as we pay	No	As above
		enough Council Tax as it is and the more councillers		
		we have the larger the Council Tax. As we live in		
		Aldridge Court which is a private road and we look		
		after our own gravelled road and lighting and i cannot		
		understand why as a Terrace house we are on Band 'F'		
<sup>270</sup> Resident	No	It's unnecessary additional cost and expense to	No	It's unnecessary additional cost and expense to
		residents. I don't see any benefit having a parish		residents. I don't see any benefit having a
		council for Baldock.		parish council for Baldock.
<sup>299</sup> Resident	No	I don't think we need to implement any changes,	No	I don't think we need to implement any
		especially those that will cost residents money		changes, especially those that will cost
				residents money
<sup>302</sup> Resident	No	A fear this would lead to the formation of another	No	I fundamentally believe that all the problems
		layer of unaccountable bureaucracy which I or others		experienced in dealing with local government
		would be expected to pay for		are created by an excess of it. Baldock has been
				unparished area for 50 years and it has
				managed beautifully in that time. I see no
				reason - at a point where we are living under
				the heaviest tax burden since in postwar
				history- that the people of baldock should be
				required to pay for the privilege of having the
				body responsible for failing to collect their bins
				be separate from the one responsible for
				trapping them in their house with interminable
<sup>311</sup> Resident	No	l don't think that many councillors are needed for	No	I don't think that many councillors are needed
		Baldock		for Baldock
<sup>315</sup> Resident	No	Why do we need 3 councillors when in the past we	No	More bureaucracy equals less services
		only had one . The services are going down and down		
		and yet your expecting us to pay more and more.		

<sup>318</sup> Resident	No	As the changes to local government are not agreed, this should wait until it is agreed. The town council in letchworth was a waste of money until it was	No	
		disbanded.		
322 Resident	No		No	
<sup>326</sup> Resident	No	Just creating a further divide between old Baldock and New	No	Baldock should work as one
<sup>339</sup> Resident	No	There is no benefit	No	There is no benefit
		Not value for money		Not value for money
		Another layer of bureaucracy		Another layer of bureaucracy
<sup>340</sup> Resident	No	We have way too many costly councillors	No	
<sup>342</sup> Resident	No	What is the purpose of this? How much money is this	No	To suggest creating an unnecessary council
		costing at a time when local councils are in dire need		with a disproportionate number of councillors
		of extra resources? When Labour are talking of		at huge cost to the residents seems to highlight
		creating unitary councils, why would you choose to		the council's inability to read the room. People
		adjust boundaries of parishes now and not wait to see		are already crippled by rising costs and high
		what happens at a county level first?		mortgage rates, local services are being cut,
				schools are desperate for money to be poured
				into them - increasing council tax to pay for this
				needless restructure would be a terrible misuse
				of money
<sup>351</sup> Resident	No	Surely Bygrave and Clothall are already well served by	No	Baldock already has two wards, albeit named
		councillors. I cannot imagine what could be gained by		differently. Do you seriously not have more
		this adjustment. It appears to be yet another attempt		pressing concerns to address?
357 Resident	No	to increase our council tax.  Answered no as don't wish my council tax to go up.	Yes	Hopefully it'll mean Mr Muir will lose his seat.
				· · · ·
<sup>364</sup> Resident	No	Why do we need more councillors over such a small	No	Why do we need more councillors over such a
		space? Won't this increase our council tax for little		small space? Won't this increase our council tax
260		benefit?		for little benefit?
<sup>369</sup> Resident	No	Why do we need Extra	No	No I do not agree.Why do we need extra
				councillors.
				They money we pay though counsel tax , could
				be used to improve services for the taxpayer
				who pays.
<sup>382</sup> Resident	No		No	Cutting bin services etc
		n di e		
<sup>389</sup> Resident	No	It will cost increase councill tax for residents and may	No	I stated my reservations in 8 above
393 Desident	No	not be as effective as the current position	No	
<sup>393</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>394</sup> Resident	No	Thought we were trying to reduce costs and	No	Thought we were trying to reduce costs and
		bureaucracy		bureaucracy

<sup>408</sup> Resident	No	Should we not change anything if it already works and	No	We are already doing fine, why change the
		to whose cost?		system, we don't want to pay extra or I certainly
				don't as we don't get much from anything
				really, considering businesses, roads, lighting,
				community, care of people in community
				settings
<sup>416</sup> Resident	No		No	We already pay too much council tax and
				should not be expected to pay even more to
				have more layers of council
<sup>428</sup> Resident	No	Council tax rises plus cost of living crisis we do not	No	l do not want yet more costs councils should be
		need more increases for more politician's. Change for		downsized like nhs England not increased.
		change sake when it's not needed and the tax payer is		
		paying the price.		
<sup>469</sup> Resident	No	I completely disagree with adding another layer of	No	I completely disagree with adding another layer
		bureaucracy that will probably make the council even		of bureaucracy that will probably make the
		less efficient and increase my council tax which is		council even less efficient and increase my
		already not good value for money		council tax which is already not good value for
				money
<sup>489</sup> Resident	No		No	l am strongly opposed to having a Baldock
				Town Council if it means an increase in council
				tax. Council tax is already punitively high thanks
				to the Tory Government underfunding local
				government over the last decade and more. I
				can't quite believe that it is being suggested
				that we need another reorganisation, that will
				leave the area still covered by the same
				number of councillors, and face a rise in council
				tax, possibly of more than £120 a year, for the
				privilege. Council tax is already too high and I
				don't see the need to increase it just to pay for
				yet another pointless local government
				reorganisation. This is an idiotic proposal which
				should be scrapped. North Herts council would
				be better spending its time looking to improve
				local services instead of carrying out costly
				navel gazing exercises like this.
<sup>521</sup> Resident	No	Waste of taxpayer's money	No	Waste of taxpayer's money
<sup>529</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary extra cost for little reward at a time of	No	Same as above
		financial stretch for everyone		
<sup>530</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>531</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is already extremely high - increases will	No	Council tax is already extremely high - increases
		not be sustainable for many		will not be sustainable for many

<sup>545</sup> Resident	No	I do not see the benefit of what the Town Council	No	I do not see the benefit of what the Town
		would offer, particularly with the overall devolution		Council would offer, particularly with the overall
		and restructure of local government		devolution and restructure of local government
<sup>557</sup> Resident	No	Bygrave and Clothall are tiny suburbs of Baldock.	No	As above
		Surely the better approach would be to create 1		
		overarching Town Council to cover Baldock and All		
		surrounding areas. Who in reality recognises clothall,		
		Bygrave, Baldock east and west as distinct areas		
		please survey them asking the question what people		
		prefer rather than proposing something made up to		
		serve the system. save us money on our council tax		
E07 D : 1 .		nlease rather than wasting money on sub division		-
<sup>587</sup> Resident	No	Do not know what the benefits are or what difference	NO	see answer to 7
<sup>596</sup> Resident	N1 -	will it make	NI-	
390 Resident	No		No	
<sup>603</sup> Resident	No	No new government structures please.	No	No new government structures please
<sup>620</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money creating a new town council. More	No	Waste of money creating a new town council.
		services and less overheads is what we want.		More services and less overheads is what we
				want.
<sup>647</sup> Resident	No	I can see no advantage in doing this, and the leaflet	No	Suspect if I was given a reason why we needed
		advertising this change gives very little detail.		in times of cutbacks to introduce another layer l
				might have voted differently, but with no actual
				statement as to why we needed a town council,
				the answer is no.
<sup>685</sup> Resident	No	Do not want to pay between £22 - £121 additionally	No	Do not want to pay between £22 - £121
		per household in council tax as a result of a new town		additionally per household in council tax as a
		council.		result of a new town council.
<sup>698</sup> Resident	No	I have not seen anything strongly making a case for	No	
		the proposed changes. My understanding is that there		
		were very few responses on this point to the first		
		consultation. Frankly this is tinkering with local		
		arrangements for the sake of it and without any clear		
		benefit, and at additional cost to council tax payers		
		which many will be ill placed to afford in current		
		circumstances		

<sup>699</sup> Resident	No	Whilst the changes to the Parish boundaries of	No	The relatively recent creation of a Town Council
		Bygrave and Clothall make perfect sense given the		for Letchworth was a very costly mistake and
		impending developments included in the District Plan,		ended a short time later when the Town
		the creation of a Town Council seems unnecessary		Council was dissolved. I feel it un-necessary to
		partly on the grounds of cost and also that North		list the expenditures required to set up a new
		Herts District is likely to be wound up and the and		town council or the continuing costs should one
		placed within a new single tier authority. Would it not		be created. All costs would, I feel, be
		be prudent to consider this matter when the future of		disproportionate to any benefits that may arise.
		local government in Hertfordshire has been settled.		I have experience of areas where there is
		Finally at the time of the last local government re-		considerable and ongoing friction between
		organisation the District Council established a system		Town Councils and the District in whose area
		of area committees which provides a direct link		they are situated.
		between the local residents of an area and the		
		Council. It seems that a town council would simply be		
		replicating processes that already exist.		
<sup>738</sup> Resident	No	There no benefit to splitting the parishes	No	No benefit
<sup>776</sup> Resident	No		No	
		Comments have been discussed to a comment of the comment		Tabello constitue de la consti
<sup>778</sup> Resident	No	Seems to have been drawn by someone who has not		Totally excessive to have so many people, with
		been to Baldock and based on old plans, like why does		no clear remit.
		it not include all houses on South Road.		
		No clear number or remit of the souncil Are they all		
		No clear purpose or remit of the council. Are they all		
802 Resident	No	volunteers. paid? There is no justifiable need to change the current	No	As answer above
Resident	110	position other than to elect more councillors at a	110	7.5 distret dbove
		greater tax burden to all residents		
818 Resident	No	JUST LEAVE IT AS IT IS.	No	AN INCREASE IN COUNCIL TAX . DOUBT THE
				GENERAL PUBLIC WILL SEE ANY ACTUAL
				BENEFITS
<sup>819</sup> Resident	No		No	
827 Resident	No	There isn't enough information provided to be able to	No	You have not provided enough information.
		agree to a change		How many councillors are there now? What are
				the problems with the current system? What is
				better about the new system? Who asked for
				this change? What are the potential negative
				impacts of the change?
<sup>834</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>838</sup> Resident	No	Do not want to pay higher council tax as the cost is	No	Do not want to pay higher council tax as it is
		already crippling.		already excessive and increasingly hard to pay.

864 Resident	No	No change is required. Public already pay to much and No	No change is required. Public already pay to
Resident	110	council tax has already increased. These changes will	much and council tax has already increased.
		increase tax's further and is the last thing residents	These changes will increase tax's further and is
		G	
		require. Bearing in mind council tax prices have	the last thing residents require. Bearing in mind
		already been increased, this proposal looks more like	council tax prices have already been increased,
		a act of greed than necessity	this proposal looks more like a act of greed
865 Resident	No	9 councillors are to much for the area No	than necessity 9 councillors are to much for the area
<sup>883</sup> Resident	No	I'm not sufficiently convinced that a town council is No	Adding three councillors based on the current
		beneficial for the added cost to council tax. Residents	population, and not the projected population
		are struggling as it is, without further unnecessary	after the completion of Urban & Civic's
		costs. Baldock is a great place, and is great without a	development doesn't make any sense. We'd
		town council which would only really add another level	only have to have a further consultation and
		of bureaucracy, further confuse the matrix of existing	add more councillors then which is needless
		councillors (as someone who is politically aware, for	and wasteful.
		the first time living somewhere, I haven't a clue what	
		parish/ward/jurisdiction we're in nor who our	
		councillors are), and add further middle-management.	
		I appreciate a dedicated town council can apply for	
		grants unavailable to larger jurisdictions, but really,	
		the few improvements Baldock need can/should be	
		·	
		addressed by existing councillors.	
<sup>933</sup> Resident	No	If it's not broke don't fix it - proposals reek of change No	See previous
		for the sake of change	
<sup>935</sup> Resident	No	I see no real benefits in this proposal and in this time No	I see no real benefits in this proposal and in this
		of financial hardship the cost to tax payers and the	time of financial hardship the cost to tax payers
		local authority canyo be justified.	and the local authority canyo be justified.
<sup>964</sup> Resident	No	One I feel that many of councillors is extreme and not No	Reduce the number of council, but increase the
Resident	140	cost effective and money can be used on providing	representation of residents.
		better services.	However the residents need to be diverse.
			nowever the residents freed to be diverse.
		However each councillor should be more engage and	
		communication should be better with residents with	
		follow ups.	
		Residents should have more of a say with evidence	
		, and the second se	
		provided that we have had engagement and what	
		, and the second se	
		provided that we have had engagement and what	
		provided that we have had engagement and what change we have made.	
		provided that we have had engagement and what change we have made.  I don't like the divide, I feel this will encourage the	
		provided that we have had engagement and what change we have made.  I don't like the divide, I feel this will encourage the young generation to divide which leads to gang	

<sup>994</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>996</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1015</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1026</sup> Resident	No	At this time of high financial pressure I do not see any benefit to these changes to warrant ANOTHER increase in council tax. I feel it will just be another costly layer of bureaucray	No	As above another layer of bureaucracy at a higher cost on council tax. Nothing I have read leads me to believe I will benefit from this change. What you have to remember is that people are not only having to find more money for council tax but also water rates, gas & electric, internet/phone providers/ foodI
<sup>1048</sup> Resident	No	Baldock used to have a Town Council. Baldock Urban District Council was abolished in about 1974 when Baldock became part of North Herts with Letchworth and Hitchin. NHDC seems to have worked satisfactorily since then. I think you need to explain why you want Baldock to have a Town Council and what benefits it would bring to council tax payers. From here it looks like an extra layer of officialdom that we would be paying for without much in the way of benefits	No	Similar to No 7. You need first to list the benefits this would bring to the tax payer.
<sup>1049</sup> Resident	No	of henetic	No	
<sup>1056</sup> Resident	No	I can't see benefits associated with with this proposal	No	I can't see benefits associated with with this
<sup>1079</sup> Resident	No	One taxes are going up to much lately, and second my children and other peoples families have no chance of getting any housing with others getting first refusal. My sister alone has been told she has to wait 5 to 7 years for any chance of getting a house, she works 2 jobs and she as born and bred here, it absolutely disgusting and outrageous.	No	proposal
<sup>1105</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1112</sup> Resident	No	The establishment of a new Town Council for Baldock could mean more bureaucracy. In addition, at a time when people are struggling to make ends meet with a high cost of living and ever increasing Council Tax payments, this proposal would incur further costs to residents. The proposal doesn't clearly explain the benefits to residents of this draft recommendation, it only states that the new boundaries will align with the		As above.
		district ward boundaries. I am against anything that		

<sup>1131</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1132</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1133</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1134</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1141</sup> Resident	No	Im not in favour of anything that can possibly increase	No	I do not want any changes
Resident	110	my council tax	110	Too not want any changes
<sup>1143</sup> Resident	No	Baldock is one place. It's not a massive community,	No	The last thing that Baldock needs is additional
		and it has taken 40 years for the Clothall estate to be		layers of administration, division between
		considered as part of the town. We do not need to be		different areas and more councillors and staff
		divided even for administrative purposes		taking funds from the already overstretched
				public purse
<sup>1144</sup> Resident	No	More uneccessary cost.	No	
<sup>1153</sup> Resident	No	See no need	No	Cost and unnecessary bureaucracy that will
				result
1172 Resident	No	Can't see a massive reason for this change	No	Think we are adequately reresented as it is
<sup>1179</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>1187</sup> Resident	No	There do not appear to be any benefits to residents	No	I do not believe that establishing a separate
		accruing from these changes		town council for Baldock will be of benefit to
				residents
<sup>1208</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1227</sup> Resident	No	I believe that changing parish boundaries would lead	No	With nine councillors in place, there is a risk
		to unnecessary costs for the council and increased		that time and energy will be spent on internal
		bureaucracy, benefiting councillors more than the		competition rather than on delivering real
		local community.		benefits for the community. A smaller, more
				focused team would be better suited to making
				effective decisions and driving positive change.
<sup>1269</sup> Resident	No	The flyer states that establishing a town council will	No	The flyer states that establishing a town council
		add between £22-£121 additionally per year to council		will add between £22-£121 additionally per year
		tax. How on earth do residents benefit from this		to council tax. How on earth do residents
		change if there is a direct financial charge for the		benefit from this change if there is a direct
		endless time spent tinkering with something that only		financial charge for the endless time spent
		benefits the North Herts Council		tinkering with something that only benefits the
				North Herts Council
<sup>1279</sup> Resident	No	There are virtually no houses in large parts of the new	No	The cost to add extra councillors will be an
		boundaries; how will this be value for money?		additional financial burden on the residents.
				We do not need so many councillors in such a
1202 5				small town; 3 is already too many.
<sup>1283</sup> Resident	No	I do not believe a town council is necessary and is	No	I do not believe a town council is necessary and
		introducing new cost and spending that is not needed.		is introducing new cost and spending that is not
				needed.

<sup>1287</sup> Resident	No	unable to see any benefits to the alterations so keep	No	unable to see any benefits to the proposed
		as it is.		changes.
<sup>1293</sup> Resident	No	why is a change needed just leave as is	No	I am not paying more money to a town council
				as its waste of time and rsources
<sup>1300</sup> Resident	No	Too expensive. Why are residents expected to pay	No	Too many councillors, too expensive, just more
		more council tax for a lesser service, eg waste		bureaucracy.
		collection every three weeks instead of two. We don't		
		need a town council costing more.		
<sup>1301</sup> Resident	No	What benefit is there to create another body? Existing	No	What benefit is there to create another body?
		bodies represent the community just fine. Why put		Existing bodies represent the community just
		additional costs onto people? How many		fine. Why put additional costs onto people?
		representatives do I need? I feel like I have enough		How many representatives do I need? I feel like
		and haven't heard a good reason why the existing		l have enough and haven't heard a good reason
		councillors can't represent Baldock under the existing		why the existing councillors can't represent
		arrangements.		Baldock under the existing arrangements.
<sup>1310</sup> Resident	No	The government is bankrupt it is ridiculous to spend	No	Too expensive and unnecessary
		more money on things like this		
<sup>1313</sup> Resident	No	We don't need any additional calls on our council tax.	No	
		The money should be spent on our services not		
		additional bureaucracy.		
<sup>1343</sup> Resident	No	I do not wish to pay more council tax to pay for a town	No	l do not wish to pay more council tax to pay for
		council or more bureaucracy.		a town council or more bureaucracy.
<sup>1347</sup> Resident	No	Additional cost for negligible personal benefit	No	Additional cost for negligible personal benefit
<sup>1372</sup> Resident	No		No	We have a District Council and creating a Town
				Council is another layer of unnecessary
				bureaucracy that may result in additional costs
				without necessarily improving local services.
<sup>1384</sup> Resident	No	I see no reason or justification to include yet another	No	
		layer of bureaucracy/administration at additional cost		
		to residents. I can also foresee the example given on		
		your flyer of between £22 - £121 increase in Council		
		Tax to be vastly underestimated and will increase		
		substantially over the years. There should be a drive		
		to reduce the size of bureaucracies and the costs		
		involved not increase them. I'm		
<sup>1435</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1438</sup> Resident	No	Additional costs are not affordable and additional	No	
		governance is not required or welcome.		
<sup>1484</sup> Resident	No	I do not consider Baldock needs a town council. Alter	No	See 7 above. I'll just repeat, NO to a town
		the boundaries if you must but in my view, the Town		council.
		does not require an additional level of local		
		government with all the extra costs and bureaucracy		
		this would involve.		

No	We need an independant Parish Council in Baldock.	No	I would wish to have a public consultation
	The addition of Clothall and Bygrave will cause		before deciding on any of this. Descriptions are
	overcrowding of public services such as GPs due to the		too brief for such an important matter.
	new estate being constructed North of the railway		
	bridge at Baldock Station.		
No	Another completely unnecessary wate8 of time and	No	
	money. There is no valid reason for this.		
No	·	No	We waste enough money on local government.
No	I don't think that this would be good value for money	No	The costs are too high
	for residents		
No	Extra cost to Council Tax payers is unjustified. Do not	No	Will add more expense with little extra benefit -
	want the boundary changes to be used as justification		more chat, less action.
	, 6		
	-		
	. , ,		
	<del>-</del>		
	expensive new cycle routes despite poor road		
	condition, reduced bin collections, increased litter, and		
	grandiose schemes driven & imposed by central		
No	We don't need any more councillors	No	
No		No	
No	Don't want to pay more council tax to facilitate these	No	
	changes.		
No	There is no need to mess with anything. Leave well	No	Not necessary. Just adds unnecessary wages.
	alone.		Which we as residents should not have to pay.
No	We do not need any changes to the existing system,	No	As above.
	many people are already struggling financially without		
	many people are already struggling financially without any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the		
	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the		
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.	No	We need to cut costs not create more which are
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another	No	We need to cut costs not create more which are
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another	No	
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more
	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication		not required . I dont want to pay a penny more
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy ? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication  We have enough bureaucracy, the proposal doesn't	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more for council tax
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication  We have enough bureaucracy, the proposal doesn't state what the additional charge to residents is for and	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more for council tax
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication  We have enough bureaucracy, the proposal doesn't state what the additional charge to residents is for and what benefit we would see if the proposals go ahead.	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more for council tax
No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication  We have enough bureaucracy, the proposal doesn't state what the additional charge to residents is for and	No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more for council tax
No No	any unnecessary and more expensive changes to the system.  Why the extra expense and bureaucracy? Just another crazy idea of jobs for the boys. All this unnecessary burocratic duplication  We have enough bureaucracy, the proposal doesn't state what the additional charge to residents is for and what benefit we would see if the proposals go ahead. I am therefore against it.	No No	not required . I dont want to pay a penny more for council tax  Already stated above
	No No No No No No No No	The addition of Clothall and Bygrave will cause overcrowding of public services such as GPs due to the new estate being constructed North of the railway bridge at Baldock Station.  No Another completely unnecessary wate8 of time and money. There is no valid reason for this.  No  I don't think that this would be good value for money for residents  So Extra cost to Council Tax payers is unjustified. Do not want the boundary changes to be used as justification for delaying democratic elections. Do not want boundaries changed for areas/developments where my formal consent/objection has yet to be given.  Council services are getting worse & my taxes are being wasted on projects such as new 20mph limits, road closures, road narrowing, road restrictions and expensive new cycle routes despite poor road condition, reduced bin collections, increased litter, and grandiose schemes driven & imposed by central and condition.  No We don't need any more councillors  No Don't want to pay more council tax to facilitate these changes.  There is no need to mess with anything. Leave well alone.	The addition of Clothall and Bygrave will cause overcrowding of public services such as GPs due to the new estate being constructed North of the railway bridge at Baldock Station.  No Another completely unnecessary wate8 of time and money. There is no valid reason for this.  No No I don't think that this would be good value for money for residents  Extra cost to Council Tax payers is unjustified. Do not want the boundary changes to be used as justification for delaying democratic elections. Do not want boundaries changed for areas/developments where my formal consent/objection has yet to be given.  Council services are getting worse & my taxes are being wasted on projects such as new 20mph limits, road closures, road narrowing, road restrictions and expensive new cycle routes despite poor road condition, reduced bin collections, increased litter, and grandiose schemes driven & imposed by central  No We don't need any more councillors  No  There is no need to mess with anything. Leave well  No alone.

<sup>1675</sup> Resident	No	Do not want to see an increase in council Tax due to	Yes	Do not want to see an increase in council Tax
		this proposal.		due to this proposal.
<sup>1689</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1704</sup> Resident	No		No	Additional council tax costs
<sup>1715</sup> Resident	No	The expense of yet another level of local government	No	The proposed number of councillors is
		is totally unnecessary.		excessive.
<sup>1734</sup> Resident	No	Unsure why 9 town councillors would be required for	No	
		a town of 10k residents? The current councillors do		
		very little for extra cost and I can imagine that the		
		extra 9 would do very little but yet expect to be		
		rewarded accordingly!		
<sup>1735</sup> Resident	No	Unsure of need	No	I do not want to
				pay more council tax for this unnecessary
				change. We already have councillors to
				represent us.
<sup>1738</sup> Resident	No	This will just create more bureaucracy and waste tax	No	This will just create more bureaucracy and
		payers money without adding any significant value.		waste tax payers money without adding any
		The current system works, why break it.		significant value. The current system works,
				why break it.

<sup>1747</sup> Resident	No	This proposal is being made only to facilitate the quite No	1) Local Government, as currently constituted in
		unnecessary expansion of Baldock from a small	North Hertfordshire works as effectively as
		English market town into what will be, essentially, a	Local Government ever can. Yet another tier of
		London suburb.	Local Government, presumably constituted
			below the District Council will serve no practical
			purpose. It would be, quite simply,
			unnecessary, expensive and serve no effective
			purpose. I, for one, am NOT prepared to pay
			YET more Council Tax for what would be
			essentially an otiose talking shop.
			2) The proposal to split Baldock into two, very
			unequal, Wards would also make this proposed
			"Council" far less democratic. The East Ward
			would always have only a minority voice within
			Baldock. As such any concerns or issues
			pertaining specifically in the east of the Town
			(where "Rayner-grad is due to be foisted upon
			us) would always be over-ruled or ignored by
			the built-in majority that would pertain in the
			West.
			2B) To this day there is still a residual "Us and
			Them" cultural legacy noticeable in the Town
			following the development of Clothall Common
			over forty years ago. Although this has
			diminished in recent years, making a conscious
			decision to split the Town into two "factions" in
			this way will only bring that problem roaring
			right back.
			2C) Furthermore in Baldock East we get to vote
1755			for a Local Councillor only in one year in four,
<sup>1755</sup> Resident	No		We do not need another layer of bureaucracy
			(funded by my council tax). If any more local
			representation is required, there are already
			councillors on NHDC representing the areas in
			question, and they could easily form an
			appropriate sub-committee or interest group
1767 Docidont	No	It's unclose if this is dependent on their exections.	without adding further layers of obfuscation.
<sup>1767</sup> Resident	No	It's unclear if this is dependent on then creating a No	I agree with the points made by the councillor is
		town council and I'm not in favour of that.	the report we don't need more layers of
			democracy or to pay more council tax as I don't
			believe we will get any value from this. Possible
			just more bureaucracy

1777 Resident				
	No	I see n benefit in the changes	No	I see no benefit in another layer of local
				govenment
<sup>1785</sup> Resident	No	Smaller gov not larger	No	As above
<sup>1788</sup> Resident	No	This is typical political jobs for the boys. You should be	No	As my comments on Item 7.
		reviewing how to make the current policy more		
		efficient and for a change how to reduce costs to the		
		rate payers. My opinion of most of the current		
		councillors i have dealt with and council meetings i		
		have attended, the standard of personell and		
		organisation is very poor.		
<sup>1789</sup> Resident	No	The leaflet delivered to residents and the website	No	See my previous answer; the information given
		signposted on it provide no information as to why a		is not enough to make an informed decision.
		town council is needed, what the benefit to residents		
		would be and what difference we would see in the		
		facilities provided. They assume prior knowledge that		
		most residents do not have.		
		The website merely explains what one is; nothing		
		specific to us.		
		There is also no information on what the difference		
		would be to the services provided by North Herts; if		
		there is a difference, I would expect the part of the		
		council tax paid to North Herts would decrease.		
		It said that there will be an increase to the council tax		
		but no information on what the town council would		
		spend it on.		
<sup>1797</sup> Resident	No	We don't need that many councillors in a small town.	No	As above. We don't need 6 it waters down their
		lt's unnecessary.		responsibility.
<sup>1812</sup> Resident	No	The council have just increased rates by 4.8%. These	No	The council have just increased rates by 4.8%.
		proposals will add a further level of beaurocracy and		These proposals will add a further level of
		result in a further increse in Council tax. In your flyer		beaurocracy and result in a further increse in
		you say this might be between £21 and £221 per		Council tax. In your flyer you say this might be
		you say this might be between 221 and 2221 per		courten take in your say time still give so
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that. What world do you people live in? As if the general		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?  Why don't you get a job in private practise - then you		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?  Why don't you get a job in private practise - then you might just get some perspective on the pressures		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?  Why don't you get a job in private practise -
		anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?  Why don't you get a job in private practise - then you might just get some perspective on the pressures most people are enduring.		between £21 and £221 per anum. Anyone with any sense will know it will be much closer to the higher end of that.  What world do you people live in? As if the general population have not got enough cost of living increases to deal with - you people want to increase it further! Seriously?  Why don't you get a job in private practise - then you might just get some perspective on

<sup>1849</sup> Resident	No	Further burden on residents when there's no demand, and the body will have no statutory responsibilities	No	More unnecessary bureaucracy .
<sup>1851</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>1863</sup> Resident	No	l don't really understand the benefit for the extra council tax	No	See above comment
<sup>1868</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1882</sup> Resident	No	An extra & unnecessary level of bureaucracy and	No	The Councillors we have now are pretty
		expense		worthless so adding more is unlikely to improve
				the situation.
<sup>1899</sup> Resident	No		No	l do not believe the additional administation is
				reqired or efficient use of time and resources.
				So no town council.
<sup>1930</sup> Resident	No		No	There is no need for a town council or need for
				an additional layer of bureaucracy or the
				additional cost and additional burden on
				residents
<sup>1964</sup> Resident	No	It will cost more money, and a town council will be	No	See comment above, get rid of multiple layers
		pointless following proposed local government		of governance and introduce unitary authorities
		reorganization to creat unitary authorities in 2028		
<sup>1976</sup> Resident	No	There is nothing wrong with the way things have been	No	There is no benefit to this and to cost a further
		run for the 30 years I've lived here. There is no need to		£121 a year is unjustifiable.
		break what isn't already broken especially when it		
		comes at great cost. Leave Baldock aloneit runs		
		perfectly well as it is.		
<sup>2056</sup> Resident	No	It's an unnecessary layer of local government, with	No	A Baldock Town Council will have no real value
		very little influence. A sheer waste of time and money.		or influence in decision making.
		It has been looked at and discussed before in great		
		detail and rejected, by the local public.		
<sup>2058</sup> Resident	No	I'm not convinced it's worth the cost.	No	There is no need for a Parish Council in my view.
<sup>2085</sup> Resident	No	With respect, existing Councillors need to do	No	Not necessary and expensive!
		everything in their power to reduce costs for residents		
		- if existing councillors cannot cope with their job role		
		then let them be replaced.		

<sup>2136</sup> Resident	No	See comments below re Town Council proposal.	No	What North Herts needs is clear partnership
				between its towns, in particular Baldock,
				Letchworth GC and Hitchin, recognising the
				differences and benefits of each. Not having a
				holistic approach will over time give a worse
				environment for those in North Herts as the
				towns attempt to compete with each other
				rather than working together to deliver a joined-
				up approach to services and facilities. A town
				council for Baldock is likely to enforce a narrow-
				minded approach to services which does not
				serve the people of the town or the wider area.
				Further, adding to the Council tax bill for
				something unnecessary is wrong at any time,
				but particularly so in times where many face
				financial hardship.
<sup>2202</sup> District	No	I think there maybe a case for a Town council in	No	<u> </u>
Councillor		Baldock after the local council reorganisation but not		
		until after that has been implemented		
<sup>2206</sup> Resident	No	At a time when we are all suffering from the results of	No	At a time when we are all suffering from the
		high inflation and a shortage of funds to pay for even		results of high inflation and a shortage of funds
		the basic necessities in life I see no advantage in		to pay for even the basic necessities in life I see
		creating yet another level of administration which will		no advantage in creating yet another level of
		just cost us all more. The district council already does		administration which will just cost us all more.
		a fine job of looking after the interests of Baldock		The district council already does a fine job of
		residents.		looking after the interests of Baldock residents.
<sup>114</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Town councils (ie Letchworth) were a costly
				failure and just another layer of bureaucracy,
				with little power. Residents expectations were
				high, but Town Councils are actually able to
				deliver little. Letchworth failed because of the
				above and i am certain Baldock would do
<sup>9</sup> Resident	Yes	Baldock has needed this local council for many years,	Yes	likewise
		as it is missing this level of representation.		
<sup>21</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>34</sup> Resident	Yes	None	No	As with Hitchin and Letchworth, a Baldock Town
				Council would be a waste of taxpayers' money.
<sup>35</sup> Resident	Yes			Why is there such a large difference in the
				number of councillors between the two wards.
<sup>38</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>52</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	

<sup>75</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>103</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense	Yes	
<sup>115</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>174</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	I think that it has been something of an
				anomaly that smaller parishes such as Bygrave
				have hitherto had local representation through
				a parish council, but that Baldock, as a town has
				only had District councillors
<sup>225</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>344</sup> Resident	Yes	This is sensible	Yes	A town council for Baldock is essential. District
				& County councillors are too focussed on party
				political issues and blaming each other for
				doing or not doing things. A town council at
				grass roots level to tackle truly local issues and
				provide advice is a much better system
<sup>346</sup> Resident	Yes	The parish boundaries should follow the ward	No	Agree if this replaces the current town council,
		boundaries now and accommodate any future		and is not as well as it. However 9 councillors is
		changes, so the boundaries need to be flexible so they		too many. The council needs to shift from
		continue to follow the ward boundaries		being a talking shop with no powers, to an
				organisation with a clear constitution with a
				mandate and powers to take action and make
				changes. I do not agree to 9 councillors and
				want to see the terms of ref of the new council
252				and way they will be accountable for
<sup>353</sup> Resident	Yes	You've made these questions incredibly difficult to	No	You've not given any reason why Baldock needs
		answer without showing them on the referenced map.		a town council.
<sup>361</sup> Resident	Yes		No	We have enough layers of bureaucracy without
				adding more expensive talking shops with more
				councillors taking money from the public purse.
<sup>379</sup> Resident	Yes	I have long thought that, being the smallest of the	Yes	
		constituent towns of NE Herts district council, Baldock		
		could be often overlooked in favour of the two largest		
		towns. This may help to redress the balance.		
		terms may map to rearess are salaries.		
<sup>384</sup> Resident	Yes	•	Yes	·
<sup>443</sup> Resident	Yes	The lack of a town council for Baldock and other north	Yes	In the event of Growing Baldock actually
		Herts towns has been an anomaly in a political		happening, I trust the system will allow some
		environment that should focus on local democracy. It's		increase in the number of councillors for
		time the situation was rectified.		Baldock east.
<sup>588</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I'm not in favour of another layer of
				government and the extra tax for me to pay
				that would be required.

<sup>619</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>650</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>664</sup> Resident	Yes	No	I am highly concerned about the idea that we
			require another layer of bureaucracy by
			creating a town council. We already have a
			district and county council, this further level of
			representation seems unnecessary.
			The idea that you would then want to increase
			council tax further to pay for this is also highly
			inappropriate. We have just received a 5.8%
			increase in our council tax bill for the
			forthcoming year. Whilst paying this increase,
			we are also getting a large service decrease
			regarding the general waste collection going
			from fortnightly to three weekly. Service
			standards have declined massively since I first
			moved to Baldock: general waste collection is
			now going to be more infrequent, garden waste
			is now charged for, litter bins have been
			removed, the library is open less and there are
			many others. If there is to be any increase in
			council tax it should not be put towards
			creating more layers of administration and
			additional councillors. It should be put into
			actually improving the services that residents
			want, rather than councillors just sitting around
<sup>707</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>714</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>717</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>728</sup> Resident	Yes	Yes	
<sup>867</sup> Resident	Yes	No	Extra costs not needed.
<sup>876</sup> Resident	Yes	No	Why the need for so many councillors fot
			baldock west
<sup>910</sup> Resident	Yes	No	Too many proposed councillors

<sup>917</sup> Resident	Yes		No	This seems excessive for a town of our size, I
				understand that there are plans in place to
				grow Baldock but increasing the costs to
				current residents by putting in more councillors
				seems ridiculous. I would like to see the
				justification of why we need this increase in
				resource and what the roles & responsibilities
				are for these councillors. Spending money on
				parking wardens to stop people parking
				consistently on the double yellow lines at the
				junction of north road & bygrave road would be
				hattar coanti
<sup>927</sup> Resident	Yes	1 1 3	No	I'm not aware of what powers would be
		parts of these areas, this seems reasonable.		devolved from NHDC to the proposed town
				council and given the continuation of the
				district council I'm not sure why we need a town
				council. My answer would be different if NHDC
				was being abolished as I think Baldock is
<sup>931</sup> Resident	Yes	Daduce the grape /boundary of parish councils as	Na	sufficiently represented on it.
Resident	res	, , , ,	No	The additional cost required to implement
		much as possible. Baldock is already well represented		further bureaucracy that is not needed and that we can't afford. Baldock is already well
		at district level		represented at district level
977 Resident	Yes	In view of the plans to create large unitary authorities	Yes	represented at district level
		for Hertfordshire a more local level of representation		
		in the form of a parish council seems appropriate and		
		this seems even more desirable when one considers		
		the plans for large scale development in Baldock.		
		However, in view of the fact that in recent years there		
		has been a tendency for the cost of utilities etc to rise		
		faster than earnings, the cost of a parish council		
		would need to be considered carefully. I suggest that		
		the establishment of the aforesaid council should		
		definitely not increase council tax bills by more than		
		5.0%		
<sup>1014</sup> Resident	Yes	I hope it gives a good focus on the needs of that	Yes	
		specific area.		

<sup>1095</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense given Baldock is expanding into these areas.	Yes	A more honest answer might be "It depends on what happens in the bigger local government
		areas.		review".
				If North Herts District Council is abolished and
				we're left as part of a big unitary authority, then
				I'm strongly in favour of having the town council
				to keep democracy local.
				If North Herts continues to exist then I'm not in
				favour of this proposal, I think there are better
				ways to spend the money.
				To be honest it seems a little strange to do this
				review now before the plan for Hertfordshire
<sup>1103</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	has been desided
<sup>1126</sup> Resident	Yes		No	More bureaucracy and slower response times
		Why are they still called parishes when most people		to solving issues.
1100		no longer identify as Christian?		
<sup>1186</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1204</sup> Resident	Yes	In general, it seems illogical for Clothall and Bygrave	No	I have lived in Baldock for over 50 years, and for
		parishes to be responsible for areas which most, if not		much of that time at a local level, it has been
		all, residents of Baldock currently believe are within		under the jurisdiction of NHDC. To my mind,
		the boundary of Baldock. It seems an inefficient use of		from a cost / benefit / efficiency perspective,
		Bygrave & Clothall parish councillors' time attending to		this level of local government works well. Under
		matters that impact on Baldock residents as opposed		this arrangement, on the rare occasion an issue
		to their own constituents.		has arisen, I have felt my voice has always been
				heard and I have never felt under-represented.
				Creating further sub-groups of NHDC, or
				disbanding NHDC in its entirety in favour of
				smaller bodies seems an inefficient use of
				taxpayers money which would no doubt result
				in higher costs, and unnecessary duplication of
				effort by those delivering local services. Indeed,
				NHDC was itself created by merging /
				disbanding the previous Urban District Councils
				(of which Baldock was one). One of the reasons
				for doing so at the time was that running a
				single District Council would be more efficient
				than having a number of small Urban District
				Councils. On this basis, the proposal seems to
				be a backwards step. As a result, I
1221 D: ! ·	V	(See Jahren elegan) Jahren 1997	V	wholeheartedly object to the stated proposal
<sup>1221</sup> Resident	Yes	I feel they should be kept separate, as they can have	Yes	This will help in focusing in on the particular
		more of a say in regards to their specific needs and enquiries.		areas they represent.

<sup>1298</sup> Resident	Yes	It seems like a logical thing to do and is probably	Yes	I assume this has been calculated
		overdue.		proportionality. It may need to change if the
				expansion ever goes ahead.
<sup>1302</sup> Resident	Yes	Not too bothered about draft 1, it's draft 2 I have an	No	l do not want to see this. A county and district
		issue with.		council is sufficient. A further town council is
				not worth the money and the rise in Council
				Tax, which is expensive enough as it is.
<sup>1303</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I do not think there is a need to create a new
				town council. I believe this would increase
				bureaucracy and is not a good use of council
				tax.
<sup>1316</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1317</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1330</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Cannot see any need for this. Also multi
				councillor wards are not democratic. We will
				most likely have 6 councillors from one party
				and either three more from the same or at best
				three from another. This won't represent
				residents views. We should either have 9 wards
				or a PR electoral system.
<sup>1335</sup> Resident	Yes	I have no arguments against the re-writing of the	No	There has not been any information regarding
		parish boundaries. The change looks sensible.		the positive or negative impacts of forming a
				town council aside from the warning that
				council tax is likely to increase. As council tax
				and their associated services are already
				expensive, I would not be happy at this time to
				vote in favour of a large town council without
				understanding the scope and value of that
1211				setun
<sup>1344</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I would support the idea of a town council of
				there were 9 wards. One for each councillor so
4257				we had a proper range of views represented.
<sup>1357</sup> Resident	Yes	I am in favour of adjusting the boundaries given the	No	
1420 p		expansion due to the town	.,	
<sup>1439</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense for all representatives for an area to	Yes	It is not clear what power these reps will have.
		share the same boundaries		Can other bodies over rule the Baldock Parish
				councillors? If the new councillors are merely a
				representative body that do not have the final
				say what is the point of them?

<sup>1542</sup> Resident	Yes	1. Another layer of cost to residents in these difficult	No	1. Another layer of cost to residents in these
		times. 2. Prematurity as local government in Herts is		difficult times. 2. Prematurity as local
		being reorganised and NHerts should wait for the new		government in Herts is being reorganised and
		organisation to look at its whole area. 3. It's		NHerts should wait for the new organisation to
		increasingly difficult to find individuals to put		look at its whole area. 3. It's increasingly difficult
		themselves forward as town/parish councillors, why		to find individuals to put themselves forward as
		are we creating more.		town/parish councillors, why are we creating
				more
551 Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>590</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>591</sup> District	Yes	A logical adjustment to boundries	No	There is little or no appetite to increase the
Councillor				amount of representation in Baldock. Current
				arrangements provide democratic
				representation for the residents of the town
				without duplicating administration at additional
				cost to the council tax payers. There is no
				evidence of added value. Also, the forthcoming
				unitary changes need to bed
<sup>683</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
		North Herts. Gov. People,		So, you're shuffling Baldock around like it's a
		Parish lines? Nine councillors? Look, let's just privatise		deck of particularly dull cards. Nine councillors?
		the whole thing. Baldock LLC. Subscription-based bins,		That's a lot of opinions about roundabouts.
		premium potholes, and councillors replaced by Al		Could we maybe just settle this with a town-
		running on a blockchain. Think of the shareholder		wide game of rock-paper-scissors? Or, hear me
		value! My vote? A resounding "meh" followed by a bid		out, a raffle? Winner gets to redraw the lines.
		to buy my street.		"Are you in favour?" My enthusiasm is currently
		Yours,		being outpaced by a snail attempting to climb a
		Future Baldock Conglomerate CEO (Maybe).		wall.
				Please, carry on. I'll be here, wondering if I can
				sell my vote on eBay.
				Yours,
				A Resident Who's Lost the Will to Draw Lines
				(Or Care).

<sup>1730</sup> Resident	Yes	I don't particularly care about parish boundaries, but it No	You have provided very little information on the
		seems to make sense to align them with district ward	justification for a new town council. The leaflet
		boundaries.	only mentioned it in passing with a one line
			comment that it may increase council tax by up
			to £121. The draft proposal pdf is not much
			help either. One line stands out: "it is very
			difficult for people to assess the options
			available to them without further information
			or context". Agreed. Please provide residents
			with further information and context. My
			(limited) understanding of the context is that
			Hertfordshire is looking to move to a unitary
			model. Until this is finalised, it makes little
<sup>1741</sup> Resident	Yes	No	No need for a Town Council in Baldock
<sup>1773</sup> Resident	Yes	Doesn't seem to be a problem No	Do not want to pay more council tax - already
			paying a huge amount for the size of my
			property.

<sup>774</sup> District	Yes	I believe that the recommendation for the parish No	This is NOT THE RIGHT TIME to be considering
Councillor		boundaries of Clothall and Bygrave Parishes being	this question while local government
		adjusted to be outside of the Baldock West and	reorganisation is yet to be implemented - or
		Baldock East District Wards is a positive step and in	even designed. The creation of a town councill
		line with the boundary review.	will undoubtedly have significant financial
			impact on our residents who have not been
			given all the facts about what a town council
			truly means for them and their household -
			specifically its remit or accountability.
			North Herts District Council already has
			SIGNIFICANT BURDENS on resources that
			should mean that to even look at
			implementation of these town councils is
			unworkable (while already undertaking work
			around the unitary reorganisation - this should
			take precedence, alongside BAU
			responsibilities). Can North Herts DC really
			afford this significant rise in costs, balanced
			against the savings that must be achieved each
			year?
			At a time of increasing costs of living - and in
			particular against a backdrop of yesterday's
			announcements regarding household bill
			increasing by 24% on average nationally - it is
			UNTHINKABLE TO ME THAT WE ARE EVEN
			CONSIDERING FURTHER FINANCIAL BURDEN on
			our residents every year, without good reason.
			THIS IS NOT DEMONSTRATING VALUE FOR
			MONEY. Town and parish councils have no
700 D : 1 .			statutory responsibilities, so they have no
<sup>790</sup> Resident	Yes	Should have been done long ago as only historic logic No	We are told the establishment of a town council
		that had the parish boundaries as they were.	will increase our council tax, but no indication
		However, the opportunity needs to be taken to drop	of the benefits that might arise are given. So it
		"clothall common" from postal and other look-up	is difficult to be in favour at this stage. And if it
		tables on internet etc for the SG7 postcode. It is	does go ahead, the boundary line between east
		unnecessary and tends to continue the separation of	and west should be redrawn to give equal
		clothall common from Baldock	representation; just mirroring the current
			district wards seems to be evidence of a lack of
			forethought. No doubt Baldock east would be
			out-voted by Baldock West. Why not be radical
			and have Baldock north-west and Baldock

<sup>1791</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1817</sup> Resident	Yes	The changes will mean that the boundaries of Baldock	Yes	Since Baldock Urban District Council was
		will bw better aligned with the housing in the town		abolished in the 1970s it has been an anomaly
		when the Local Plan is implemented.		that there has been no public body too speak
				specifically for Baldock, and the town has
				suffered as a result. Creating a tTown Council
				should help to correct that.
<sup>1826</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I do not support this proposal. While I
				understand the intention behind giving local
				communities more representation, this feels
				like an unnecessary extra layer of governance
				with limited actual power.
				As a resident, I'm already paying significant
				council tax, yet many essential services seem
				under strain. Introducing a Town Council with
				additional costs, potentially £30 to £130 more
				per year feels like asking residents to pay more
				while receiving less from the main council.
				Unless a clear, tangible benefit can be
				demonstrated beyond meetings and symbolic
				decisions I don't see how this improves
				outcomes for the town. I would prefer existing
				councils focus on delivering better value and
				service with the structures we already have.
<sup>1850</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I do wish for an increase on my council tax
<sup>1878</sup> Resident	Yes		No	

<sup>1893</sup> District	Yes	It absolutely makes sense to remove rural parish ward No	This is not the right time, if indeed there will
Councillor		boundaries from within the urban ward boundaries of	ever be a right time, to consider this question
		Baldock West and East.	while local government reorganisation has yet
			to be implemented - or even designed. The
			creation of a town council will undoubtedly
			have a significant financial impact on our
			residents who have not been given all the facts
			about what a town council truly means for
			them and their household - specifically its remit,
			cost, or accountability.
			North Herts District Council already has
			significant financial and resource burdens
			which means that even looking at the
			implementation of town councils is unworkable
			(while already undertaking work around the
			unitary reorganisation - this should take
			precedence, alongside vital day-to-day
			responsibilities). North Herts Council can not
			afford a significant cost rise, balanced against
			the savings that must be achieved each year, or
			a drain on officer resources.
			At a time of increasing costs of living - and in
			particular against a backdrop of yesterday's
			announcements regarding household bills
			increasing by 24% on average nationally - it is
			unconscionable that there is even a
			consideration of further financial burden on our
			residents every year, without good reason.
			This demonstrates no value for money. Town
			and parish councils have no statutory
1897 Resident	Yes	No	Proposal is unequal on ground of potential
			population.
<sup>1909</sup> Resident	Yes	The boundaries are inconsequential to me. However, No	This is ridiculous. At a time where the intention
		it makes sense to have parish, district and ward	of Government is to have less layers, it makes
		boundaries the same. Agreeing to this does not mean	no sense to add an extra layer. I also don't
		I agree with additional town councils. I believe a	agree to having to pay extra for a town council
		unitary authority solution is the best solution for all.	to do things that should be done already by
		All boundaries for national and local governance	North Herts or Hertfordshire councils (and
		should align.	would be done by an upcoming unitary
			authority). We need less government, not
			more, and single points of contact for issue
			resolution

<sup>1917</sup> Resident	Yes	ľ	No	
<sup>1923</sup> Resident	Yes	1	No	I do not agree with an increase in council tax to
				pay for a Town Council and nine new
				councillors.
<sup>1993</sup> Resident	Yes	No strong feelings either way but makes sense to align 1	No	I can see no benefit this additional level of
				bureaucracy and cost will bring. Baldock
				functions well without one so all this does is
				create unnecessary cost to residents
<sup>2066</sup> Another	Yes	These areas mainly appear to be outside the ONS BUA.	<b>Y</b> es	I think all areas should have been parished in
organisation				1974 and as such Baldock should have been
(l'm				given a successor parish in 1974 just like places
representing				like Hertford and Bishop's Stortford were. I see
myself as part				no reason why Baldock, Hitchin and Letchworth
of a proposal				Garden City should be treated differently than
to parish all				the rest of North Hertfordshire which is
non				parished.
metropolitan				
area in				
Fngland) *				
<sup>2103</sup> Resident	Yes	. , ,	Yes	Support creation of a parish of Baldock and
		parishes within Baldock East and Baldock West wards		associated town council, in order to create a
		into the new Baldock parish, so that the new town		focus for local community activity, particularly
		council can act as a unifying focus for community		in light of anticipated local government reform
		activity and identity in light of proposed significant		of district / county levels into a unitary authority
2200		new developments.		in near future.
<sup>2208</sup> Resident	Yes	r	No	Since I have lived in Baldock, the median wage
				has doubled while council tax has more that
				quadrupled. We do not need more expensive
				local government. We need fewer tiers, not
<sup>2218</sup> District	V	And an action and another transfer another transfer and another transfer another transfer another transfer and another transfer ano	/	more.
	Yes	•	Yes	
Councillor		needed throughout North Herts as part of the		
		restructuring of local govt. otherwise councils will be		
		too far removed from local communities and residents		
		needs and concerns. They are an important integral		
		part of our democratic structure		

BARI	LEY					
			Election dates		N Clirs	
ID	Capacity	Are you in	Please provide further comments to your answer6	Are you in	Please provide further comments to your	
		favour of the		favour of the	answer7	
		draft		draft		
		recommendat	i	recommendati	ti	
		on?6		on?7		

<sup>2161</sup> Parish or Town Yes	(No.1) Barley Parish Council has no objection to this	No	(No.2) Barley Parish Council do not support the
council (Barley	proposal		proposed increase from 6 to 7. Barley has 574
Parish Council)			electorates, a ratio of Councillors to electorates
*			of 1:95. Increasing the number of Parish
			Councillors to 7 would produce a ratio of 1:82.
			This is only a marginal increase. However, it
			would cause practicalities for the running of the
			Parish Council, for example, the difficulty of
			achieving a quorum and the reluctance of
			residents to put themselves forward to become
			Councillors. Barley Parish Council is of the view
			that the practical difficulties totally outweigh
			the very marginal increase in representation for
			villagers; the number of Councillors should
			nematic at C

BYGRAVE				
		Election dates		Boundaries
ID Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
339 Resident	Yes		No	There is no benefit
				Not value for money
				Another layer of bureaucracy
<sup>114</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>32</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense	No	I see no reason to change any boundaries

CALDECOTE AND NEWNHAM					
		Election dates		N Clirs	
<sup>ID</sup> Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>114</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>16</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I think that 6 should remain as modern life	
				dictates that not all councilors can attend every	
				meeting	
<sup>1971</sup> Parish or To	wn Yes			I seek clarity that the proposed reduced	
council				number of Councillors is the minimum number	
(Caldecote a	and			and does not put a limit on the maximum	
Newnham				number (reasonable number!). Are we okay to	
Parish Cour	ncil)			have 6 Councillors should we wish?	

LOTHALL		
		Boundaries
ID Capacity	Response	Reason
<sup>339</sup> Resident	No	There is no benefit
		Not value for money
		Another layer of bureaucracy
<sup>49</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>621</sup> Resident	No	You are only changing boundaries to accommodate
		future new housing developments it has nothing to do
		with the current day requirements
<sup>918</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>2240</sup> Another	Yes	
organisation		
(Clothall		
Parish) *		

	Election dates			N Cllrs
Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>22</sup> Resident	No	Ineffective Council needs reviewing and changing.	No	Codicote is increasing dramatically/ need more
		Need to be accountable. Too many people are doing		not less people.
		absolutely nothing for years! Needs to be a shorter		
		term so Councillors prove themselves to be effective		
		and proactive in the role.		
<sup>24</sup> Resident	No	Given the degree of responsibility expected of being	Yes	
		an unpaid Parish Councillor, I think that the proposed		
		one off 5 year term is excessive.		
<sup>55</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
85 Resident	Yes		Yes	

#### 

<sup>1970</sup> Resident	No	5 YEARS FAR TOO LONG
<sup>29</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1250</sup> Resident	Yes	Agree with term but not to expand the number of parish councillors

	Election dates			N Clirs	
D Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>78</sup> Resident	No	Currently the electorate and Parish Councils are being	No	I believe we the Electorate should be	
		ignored and not being given considerstion		listentened to and action taken, in our	
				opinions; this is not happening currently	
<sup>1970</sup> Resident	No	5 years too long	Yes	There are too many Parish Councillors	
<sup>53</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>558</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I agree with aligning the elections, but I'm in	
				favour of keeping 12 councillors.	
<sup>2162</sup> Parish/Town	Yes		No	The Community Council has received increased	
Councillor				interest from residents recently and with Great	
				Ashby an area due to expand, my personal view	
				is that there is no merit in decreasing the size of	
				the council at this time. GACC Councillors reside	
				in NH Great Ashby and the Stevenage part of	
				Great Ashby, and it seems likely that residents	
				from new developments will view GACC as their	
				parish council and their contributions as	
				councillors would make for a representative	
				viewpoint of our area	

HEXT	HEXTON							
					•			
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason			

<sup>103</sup> Resident	No	Hexton presently only has a parish meeting, not a
		parish council. If we are moving to unitary authorities,
		parish meetings may not be an effective way for the
		voice of the community to be heard at the larger
		unitary authority level. It would be worth considering
		establishing a grouped parish council for Hexton and
		Lilley, such that there's a permanently established
		council to speak on behalf of the two parishes. (I
		would not support formally merging the two parishes,
		only creating a grouped parish council for them.)
<sup>80</sup> Resident	Yes	We are small community often forgotten and no
		public transport.Recent water leak reported three
		weeks ago and still nothing done.Roads and drainage
		also low priority and education took our junior school
		away.

# **HINXWORTH**

ID Capaci	ty Respon	se Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>114</sup> Reside	nt Yes			
<sup>45</sup> Reside	nt Yes	This is a minimal change		

HITCHIN						
		Boundaries		Town Council		
<sup>ID</sup> Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason		

<sup>14</sup> Resident	No	Hitchin does not need a town council and is currently	No	Hitchin does not need a town council. Town
	-	well served by the existing BID, Hitchin Initiative, and	-	councils result in regulatory uncertainty under
		district set up. Local government reorganisation plans		the current system as there are no statutory
		currently indicate a future unitary will maintain		services and the precept is unregulated. During
		existing representation. Moving St Ippolyts will		a prolonged cost of living crisis there is no
		damage the parish boundary in the event no Hitchin		justification increasing council tax costs to
		Town Council is established creating a democratic		residents who will be forced to pay more, but
		deficit for the village.		get less. Residents outside the town centre will
				not be well served by the current proposal.
				Recent campaign literature on this duplicates
				the work of the BID and existing council, but is
				town centre focussed with no real offer for
				communities outside the town centre. There is
				nothing to require a town council maintain
				parks, play spaces and green areas, which risk
				being left unmanaged should this proposal go
				ahead. Unless the lowest tier of local
				government is reformed to require precepts be
				spent on specified service provision this
				proposal represents no value for money. It is
				based on existing representation levels, and
				while the district exists will add a further layer
				of local government adding to resident
				confusion about who is responsible for what.
				The future unitary set up currently likely will
				result in the same number of unitary
				councillors for each ward, while the BID and
				other community interest groups will continue.
				This means there is no demonstrable need for
				this proposal - residents will be forced to pay
<sup>27</sup> Resident	No	Total waste of time as NHDC is being abolished so why are you wasting time and money.	No	As previous answer
<sup>36</sup> Resident	No	We already have to many councillors. Why change	No	We already have to many councillors. Why
		things without giving clear and precise details of		change things without giving clear and precise
		improvements or cost savings.		details of improvements or cost savings.
		Eliminate Parish Councils. Combine Hitchin,	No	See 7 above.
<sup>48</sup> Resident	No			
<sup>48</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area		
		Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area Council. Will cut costs and beaurocracy.		
<sup>48</sup> Resident <sup>67</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area	No	I'm in favour of reducing the number of
		Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area Council. Will cut costs and beaurocracy.	No	parishes and councillors overall but this isn't
<sup>67</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area Council. Will cut costs and beaurocracy.  Seems a disjointed match		•
67 Resident 77 Another		Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area Council. Will cut costs and beaurocracy.  Seems a disjointed match  Isn't this futile as the Government is planning to either		parishes and councillors overall but this isn't
	No	Letchworth and Baldock and parishes into one Area Council. Will cut costs and beaurocracy.  Seems a disjointed match		parishes and councillors overall but this isn't

<sup>93</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>98</sup> Resident	No		Yes	More public consultation to drive positive
				change in Hitchin
<sup>109</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is area clearly separate from Hitchin town	No	Village is a well-defined community
<sup>139</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>162</sup> Resident	No	I don't have a strong view on this	No	We do not need another layer of local
		Ü		government. We do not need more councillors .
				We do not need increased council tax bills.
				On the contrary, we need to reduce spending
				on local government.
				This should be put to a local vote.
<sup>168</sup> Resident	No	To obviate additional costs	No	Unnecessary
<sup>179</sup> Resident	No	Each town should be run by individual government	No	
		party's like lease so they can respond better to		
		its own needs.		
<sup>194</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree with the proposal to form a town	No	It would involve and increase in Council Tax
		council.		which residents cannot afford.
<sup>196</sup> Resident	No	I do not have enough information to say "Yes".	No	I do not want yet another layer of bureaucracy
				paid for by council tax payers.
<sup>208</sup> Resident	No	It is waste of the tax payers money to introduce	No	It is a waste of the taxpayers money.
		another layer of council representation to a local		
244 =		authority.		
<sup>211</sup> Resident	No		No	What benefit would this even have.
<sup>214</sup> Resident	No	I do not see any benefit to having another layer of	No	I am indifferent to whether St Ippolyts north is
<sup>214</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
<sup>214</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local	No	****
<sup>214</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
<sup>214</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
214 Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
214 Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
214 Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
214 Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the
		bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council
214 Resident 219 Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no benefit in.  The current council tax is already too high		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high
		bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no benefit in.  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is
<sup>219</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no henefit in.  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is unacceptable	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high
		bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no benefit in.  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is unacceptable  Rather than reducing Highbury alone, simply reduce		in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is
<sup>219</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no henefit in.  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is unacceptable  Rather than reducing Highbury alone, simply reduce to 10 councillors and set it to 2 across the board per	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is
<sup>219</sup> Resident	No	bureaucracy, my view is that the community forum gives enough power and decision making to local members and the community, which is the same for Letchworth, why should Hitchin be any different. The town also benefits from the work of the BID, so I don't see where there is a gap in managing the town. I also object to having my council tax bill increased, I do not want to fork out even more for a town council I don't want and see no benefit in.  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is unacceptable  Rather than reducing Highbury alone, simply reduce	No	in or out of Hitchin, but I do object to the principle of a town council  The current council tax is already too high Creating a parish adding to the council tax bill is

<sup>231</sup> Resident	No	First steps to merging the boundaries of Hitchin and St	No	Adds an additional and unnecessary layer of
		Ippolyts.		administration bringing with it costs, confusion
				of accountability and potential expensive
				employment associated complications.
				Administrative structures should be kept
				'simple' to ensure financial efficiency.
<sup>233</sup> Resident	No		No	The town does not need any more money to be
				spent on bureaucrats. There is nothing wrong
				with the way it is run now.
				No more bureaucratic layers.
<sup>237</sup> Resident	No	Too expensive. Too many councillors already, no need	No	Too expensive. Too many councillors already,
		for extra layers of bureaucracy.		no need for extra layers of bureaucracy.
<sup>240</sup> Resident	No	ioi extra rayers or surreactively.	No	It felt as unnecessary and will not be of any
Resident	110		110	benefit
<sup>246</sup> Resident	No	It appears that creating more local authority	No	Certain
riesident		administration changes and positions is it the best		
		possible way to serve the local community especially		
<sup>252</sup> Resident	No	as we are in an extremely tough economic climate.  We do not need a new level of bureaucracy (and cost)	No	We do not need a new level of bureaucracy
Resident	NO		NO	
<sup>269</sup> Resident	No	established in our public services  As a former town councillor in another district of Herts	No	(and cost) established in our public services
203 Resident	NO		NO	See reply to questions 7
		that experience tells me that town councils have very		
		limited powers and influence. North Herts DC is local		
		enough and another tier is unnecessay. Also the		
		government are moving to a unitary authority		
		structure and we need to see their proposals for Herts		
		before creating new structures.		
<sup>271</sup> Resident	No		No	Council tax is already far too high. We don't
				need any more unneeded council jobs being
				created pushing this even higher
<sup>273</sup> Resident	No	With the cost of things going up with council tax, I'm	No	With the cost of things going up with council
		not in favour of increasing more revenue		tax, I'm not in favour of increasing more
				revenue
<sup>279</sup> Resident	No		No	Council tax is already too high. No need to
				make a new council
<sup>280</sup> Resident	No	None	No	A third layer of bureaucracy in Hertfordshire
				isn't needed and also it will increase the council
				tax residence pay.
207 5 11 .	No		No	
<sup>287</sup> Resident				
288 Resident	No	We do not need a town council	No	We do not need a town council
	No No	We do not need a town council  Too expensive	No No	We do not need a town council  Too expensive
<sup>288</sup> Resident				
<sup>288</sup> Resident <sup>289</sup> Resident	No	Too expensive	No	Too expensive

<sup>291</sup> Resident	No		No	I am an old age pensioner and object to any
				change by self-serving local politicians which is
				designed to take even more council tax from
				my fixed income, in order to pay for the
				creation of more jobs for the boys and which
				will no doubt increase bureaucracy.
<sup>296</sup> Resident	No		No	No wish to pay any more council tax than I am
				already paying
<sup>298</sup> Resident	No		No	l do not wish to pay any more council tax than l
				am already paying for what I see as no benefit -
				the tax burden is already too high for the
				limited service we receive.
300 Resident	No	So you are asking people to vote for higher council	No	So it seems there is only one recommendation,
		tax? This year the council once again increased the		why consult at all if there seem to be only one
		council tax but announced it is cutting services and		option? It is not clear to me why, despite having
		making a change from collecting the bin from 2 weeks		the same number of councillors if St Ippolyts
		to every 3 weeks. Now, you expect the residents to		does bnot move, proposal 1 will cost each
		vote for increase of council tax by additional up to		household up £120 more? Does it mean money
		£120 or more per year. I think the expectation is		is needed for another layer of bureaucracy? I do
		totally outrageous as people are already struggling. I		not approve or agree to this.
		do not agree to this. Does Hitchin really need 13		
		councillors in addition to an MP? or is it just a gravy		
		train for some?		
<sup>303</sup> Resident	No	No rationale for the change is immediately obvious.	No	No rationale provided. Unclear as to what
				benefits this brings to residents. Particularly if
				there is an increased cost to residents over and
				above the near 5% rise in CT this year
<sup>307</sup> Resident	No		No	Adding another layer of beaurocracy is
				unnecessary and costly. Resources and money
				should be diverted to areas that improve our
				community and infrastructure using existing
				bodies! Eg. National Highways and potholes. I
				absolutely reject any idea that we should pay
				more council tax to support new councillors.
				We already know where money should be
				snent
	No	We don't want or need more layers of governance,	No	We don't want or need more layers of
<sup>320</sup> Resident				
320 Resident		more costs and unelected retired bureaucrats.		governance, more costs and unelected retired bureaucrats.

<sup>328</sup> Resident	No		No	Given the unsatisfactory level, and quality, of
				service currently being provided I have zero
				interest in further stretching my already limited
				household budget to fund this change given the
				indication that council tax would have to rise to
				fund this vanity project. I appreciate that
				budgets are stretched and local government
				has to work within these confines but I'd much
				prefer you focused on getting the basic things
				right rather than this nonsense.
				ngittudiel dial dis lonselise.
<sup>332</sup> Resident	No	What's the point? Leave it alone!	No	I don't see any point in doing this. The council
				do, or appear to do, very little apart from cost
				the tax payer money, by doing this you will cost
				the tax payer even more money which we don't
				have.
<sup>341</sup> Resident	No	The constant cuts and increase in prices is	No	I see no benefit for the change and only costs
		unacceptable and further changes resulting in		related to it. It's another example of a poorly
		increased council tax pose no benefit to me so I am		managed council system. It would be much
		against any further unnecessary changes.		better to focus on this that actually benefit the
				community rather than send it into further
050				decline.
<sup>350</sup> Resident	No		No	No rationale has been given for establishing
262.5				this body.
<sup>363</sup> Resident	No		No	Further councillors not necessary and not in
				favour of increased cost. Current service poor
				as it is. Absolutely no justification given, bar
				aligning wards, for this increase in councillors
				and therefore assume is a job creation scheme
				that doesn't benefit residents. Request a
				detailed breakdown of the proposed benefits of
				the increase in councillors and the value for
27/ Docident	No		No	money residents will see
<sup>374</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>377</sup> Resident	No	In these tough economic times I do not want any	No	Why make a change to existing arrangements
		actions taken that will increase the cost of the already		which have worked for years. This appears to
		expensive council tax. Residents simply can not afford		be a stealth measure just to increase council
		it!		tax and one that will not go unnoticed at
				election times for local and national elections.
				Councillors have a responsibility to protect the
				people they serves from financial impacts such
				as this
<sup>390</sup> Resident	No	This will affect my council Tax, add more red tape,	No	
<sup>391</sup> Resident	No	This will affect my council Tax, add more red tape,	No	
resident		ancerny council ray, and more rea tape,	. 10	

<sup>392</sup> Resident	No	My concern is will this change add additional costs to	No	Absolutely not! This is a pointless exercise
		Hitchin residents?		taking more money away from hard working
				residents. I and many others totally disagree
				with a new creation of a Town Council.
<sup>401</sup> Resident	No	I don't understand from this information what the	No	
		council does, and you indicate it will increase council		
		tax bills. Can you explain that and then I can respond		
		with the right information.		
<sup>406</sup> Resident	No	We don't want a Town Council	No	Added expense on our council tax. This will take
				ours over £400 per month, which we can't
				afford
<sup>412</sup> Resident	No	More bureaucracy, less efficient, more cost - NO, NO,	No	More bureaucracy, less efficient, more cost -
		No		NO, NO, No
<sup>420</sup> Resident	No	No cogent argument has been presented to justify the	No	In my experience, increasing the tiers of local
		change.		governance causes confusion, duplication and
				needlessly increases costs to residents. The
				suggestion that such a move brings governance
				closer to communities invariably falls when one
				considers the number of members serving on
				all three tiers - the net result being decisions
				take longer and are more costly!
				Having worked with (or attempted to) three tier
				authorities over more than three decades 1
				conclude the only sensible way forward is the
				conclude the only sensible way forward is the establishment of unitary authorities.
<sup>421</sup> Resident	No	lt should remain as a village parish	No	
421 Resident 422 Resident	No No	It should remain as a village parish I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will	No No	establishment of unitary authorities.
		0 1		establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further
		I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will		establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that
<sup>422</sup> Resident	No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money	No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money
<sup>422</sup> Resident	No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money	No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of
<sup>422</sup> Resident	No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money	No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on
422 Resident 427 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides	No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council
422 Resident 427 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly	No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine.	No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine.
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine. I do not believe any perceived benefits will
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine. I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine. I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine. I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine.  I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has imposed numerous increased taxes with the likelihood of further increases - I do not believe
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine.  I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has imposed numerous increased taxes with the likelihood of further increases - I do not believe local accountability by elected representatives
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine.  I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has imposed numerous increased taxes with the likelihood of further increases - I do not believe
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident	No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine.  I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has imposed numerous increased taxes with the likelihood of further increases - I do not believe local accountability by elected representatives will improve local services to justify the
422 Resident 427 Resident 431 Resident 436 Resident	No No No	I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost even more money Unclear what benefit this provides  We don't need another layer of more costly bureaucracy. NHDC works fine. I have not seen any perceived benefits to either St Ippolyts or Hitchin residents to justify the proposed changes and the likely increase in costs and disruption.	No No No	establishment of unitary authorities.  I'm against my council tax increasing further  I am against another layer of bureaucracy that will cost taxpayers more money  Unclear what benefit this provides at the cost of increased council tax bills as mentioned on leaflet sent by council  We don't need another layer of more local bureaucracy that costs more. NHDC is fine. I do not believe any perceived benefits will justify another substantial increase in Council  Tax, in my case potentially an annual increase of £140, at a time when the Government has imposed numerous increased taxes with the likelihood of further increases - I do not believe local accountability by elected representatives will improve local services to justify the increased costs

<sup>447</sup> Resident	No	I find the marketing of the proposed Hitchin town	No	I find the marketing of the proposed Hitchin
		council and wording of the documentation received		town council and wording of the
		about it to be very sneaky and underhanded, things		documentation received about it to be very
		like "self funded" when in reality it's really being		sneaky and underhanded, things like "self
		funded by an additional amount from our council tax		funded" when in reality it's really being funded
		Even the last one is worded in such a way that it		by an additional amount from our council tax
		appears we have ONLY two options; both of which are		Even the last one is worded in such a way that it
		to have a town council of some sort.		appears we have ONLY two options; both of
				which are to have a town council of some sort
<sup>452</sup> Resident	No	Unclear why I want to accept something that will cost	No	Same as above.
		me more money.		Why accept a change that will cost me money
		What is not happening to suggest this change is		and what is not happening to do this? In which
		required? In which case should we be asking for a		case should we be asking for a council tax
		council tax reduction?		reduction,?
<sup>455</sup> Resident	No	I do not think Hitchin needs a town council.	No	l do not believe Hitchin should have a town
				council
<sup>458</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>463</sup> Resident	No		No	It is too soon to set up a Town Council. It may
				be necessary if we ose NHDC but not yet. I do
				not want to pay extra for an unnecessary ayer
<sup>471</sup> Resident	No		No	why on earth would you do something that will
				cost residents more money in this time of
				austerity? this is absolutely ridiculous
<sup>481</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>482</sup> Resident	No	l do not understand the reasons why this would	No	
		benefit the residents or the council. How would this		
		provide a safer more economical place for all		
		residents. How will the improve education and		
		opportunity for residents.		
<sup>485</sup> Resident	No		No	Charging the hard pressed council tax payers of
				North Herts even more council tax, whilst
				cutting services is a joke and would not support
				this, there is no benefit to a single person within
				North Herts. With increasing costs and inflation
				you think its a good idea to charge people more
				monev. vou must be mad.
<sup>486</sup> Resident	No		No	Object to further increase in Council Tax and
				more burocracy
<sup>487</sup> Resident	No	We don't want a Town Council. Ever.	No	We don't want a Town Council. Ever.

<sup>488</sup> Resident	No	What is the purpose??	No	This will be simply a duplication of what the
				district councillors are supposed to do now. You
				have provided no justification or explanation as
				to the purpose of the new level of councillors.
				Plus you propose to add yet more cost for this
				new council. I completely disagree with this it
				will achieve nothing other than a new talking
				shop. You have just increased my council tax by
				5% for no further benefit other than to pay
				council employees and their expensive
				pensions. The bin collection is getting worse -
				what are we getting for these further costs??
<sup>490</sup> Resident	No	lt's not in Hitchin and as such should remain	No	I do not want to pay more money for the same
		independent		or less service.
<sup>493</sup> Resident	No	More Bureaucracy	No	More Bureaucracy
<sup>495</sup> Resident	No	it will cost me more money	No	waste of money
<sup>499</sup> Resident	No		No	Adds another unnecessary layer of bureaucracy
				and cost to run what is ultimately a small town.
				We already have NHDC and an active MP.
				Nothing in the town council proposal gives a
				good reason why it ought to exist. I am also
				unconvinced that enough qualified candidates
				would be found.
<sup>502</sup> Resident	No		No	If creating a town council is going to increase
				my council tax still further I am not in favour of
				it. I cannot see the logic in another layer of
				meetings and beaurocracy.
<sup>507</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>508</sup> Resident	No	We've seen the leaflet and there is no information or	No	See above comments
		explanation on why this is being proposed it just		
		seems it's going to cost us more money with no		
		justifiable reason.		
<sup>515</sup> Resident	No	Very strongly opposed to any changes that create	No	Very strongly opposed to any changes that
		additional bureaucracy and additional costs to		create additional bureaucracy and additional
		taxpayers.		costs to taxpayers.
<sup>516</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>517</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>522</sup> Resident	No	This is just wasting time with administration and	No	This is just wasting time with administration
		bureaucracy		and bureaucracy
<sup>527</sup> Resident	No		No	
528 Danisland	No	I simply can't see the point of the Council spending	No	I simply can't see the point of the Council
<sup>528</sup> Resident				
sesident		our money and its time on an arcane reorganisation.		spending our money and its time on an arcane reorganisation

530 Dacidant	NIa		Vos	
<sup>539</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>540</sup> Resident	No	Now is good.	No	No need
<sup>541</sup> Resident	No		No	This is just a bureaucratic exercise that puts
				undue pressure when there is a cost of living
				crisis. Is the council out of touch with the
				working people?
<sup>544</sup> Resident	No	What is the value - there are no published benefits on	No	What is the value - there are no published
		the literature provided. Just an added cost.		benefits on the literature provided. Just an
				added cost.
<sup>549</sup> Resident	No		No	Why are we changing what we have now, why
				would we give you a reason to put up our
				council tax by £121
550 Resident	No		No	
<sup>551</sup> Resident	No		No	Waste of money
552 Resident	No	Don't understand what kind of benefit this will provide	No	Adding to the cost of resident's council tax bill
				when people are already struggling with the
				cost of living is ridiculous. The existing council
				should be able to manage.
<sup>562</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>563</sup> Resident	No	l don't want any more increases to my council tax.	No	
<sup>573</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>576</sup> Resident	No	I see no examples of the proposals improving council	No	I see no examples of the proposals improving
		services but I can see a possible increase in council tax		council services but I can see a possible
		payment as suggested in the flyer that was posted to		increase in council tax payment as suggested in
		my house because of that reason I can not agree with		the flyer that was posted to my house because
		the proposals.		of that reason I can not agree with the
				proposals.
<sup>578</sup> Resident	No	We don't need a new Town Council	No	We don't need a new Town Council
<sup>579</sup> Resident	No	No need for yet more layers of bureaucracy & even	No	As above. No need for yet more layers of
		higher hikes in council tax. No thanks.		bureaucracy & even higher hikes in council tax.
				No thanks.
583 Resident	No	See no benefit in these changes	No	

<sup>589</sup> Resident	No		No	I've just received a leaflet through the door
				telling me about the change and how to
				comment. There's just no information on
				exactly why this would be of any benefit to any
				resident, but noting that my council tax could
				go up as much as £121! That's a big strain on
				people and something that I personally would
				not want to pay when. It's so unclear as to what
				we'd actually be getting for the money. Before
				bringing this in, a proper consultation would
				need to be had with people explaining what the
				benefit is. As yet, I cannot see what any of the
				benefits could be. Many of us are turned off of
				local politics anyway. Please please please
				make a compelling case on why this would be
				of any benefit. If not, the whole notion needs to
				be dropped and our council tax money be
				saved. In its current form, I do not support the
500 D:	NI -	I alaulkaan aurusaan klask Ck Innahistaa Ninskia wasiid	NI-	
<sup>590</sup> Resident	No	, , , , ,	No	We don't need more people involved in
		be better served by moving it to Hitchin ward. It seems		anything. The council don't listen to the
		to make far more sense that it is looked after by is		residents at the moment they won't listen to
<sup>592</sup> Resident	No	own parish ward. This is unnecessary waste	No	these additional people. Total waste of money. This is unnecessary waste
		This is difficeessary waste		
<sup>593</sup> Resident	No		No	I don't see the benefit of having an additional
				layer of bureaucracy without clear plans. The
				current proposal talks about things that "might
				be enabled" without any concrete proposals or
				things they would tackle for sure with the
507 D: -! +	NI -	There are two accounts and morelets demand	NI-	money the new council would collect.
<sup>597</sup> Resident	No	These are two separate and unrelated areas	No	There would be no significant benefit to the
				community in instituting another council. Just
				more would-be-politician councillors with their
				associated expense claims and a further charge
				on local residents who already have significant
600 Resident	No	I don't feel there is a need for this and local	No	rises in bills to contend with. I don't feel there is a need for this and local
RESIDERE	140	government should protect my interests. I am unclear	. 10	government should protect my interests. I am
		of any benefit to this proposal and it seems it will just		unclear of any benefit to this proposal and it
		cost the residents money with limited benefits.		seems it will just cost the residents money with
				seems it will just cost the residents money with
		cost the residents money with limited benefits.		limited banefits
<sup>601</sup> Resident	No	cost the residents money with limited benefits.	No	limited benefits.  Reading the proposal it sounds like it would
<sup>601</sup> Resident	No	cost the residents money with limited benefits.	No	limited benefits.  Reading the proposal it sounds like it would increase the cost of council tax rates in Hitchin

<sup>602</sup> Resident	No	No idea of what are the pros and cons of this proposal	No	Only of North Herts council gets merged with
				Herts County Council. Otherwise we'd end up
				with too many layers of local government
<sup>609</sup> Resident	No	It is likely to increase my council tax and I don't want that	No	Same as above
<sup>611</sup> Resident	No	I would rather spend the additional money proposed on ensuring refuse collections continue on a 2 weekly rotation as opposed to spending it on an unnecessary bureaucratic change.	No	See previous answer
<sup>612</sup> Resident	No		No	
622 Resident	No	I have never seen any justification for this change, so	No	There's no plan on what this council would
		why the change?		actually do. It's unlikely it will have any real
		,		impact on local services. I don't think there is
				any need for this, and I strongly oppose to this
				and any additional cost unless directly linked to
				an essential local service. People are struggling
				to afford to buy their first home, rent and
				council tax increases are bleeding us out, and
				you suggest an undefined hike in council tax for
				an undefined council with no plan whatsoever. I
				find this extremely tone deaf.
623 Resident	No	What is the need/value that represents an upside to	No	Given the current economic backdrop I believe
		people if their council tax is to increase?		any central or local government proposal
				should centre around cost reduction and
				efficiency/efficiency savings. I note this proposal
				will result in an increase to council tax. What is
				the benefit and value for council tax payers of
				this initiative? Adding any additional cost to
				council tax payers should be rigorously
				challenged. Are 13 councillors really needed?
				Why not 11? What efficiencies and savings can
				be found elsewhere to fund these proposals
				that will not result in an increase to council tax
				bills? This feels like a fait accompli as there is no
				explanation of the upside to council tax payers.
				I would have thought the headline for such a
				proposal should be a reduction in council tax
<sup>624</sup> Resident	No	What is the point? There is no information saying why	No	What is the point? There is no information
		this is a good thing. I do not want my council tax to go		saying why this is a good thing. I do not want
				my council tax to go up again.
		up again.		my council tax to go up ugum.
<sup>626</sup> Resident	No	Do not want additional quang. Not needed if existing	No	As above
626 Resident	No		No	

<sup>634</sup> Resident	No	Having just sent out this coming year's increased	No	Having just sent out this coming year's
		Council Tax demand, surely now is not the time to be		increased Council Tax demand, surely now is
		proposing changes which would increase Council Tax		not the time to be proposing changes which
		still further. Especially not a change that brings a		would increase Council Tax still further.
		rather pointless additional tier of governance whilst		Especially not a change that brings a rather
		actual Council services to residents are being cut year		pointless additional tier of governance whilst
		on year. I, like many, cannot afford the existing new		actual Council services to residents are being
		charge, never mind the hardship a further increase		cut year on year. I, like many, cannot afford the
		would bring. Read the room!		existing new charge, never mind the hardship a
626 5 11				further increase would bring Read the room!
<sup>636</sup> Resident	No	Added bureaucracy and increases to Council Tax to	No	As above, in my experience new Councillors are
		pay for it unnecessary and not in residents interest.		often opinionated, and use their position to
				push through changes to suit themselves,
				family members and friends - to the detriment
<sup>641</sup> Resident	NI-	Use and account of any base of the Wiley are and the system of the	NI-	cost wise of the wider community
Resident	No	I'm not aware of any benefit. Why spend they money?	NO	Seems like no benefit but more cost - I would
				rather you focused on keeping council tax
				down. Not creating more jobs/roles with
				unclear benefit. I believe historically these town
				councils have been shown to increase council
				tax with very limited benefits, and are very
				difficult to get rid of - Letchworth managed it
644 Resident	No	I have no real opinion on this, not being a resident of	No	but with great difficulty We don't need yet another layer of local
Resident	140	St Ippolyts	140	government
<sup>649</sup> Resident	No		No	Another layer of local government resulting in
ricorderic		no opinion.		duplication and extra cost. Further more the
				government have started the process of
				reducing and combining all levels of local
				government.
<sup>654</sup> Resident	No		No	ACTO INTO INC.
656 Resident	No		No	
658 Resident	No		No	
		The couldished information on these are		The graduate of information on these annuals
660 Resident	No	The published information on these proposals does	No	The published information on these proposals
		not seem to provide any details of cost benefits to		does not seem to provide any details of cost
		Hitchin residents, and only increases charges at this		benefits to Hitchin residents, and only increases
		time of ongoing austerity with large increases in local		charges at this time of ongoing austerity with
		and general taxes, energy costs, inflation, etc due to		large increases in local and general taxes,
		arrive in the coming months. These unnecessary		energy costs, inflation, etc due to arrive in the
		increases in Council Tax should definitely not be		coming months. These unnecessary increases
		imposed at this very costly time for residents.		in Council Tax should definitely not be imposed
				at this very costly time for residents.
<sup>661</sup> Resident	No	Don't need another layer of burocracy and no more	No	See above

663 Resident	No	No information is provided as to the benefits for	No	Again, more bureaucracy and additional
	-	residents despite additional costs being incurred as a	-	expense for hard working taxpayers with no
		result of the implementation of this initiative.		demonstrable benefit being effectively
		result of the implementation of this initiative.		communicated.
		Residents and businesses already pay significantly		Conmunicated.
		increased council tax for reducing service provision.		
		increased council tax for reducing service provision.		
		This initiative looks like a bureaucratic waste of time		
		and money - things that no resident or business can		
		afford, particularly where no tangible benefits are		
667 Resident	No	You have not provided enough information in the	No	Again, you have not provided enough
		form of easy to navigate 'what we have now and what		information in the form of easy to navigate
		we recommend' presentation to outline how local		'what we have now and what we recommend'
		community governance is delivered, and what		presentation to outline how local community
		responsibilities will transfer or be created.		governance is delivered, and what
		responsibilities will dansier of be created.		-
				responsibilities will transfer or be created.
				You have though printed a glossy leaflet and
				used the Royal Mail to deliver a single A5 full
				colour sheet with an envelope to each
				household. This is both environmentally
				unsound, and a costly waste of resources, to
				send out incomplete information. You sent me
				my council tax recently with a load of flyers
				enclosed. Why didn't you just include this with
				that?
				tiat:
				This is what happens when the left hand and
				the right hand are not coordinated. Adding
				another layer of local governance & process will
				increase the risk of continued poor comms and
				slow bedraggled decision making.
				It may be a complex issue, and communicating
				simply and effectively is an art. You haven't
				done that yet, so it's impossible to support your
				recommendations without better quality
<sup>569</sup> Resident	No	I don't see any benefit, and if it's St Ippolyts then it	No	Parallel councils is inefficient. The district
		should be governed by St Ippolyts Parish Council,		council should be sufficient along with local
		surely?		government, the cost of which has been rising
		<del>y</del> ·		by 5% per year. This proposal would add more
				cost, which cannot be opted out of.
<sup>673</sup> Resident	No	Why the increase in council tax, what extra service are	No	cosy miles carriot de opted out on
		we going to get if no extra or improved service why		

<sup>674</sup> Resident	No	No real position on this, but there hasn't been a clear outline of the benefits this would bring. That should	No	No clear communication on the benefits of this proposal, only details the what and not the why.
		be shared to consider this fully		
				Given the note around increased in costs, then
				without that articulation of improvements and
				rationale for the work then hard to see why it
				would be recommended or decided.
<sup>675</sup> Resident	No	Is this the best use of your time as councillors?? Stop	No	This recommendation makes no sense as it
		finding ways to increase council taxreduce it		does provide possible costs for doing nothing
670				or for recommendation2
<sup>679</sup> Resident	No		No	Little power and additional costs
<sup>682</sup> Resident	No		No	No more politicians on the take
<sup>687</sup> Resident	No	I think we need less layers of government, not more	No	
<sup>688</sup> Resident	No	There's no benefit	No	This is an abject waste of time and money. The
				District Council already has structures in place
				to address Hitchin matters. Another level of
				bureaucracy and overhead is not welcome or
				warranted.
				Given the need to focus on operational
				efficiency adding more funding burden on
				residents js poor form.
				There's not a single thing the local Town Council
				could do that can't be done already
<sup>700</sup> Resident	No		No	My preferred approach would be to create a
				council to represent the area of the old Hitchin
				Urban District with the power to carry out the
				functions that it had before. This would include
				all other areas to create their own councils.
				These councils could then form a co- operative
				to provide the services needed. This would
				allow each area to have the representation it
712 Resident	No	Would prefer and 'Don't know' option for this one. I	No	requires with services tailored to its needs We do not need another level of bureaucracy,
		know nothing about St Ippolyts		or to pay admin costs and expenses to 13 new
		0 11 3		councillors.
<sup>718</sup> Resident	No	l am not in favour of the proposal to create a new	No	We do not need another layer of bureaucracy
		town council whatever the detailed arrangements -		at more cost to residents. Regardless of the
		see below.		detailed arrangements, a new town council will
				just lead to yet more unproductive spending,
				more councillors charging expenses and more
				delavs in getting things done.

<sup>721</sup> Resident	No	Seems like a work creation / job creation scheme for No	1	1. In order for the local council to demo it can
		the boys. Sy Ippolyts does not appear to suffer being		add value with an additional layer of
		out of the step with other parishes / councils. Do why		government, I want to see evidence that the
		make a pointless change just to make things look neat.		council (and Herts CC) can 'cut the mustard'
		Who cares?		with regard to their existing duties. The roads
				are a mess (not just potholes but invisible road
				markings, dirty and hidden road signs and
				collapsing pavements, blocked road drains,
				despite asking CC councillor to help out,
				nothing gets done on pavements and not much
			on drains). Another example at NHDC level is	
			dustbin service - cutting the purple bin service	
			to once evey three weeks will drive fly-tipping	
			and I really do not yet another another full size	
			bin thank you.	
			2. I pay enough in council tax and do not want	
			to pay any more. Actually, when I look at non-	
			monopoly and non-price-regulated suppliers,	
			e.g. insurance, I see prices going DOWN. When	
				I look at councils, prices always go up. I already
			pay a lot of money for an indifferent service	
				and until you learn to do the job, I am
				completely opposed to paying any more
				3. The councillors are all inept. E.g. the 20mph
				speed limit in Hitchin would be approprate for
				narrow side roads (e.g. Outghonhead Way or
				Westmill), not main roads. The imposition of
				this speed limit is just so mind-numbingly
				stupid as to be embarrasing. So, no more
				councillors. I just want them to go away and
				leave me alone. Similarly, l do not think distrcit
				councillors have a clue about how to push back
				on planning applications (the law is immaterial,
<sup>723</sup> Resident	No	No	)	Absolutely waste of money.
				Self serving.
				Why do we need four layers of government.
<sup>735</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is a good size for its current council area. Yes	S	Hitchin will be a small entity in the new unitary
				authority. It needs to have some clout to ensure
				money is allocated to Hitchin and detrimental
				action can be defending.
<sup>736</sup> Resident	No	This will cost hard-pressed households so much more No	)	See above!
		in council tax! Nowhere does it tell me what the		
		advantage of the proposal is.		

<sup>737</sup> Resident	No	How is this beneficial?	No	What purpose will this serve? Will it improve
				services, probably not. Just added civil servants
				funded by the squeezed tax payer. Your leaflet
				doesn't explain or highlight potential benefits
<sup>744</sup> Resident	No	The council tax has gone up enough already!!	No	Stop fiddling with things that just don't need
				changing, it's a waste of time and money!!
<sup>745</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>747</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>748</sup> Resident	No		No	What powers will this town council have that
				the district council don't already have? I don't
				want an additional layer of governance and the
				overhead of bureaucracy and the cost this will
				incur. What is demonstrably wrong with current
				governance arrangements?
<sup>749</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is St Ippolyts not Hitchin. They have there	No	We do not need a town council for Hitchin at
		own Parish council		further expense to the taxpayer. More
				bureaucracy. We have already got councillors
				who are supposed to represent us. We do not
				need more for an organisation that will have
				little say on anything. We do not need a town
				council. The local council is already supposed to
				engage with the community why should we pay
751 Danisland	NI-	No start of the state of the st	NI-	for another organisation to do the same
<sup>751</sup> Resident	No		No	Additional rises to the council tax are
		the other recommendation) but I oppose anything		unacceptable currently unless unavoidable
755 Resident	No	that implies a rise in council tax I want the district council to remain the same I do t	No	Same as before no amended council no extra
Resident	NO	want it bigger or smaller or pay more	NO	payments
<sup>760</sup> Resident	No	want it bigger or smaller or pay more	No	payments
<sup>766</sup> Resident	No	I don't see any detail in the proposal as to how this	No	Again, where is the detail of the proposal for us
		would benefit either parish?		to make an informed decision. What are the
		Troute Series eteres parisin		pros/cons and what are we getting for our
				money? The wide range of the proposed council
				tax increase (1 to 5.5% on a £2200 council tax
				bill) suggests there is no detailed and costed
				plan behind whatever the proposal is.
				plan benind whatever the proposaris.
<sup>768</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>769</sup> Resident	No		No	
772 Resident	No		No	There has been no information given on any
				potential benefits from doing so, only that it will
				increase council tax at a time that people can
				afford it least.
779 Resident	No		No	afford it least. Do not feel another layer of bureaucracy is

<sup>793</sup> Resident	No	I am not interested in my council tax being raised for this.	No	I am not interested in my council tax being raised for this.
<sup>806</sup> Resident	No		No	Cut number of councillors
<sup>810</sup> Resident	No	Council tax its already to much stop asking people to pay more	No	Council tax its already to much stop asking people to pay more
<sup>815</sup> Resident	No	Possible impact on School catchment increase to already oversubscribed Hitchin schools.	No	Increase costs to homeowners by introduction of further councillors. Already pay high council tax.
<sup>823</sup> Resident	No		No	COA.
825 Resident	No	See no advantage, only higher council tax	No	See no advantage, only higher council tax
<sup>839</sup> Resident	No	More unnecessary expense.	No	
<sup>843</sup> Resident	No		No	It not clear why this is being proposed. Further, since it will increase council tax it needs to be communicated why this being proposed + if any benefits. Per literature provided there are no listed benefits
<sup>845</sup> Resident	No	Na	No	Pay already too much council tax and don't get value for money
<sup>846</sup> Resident	No		No	I disagree to this proposal if it means a further increase in Council Tax.  All you need is an unpaid voluntary community group for each area to liaise with the council if issues arise.
<sup>848</sup> Resident	No		No	It seems in either option, saying yes is voting for the new Town Council. Happy with the ward changes but not the Town Council without seeing what difference it might make for the additional council tax
<sup>855</sup> Resident	No	There is no information on what this means for me other than increased prices	No	There is no information on what this means for me other than increased prices
<sup>856</sup> Resident	No	I'm against the formation of a council for Hitchin. I do not believe we require one.	No	I'm against the formation of a council for Hitchin. I do not believe we require one.
<sup>859</sup> Resident	No	I do not see a need for a town council, and do not wish additional tax to be spent on it.	No	Do not see a need
<sup>860</sup> Resident	No	What's the point of this beyond increasing our Counci Tax? It doesn't serve any obvious purpose? All primary services will be controlled by either NHDC or HCC still.	No	Beyond making elections fall in line, what other purposes does it serve?
<sup>862</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see how the anticipated benefits would justify the cost involved. Just looks like more money for fat cat councillor salaries	No	

<sup>863</sup> Resident	No	If it costs more money to residence then NO	No	If it costs more money then no.
<sup>874</sup> Resident	No	Don't see the need as I disagree fundamentally with	No	Unnecessary extra financial burden on local
		the overall proposal		residents. If there is a transfer of responsibility
				to a town council I see there should be a
				concomitant reduction in council tax from
				NHDC and / or HCC. I think Hitchin has
				managed very well without one and so not
				need a town council that will be an extra
				burden of bureaucracy
878 Resident	No		No	We don't need another layer of beaucracy with
				yet another increase in Council Tax to pay for it.
<sup>879</sup> Resident	No	The benefits do not come close to justifying the extra	No	The benefits do not come close to justifying the
		council tax		extra council tax
<sup>880</sup> Resident	No	At this time cost is a major factor. The emphasis	No	Forget this idea. May be one for when times are
		should be to control and possibly reduce costs.		better. But not now.
		Pensioners can not afford the increase (Are we to be		
		exempt from the additional costs ?) Already we have		
		to many add on costs ie disposal of Garden waste etc.		
		Your actions drive up inflation. I'm sure we all would		
		like better services BUT this is not the time. You try		
		living on a pension!		
<sup>884</sup> Resident	No		No	It is unacceptable to set up a small hitchin
				council which will increase an already expensive
				council tax.
<sup>889</sup> Resident	No	I do not understand what benefits this would bring.	No	What benefit would I gain from paying
200 5 11				increased council tax for extra councillors.
<sup>899</sup> Resident	No		No	Further bureaucracy is not needed. If anything
000 D : 1 .		W 1 6 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11		should be less layers of councils
<sup>900</sup> Resident	No	We don't need increase in council tax	No	We don't need increase in council tax
<sup>905</sup> Resident	No	Not in my area	No	Don't need more people talking and doing very
				little and adding increased cost to the council
				tax.
<sup>908</sup> Resident	No	I do not wish to have my current fees raised	No	I do not wish to have my current fees raised
<sup>912</sup> Resident	No		No	Do not want to pay more council tax
<sup>921</sup> Resident	No	I don't see why it is necessary	Yes	I would like to see a town council for Hitchin but
				only - ONLY - if we have a unitary council for
				districts/boroughs and county. I also fee
				strongly that town councillors should not get
				any form of allowance or remuneration other
				than mavbe small expenses.
<sup>929</sup> Resident	No	You have provided no information as to the benefits	No	Se answer to previous question, also why does
		or otherwise of this proposal, other than it will mean		this survey start at question 6?
		an Increase in council tax. Whereas normally		
		consolidating something usually means a saving !!!		
<sup>930</sup> Resident	No	none	No	none

<sup>934</sup> Resident	No	Insufficient knowledge of the implications means I do No	I do not think we should add a further layer of
		not feel able to support any changes.	bureaucracy to what we already have,
			especially if residents have to pay more for it.
<sup>939</sup> Resident	No	This area doesn't affect me but as per below the No	In the flyer sent to me other than telling me
		benefits / drawbacks are not clear.	that a new town council would cost £22-£121
			additionally on council tax there is no
			explanation of what the town councillors would
			do or of the benefits to Hitchin residents.
			Can you please make this clear as it feels like at
			the moment just a level of bureaucracy that we
			will pay for is voted in.
<sup>957</sup> Resident	No	Totally unnecessary move that makes no difference to No	If this proposal is to replace north herts coincil
		either Hitchin town or st. Ippolyts.	with local councils, then i can understand it. But
			that doesnt appear to be the case. So under
			this propsosal we will we have North herts
			council existing with multiple councillors
			representing Hitchin and Hertfordshire county
			council existing with mutiple councillors
			representing Hitchin. No evidence has been
			provided that these councillors aren't working
			in the best interests of Hitchin and getting a
			good deal for Hitchin. The town is thriving
		compared to many other similar sized towns,	
			despite 14 years of Tory destruction. I have not
			been provided any compelling reason why we
			need a 3rd layer of local representation, nor
			have I been provided with any clear evidence of
			what they will be accountable for and able to
			influence. This proposal will only serve the
			interests of a few noisy people who think they
			have something to gain by being part of a town
			council. If formed I would find it almost
			impossible to vote for any candidate (and
			please note, I've voted in every local and
			national election since age 18) and I would feel
			compelled to spoil my paper. As a final note I
			need to mention the cost. A range is provided
			but I'm sure it will inevitably end up on the
			higher end of that. Affordability isn't a problem
			for me right now, but it will be for many other
			people in Hitchin and with no direct benefit to
			them.
000 5 11 1			Overall this is a terrible idea and should be
<sup>960</sup> Resident	No	Move them into St Ippolysts ward No	Keep the councillors that we already have

<sup>970</sup> Resident	No	I am positively against paying anymore council tax.	No	If it costs more money on my council tax bill I'm
				against it.
<sup>976</sup> Resident	No		No	I can't see what difference it'll make to me
				other than potentially costing more money in
				Council tax.
<sup>981</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>984</sup> Resident	No	Another exercise in bureaucracy	No	Another pointless exercise wasting my money
<sup>987</sup> Resident	No	What benefit does this provide to me as a council tax	No	There is no explanation of why this would be an
		payer who is not in St Ippolyts? What benefit does this		improvement over the fairly dire services
		provide Hitchin council tax payers?		already provided for a as yet to be defined
				increase in the council tax. It's my view that
				you should express this proposal in cost /
				benefit terms and represent the case.
<sup>988</sup> Resident	No	We need more consolidate government not more of it.	No	Above
		It's expensive to run and ineffective at this level. There		
		will be more costs in running it than in what it can		
		deliver		
<sup>1000</sup> Resident	No		No	This would be a waste of money on yet more
				bureaucracy which would have no obvious
4004				benefit to anyone.
<sup>1001</sup> Resident	No	why do we need town councilor's when we are	No	as above totally unnecessary duplication and
		adequately covered by North herts district councilors.		cost to residents
		All this will lead to is totally unnecessary duplication		what an utter load of beaurocratic nonsense
		and cost for the resident.		typical of government organizations just costing
				the public yet more money at a time a great
				financial problems you should be ashamed of
				yourselves
<sup>1002</sup> Resident	No	The interests of the residents of both si ippolyts and	No	A new town council is adding another level of
		Hitchin are not necessarily the same. This change		bureaucracy. Hitchin will have to pay for this.
		doesn't help either town.		

<sup>1010</sup> Resident	No	No details have been provided as to how this proposal	No	The benefits of a town council have not been
		would improve the representation of the interests of		adequately explained, and there is an attendant
		the residents and businesses in at st ippolyts.		cost for council tax payers associated with the
				change. I contend that proper interaction of
				the existing councillors could perform the
				intended function.   also contend that it is
				almost inevitable that such a body will
				introduce measures or spending that
				represents a perceived rather than a real
				benefit. In the current era, there is a lack of
				central funding and I am not on favour of
				creating additional beaurocracies to slice an
				avar this par cala
<sup>1023</sup> Resident	No		No	We do not wish for our council tax to be raised.
				We have recently moved from a flat in hitchin to
				an house in hitchin, and raising the cost of
				council tax would increase our outgoing
1005				payments to above our budget.
<sup>1035</sup> Resident	No		No	We do not need a Town Council. We are already
				served by a District and a County Council. That
				is more than enough hot air.
1041 Resident	No	, ,	No	Again not necessary - more admin and
1042 D		necessary for Hitchin		bureaucracy
<sup>1043</sup> Resident	No	I don't see what benefit this would bring.	No	I see no need or requirement for a town
				council. This will simply bring more cost (when
				people are all ready too stretched as it is) and
				more burocracy (when there is already far too
				much in this country). Hitchin is a bright and
				beautiful town as it is. Let's keep it this way. I
				would like to see less councils, not more. I think
				this would be an absolute waste of residents
				hard earned money. Money they could instead
				be spending in local shops and supporting local
<sup>1047</sup> Resident	No	No supporting information has been provided to	No	lt sounds like yet more administration is being
		justify this change		added at a time when numbers should be
		J		streamlined/ reduced to save money
<sup>1053</sup> Resident	No	l am unsure of the benefits of town council and	No	As response to 7
		therefore change of parish.		
<sup>1057</sup> Resident	No	Residents do not need a further council tax increase to	No	Residents do not need a further council tax
		cover the cost of this.		increase to cover the cost of this.
<sup>1064</sup> Resident	No	Will put up my council tax that I already can't afford	No	Will put up my council tax that I already can't
				afford
		What will these extra charges be for? Extra free		
		lunches for useless councillors		What will these extra charges be for? Extra free
				lunches for useless councillors

<sup>1073</sup> Resident	No	Why would I vote to pay more council taxes? We have	No	What is the benefit in changing this is not
		enough people running the country ripping the tax		explained
		payers off. You should be talking about streamlining		
		and cutting back council positions.		
<sup>1074</sup> Resident	No	No opinion	No	There is no need for another layer of local
				government bureaucracy. There are already
				many local bodies in addition to the district and
				county councils that can be consulted on
				policies or decisions. No tangible benefits of a
				town council have been described in the plans,
				and the council tax rise would be another
				unnecessary cost for households at a time
				when the cost of living (including local and
				national taxes) is constantly rising - especially
				when it will not contribute to more or better
4076				public consists
<sup>1076</sup> Resident	No	I serve St Ippolyts as a curate in the church of England Y	Yes	My caveat would be that this enhances the
		and understand the community there well. The people		work of the Hitchin Bid team. I suspect that
		have a strong identity as a village and the surrounds		they are better able to get government support
		and those people who live in St Ippolyts North		without the existence of a town council, and so
		especially those on the Broadmeadow estate form		if that were the case, it would be detrimental to
		part of the active community there. I would be		have a town council.
		concerned that the St Ippolyts community would in		
		some way be depleted. I can see an advantage		
		though, in that the community would have		
		representation in a number of wards so if an issue		
		came up about which they felt strongly there is		
<sup>1090</sup> Resident	No	Hitchin (and Letchworth) already have the highest	No	Creates an additional layer of bureaucracy,
nesident		ratio of population to councillors in NHDC. Increasing		duplication and red tape when central
		the size of Hitchin without additional an additional		government is trying to streamline council
		Councillor will make this imbalance worse.		services, reducing duplication and red tape.
		councillor viii mane tino imparantee viorbei		Adds extra charge to council tax to be wasted
				on the additional administration and expenses
				costs when many are already struggling to pay
				the existing charges.
				the existing entirges.
<sup>1092</sup> Resident	No	N	No	We do not want to pay extra tax, it has not
				been explained how the money would be
				spent. Regardless, no thank you to a Hitchin
				Town Council.

1118 Resident	No		No	The cost will outweigh the perceived benefit.
				From my experience in a different town the
				added layer of bureaucracy will cost much
				more to to operate than is envisaged. The
				council tax is high enough now without even
				more being added. Estimates are notoriously
				inaccurate and this extra cost will not be
				recouped by benefits for the town, and will only
				increase year on year
1119 Resident	No		Yes	
1128 Resident	No	This doesn't seem to affect me, but there is no real	No	Again there is nothing in the proposal as to why
		explanation as to why this move is necessary		the formation of a town council is necessary,
				especially considering the extra cost being
				added the council tax which is already
				prohibitive, and doesn't seem value for money.
				I don't want more councillors claiming expenses
				and doing nothing, when we have a district and
				count council already. This proposal serves no
				nurnose
1138 Resident	No	You do not specify any reason to make this change. It	Yes	
		would obviously decrease the size of St Ippolyts area		
		for no obvious benefit.		
1142 Resident	No	These are two different areas with different	No	We need less administration, not more and
		characteristics and requirements. One size does not fit		certainly in the current economic climate, we do
		all.		not need the additional cost. Can see no
				advantage to the residents of Hitchin by
				duplicating and adding more layers of
				administration. Less is more and certainly more
				is achieved, with more efficiency and less cost.
1145 Resident	No	I am not paying more council tax it's already	No	I'm not in favour for anything that means
1146 5 11 1		overpriced for a poor service		paying more council tax
1146 Resident	No		No	
1147 Resident	No	Increasing cost which can be avoided,	No	The same as above.
		Not enough schools to serve community.		
		Hitchin and Ickleford children already get school		
		places in Letchworth.		
1149 Resident	No	You have not explained what the purpose of a new	No	as above.
		town council will be and how it will benefit residents.		
		You have only communicated that it will cost residents		
		more each year. And with another layer of		
		bureaucracy, this idea has been very poorly		
		bureaucracy, this idea has been very poorly communicated and I cannot see what benefit there		

<sup>1152</sup> Resident	No	You have said on the leaflet that these changes will	No	You have said on the leaflet that these changes
		mean additional council tax payments, this is unfair		will mean additional council tax payments, this
		and many people can probably not afford additional		is unfair and many people can probably not
		cost. You also have not made it clear even the benefit		afford additional cost. You also have not made
		of this change.		it clear even the benefit of this change.
<sup>1154</sup> Resident	No		No	Ridiculous increase in council tax
<sup>1156</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is a distinct settlement to Hitchin and all	No	the cost in terms of council tax increases are
		efforts should be made to maintain that		clear, but any benefits of such a change are not
				made clear.
<sup>1159</sup> Resident	No	No information has been provided on what additional	No	Increase in council tax is undesirable
		council tax increases this would create		
<sup>1168</sup> Resident	No	I fail to see the advantage of this proposal.	No	This will just add another layer of bureacracy to
				an already top-heavy system which will increase
				our taxes unnecessarily. My preference is to
				have a direct line of communication with the
				District Council rather than having an
				intermediary organisation which will only serve
				to complicate matters.
				Lan see no advantage to this proposal
<sup>1170</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1177</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1182</sup> Resident	No	A increase in Council tax is not acceptable	No	Not in favour in any proposal that will increase
		·		council tax
1183 Resident	No	We don't need move government bodies and the	No	We don't need move government bodies and
		expense in these times of austerity.		the expense in these times of austerity.
<sup>1188</sup> Resident	No		No	don't want to pay money
<sup>1189</sup> Resident	No	The village interests should be kept separate with their	No	It makes another layer of bureaucracy at extra
		parish council		costs
<sup>1193</sup> Resident	No		No	l do not wish to pay for any additional
				beurocracy.
<sup>1194</sup> Resident	No	As my comments on the Letchworth proposal!	No	As my comments on the Letchworth proposal
<sup>1195</sup> Resident	No		No	l do not want to pay for extra costs of a new
				Council. My finances are tight already.
<sup>1196</sup> Resident	No	I don't see a need for change	No	I don't se the need for change
<sup>1198</sup> Resident	No		No	I will not be able to afford paying an additional
				charge, council tax is expensive as it is let alone
				paying more to be one a Town Council
<sup>1201</sup> Resident	No		No	p.// (/
<sup>1205</sup> Resident	No	No practical benefit to be had. Will cause St Ippolyts to	No	No practical bemefit. Too beurocratic and will
		lose identity and be swallowed up by Hitchin.		cost more
<sup>1206</sup> Resident	No	Stop stealing my money you charlatans	No	Stop stealing my money you charlatans
<sup>1207</sup> Resident	No		No	Waste of time and money
- 21	-		-	· · · •

1213 Resident	No	Moving St Ippolyts North parish ward to Hitchin pre-	Parish/Town Councils charge a precept which
		supposes that Hitchin will have a town council. To	would be additional taxation.
		move the North parish ward without a new Town	Parish/Town councils have limited powers,
		Council and without a reduction in their council tax	limited powers to raise funds for projects and
		[parish precept] would be indefensible as they would	would replicate powers currently held by the
		be paying for a service they did not receive.	District Council.
			The number of voters for District council
			election is low, sometimes less than 30% of
			electors and for Parish/Town Councils even
			lower. This low turn out indicates voters are not
			interested in additional bureaucracy.
		Parish/Town Councils are an unnecessary	
		additional tier of government the bureaucracy	
			and cost of which would grow over time.
			The history of Letchworth Town Council, and its
			subsequent abolition, is indicative of an
			expensive experiment in local governance.
			The Parish/Town Council would be dominated
			by the usual party groupings, Conservative,
			Labour, Liberal and would not produce wider
			democratic participation.
			This consultation is faulty as it does not include
			holding Parish/Town Council elections at the
			same time as District Council election. They
			should held at different times so residents
			could express their opinions of the ruling party
			through the ballot box once every two years
			rather than four at present.
			Holding elections at the same time would lead
			to a majority for one party or another at both
			District and Parish/Town level leading to the
			effective silencing of debate and opposition to
<sup>219</sup> Resident	No	This is diabolical! Council tax is paid for services we No	No
		don't fully utilise already I.e schools, churches, libraries	
		etc therefore why would I pay in addition to a service	
		not utilised. I do not agree with this at all !! Local	
		residents bills are already high, so why should we pay	
	NI-	extra in council tax.	MIL No Alexander Stady and the second
220 Dogi-lt	No	No preference No	What's the benefit? You can't expect us to vote
<sup>220</sup> Resident			on this when you have provided no
<sup>220</sup> Resident			information Lean and it only against more
<sup>220</sup> Resident			information! I can see it only costing more
1220 Resident			information! I can see it only costing more money for the administration of the council but just adding another tier of bureaucracy.

<sup>1224</sup> Resident	No		No	I am totally in favour of creating a town council
				within a unitary system but totally against
				creating this extra layer before unitary
				government has been created. This proposal
				will probably fail as many people will just see
				this as an unnecessary additional layer of
				bureaucracy. This consultation as such is
				premature .
<sup>1225</sup> Resident	No	They are very different areas with different	No	This is duplication of administration imposing
Resident	NO	characteristics and different needs.	INO	unnecessary additional cost on the council tax
		characteristics and afficient needs.		payer. We already have accessible councillors
				for these wards via North Herts District Council
				AND Herts Council. This should be
				adequate to represent the needs of each parish
				without creating ANOTHER layer of bureaucracy
				at significant additional cost.
				This would inevitably fall into the pattern of
				Party Political representation.
				The costs mentioned would be just the starting
				point and would build and build - as with the
				Police Commissioner's Office and costs.
				WE CANNOT AFFORD THIS ON TOP OF THE
<sup>1228</sup> Resident	No	At no point have you stated what the benefits will be	No	COUNCIL TAY
Resident	INO		INO	What are the benefits of the proposed changes?
		from the proposed changes. For example, more		
		representation means what exactly? More meetings,		
		quicker decisions, more actions? And why is this		
		necessary? Is there currently too much wok for the		
		existing councillors to do?! If so then surely the cha ge		
<sup>1231</sup> Resident	No	should be in efficiency and not man power?	No	
<sup>1233</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1238</sup> Resident	No	Don't want an increase in council tax given cost of	No	Don't want an increase in council tax given cost
		living crisis!		of living crisis!
<sup>1240</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1241</sup> Resident	No	I think St Ippolyts North parishioners should decide	Yes	But only if Hertfordshire moves to unitary
		this. They may identify more with the St Ippolyts		governance, which as I understand it, is not yet
		parish and therefore may prefer to remain in it. It		a certainty. If that doesn't happen & the District
		makes very little difference to Hitchin (if it is to have a		Council remains in existence, I see little point in
		town council), whereas it may make a lot of difference		a third layer of bureaucracy.
		to those residents of St Ippolyts North.		

<sup>1244</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see why St Ippolyts should be split. Surely the whole of St Ippolyrs should be a single community, either inside or outside the Hitchin Parish.	e Yes	Approval is on the basis that NHC will be lost to some form of Unitary council which is likely to ignore local needs. However, I note that the website about this suggests a precept fee of around £50 per annum. My latest Council Tax bill says that in the event of a town council being created the increase to the council tax would be in the region of £120 per annum, which is more than double that advertised in your publicity. This suggests that the website is
				grossly misleading. Accurate facts are important as these will influence the feedback you receive. Responses given on the basis of inaccurate facts will lead to dissent and dissatisfaction on the part of the residents you
<sup>1245</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1253</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1255</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1257</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1258</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1259</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1260</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1264</sup> Resident	No	Not sure if in favour as want to understand why it will cost more and the benefits. Your flyer tells us of the change but not why or any potential benefits. Our starting point is that we are not in favour of a change that increases council tax, unless there is a clear	No	Not sure if in favour as want to understand why it will cost more and the benefits. Your flyer tells us of the change but not why or any potential benefits. Our starting point is that we are not in favour of a change that increases council tax,
<sup>1267</sup> Resident	No	benefit.	No	unless there is a clear benefit. There doesn't appear to be any benefit of doing this and the council tax will increase. What a waste of time and money.
<sup>1270</sup> Resident	No	I feel adequately represented by councillors at NHDC. We should be looking for less government, not more. It is a strange proposal which says it will cost more without definite benefits being described.	No	I feel adequately represented by councillors at  NHDC. We should be looking for less government, not more.  It is a strange proposal which says it will cost more without definite benefits being described.
<sup>1284</sup> Resident	No	I haven't been provided with a valid argument for the change so I don't care and I don't think wasting the money would be appropriate.	No	Nobody asked for it and I'd rather use the money for something else than subsidizing 13 people for doing things that wouldn't directly impact essential services.

1290 Resident	No	The needs and issues associated with the St Ippolyts North and Priory wards are very different and the proposed change will potentially dilute the influence of one or both wards depending upon the origin of the elected councillors.	No	The council budget is high and already overstretched. The proposals will increase the overall council cost and the additional bureaucracy will will require yet more permanent staff who will need to be paid and pensioned for a long time into the future. The council cannot afford its current pay and pension costs and needs to reduce overall staff to remain solvent in the future. Unless there are are reductions elsewhere in the overall council costs sufficient to make this a zero cost option the proposal should be thrown out. Hitchin residents will be justifiably angry to see their council taxes increase with no demonstrable benefit amid the ongoing
<sup>1295</sup> Resident	No	More money, & as I live in Westmill this area always comes bottom of the list for spending & improvements. I don't see that changing & can ill afford the council tax rise.	No	As above
<sup>1297</sup> Resident	No	We need to understand how this decision will be made. It is not clear from your documentation what the threshold of feedback and participation is required to actively make a change that will incur additional cost to all residents.	No	
<sup>1319</sup> Resident	No	cost to an residents.	No	
1322 Resident	No		No	The National Government is moving to unitary authorities (presumably to take advantage of economies of scale), so why then introduce a further tier of local government, especially when it will result in a cost to the residents.  What exactly are the benefits?
<sup>1327</sup> Resident	No	We do not need a new town council; or any town council	No	We do not need a new town council; or any town council
<sup>1332</sup> Resident	No	N/A	No	It's not needed and increases council tax.
1337 Resident	No	I am struggling to see what actual benefit this would have. All its going to do is create more councillor jobs that don't need to exist. If this involves an increase in council tax then I am not interested at all. We already get nothing for our money and this year it has gone up another 5% and in exchange our bin collections have become even more infrequent.	No	I am struggling to see what actual benefit this would have. All its going to do is create more councillor jobs that don't need to exist. If this involves an increase in council tax then I am not interested at all. We already get nothing for our money and this year it has gone up another 5% and in exchange our bin collections have
			No	become even more infrequent

<sup>1340</sup> Resident	No	This is pointless	No	Waste of money, hitchin rents are already too
				high, don't make it even more expensive to live
				here
<sup>1341</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1342</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is not part of Hitchin. Leave as is.	No	Yet another drain on council tax funds and an
				additional level of bureaucracy that Hitchin
				doesn't need.
<sup>1349</sup> Resident	No		No	There is little to no information available
				regarding what this would mean for residents,
				nor the benefits and downsides. This is also not
				a time to be adding more costs for residents
<sup>1351</sup> Resident	No	I have a neutral view on this as it is more a matter for	No	Creating another tier of local government just
		St Ippolyts residents. Expressing a neutral view is not		adds another layer of unnecessary
		an option, so the only sensible alternative was to		bureaucracy. Will result in delay in decisive
		select 'no'.		decision making. It will also increase the Council
				Tax rate for already cash-strapped local
				households.
				Pending the outcome of the wider review of
				local governance in Hertfordshire to create
				unitary authorities, this exercise should be
				paused. One of the overriding objectives of that
				is surely saving money through streamlining
				existing service provision. Creating a Town
				Council for Hitchin will only increase spending
				and costs. This will include personnel as there
				will need to be a Town Clerk and other officers
				to run the organisation and support the elected
<sup>1355</sup> Resident	No		No	It is unnecessary and would add substantially to
				council tax.
				I am strongly against this.
<sup>1356</sup> Resident	No		No	I am strongly against this. It is unnecessary and
				would add substantially to council tax.
<sup>1359</sup> Resident	No	Parish councils serve their communities better than	No	Stop wasting time and tax payers on projects
		bigger councils.		like this. Use the councils time and money on
				fixing the real issues affecting the residents of
				Hitchin.
<sup>1360</sup> Resident	No		No	

1261 5 11				
<sup>1361</sup> Resident	No	I assume this only happens if the other	No	The government is encouraging 15% savings for
		recommendation is agreed. If not, and it is more		the civil service admin costs, encouraging
		efficient then I would agree.		efficiencies and less red tape. What the council
				is suggesting is the complete opposite of
				efficiency, to employ more people. 13 people
				for 1 fairly small town seems unnecessary
				additional admin and terrible value for money
1262				for the residents
<sup>1363</sup> Resident	No	The extra layer of bureaucracy and cost is not needed	No	The additional cost and bureaucracy is not
1202 B : 1 .		Will be a second of the second		needed or wanted
<sup>1382</sup> Resident	No	Why change a system that isnt broken and further	No	As above. Why change a system that isnt
		change it to one that costs more! Please do not		broken and further change it to one that costs
		change the current system.		more! Please do not change the current system.
<sup>1385</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1389</sup> Resident	No	I have no strong opinions about St Ippolyts. But I	No	At a time when council budgets are squeezed
		suspect they would receive a lot more from being part		very tightly, service provision is continuing to
		of this arrangement than their small number of		deteriorate from the council (eg bins moving to
		residents generate in revenue.		three weekly collections) and households are
				struggling with the ongoing cost of living
				crisis/stagflation, I cannot support another
				pointless initiative like this. It seems like it will
				costs households another £100 a year but with
				absolutely no discernible benefit. I have seen
				absolutely no evidence that the new councillors
				would have any power or that any service
				improvement would be provided. I'm all for
				democracy but this just seems like yet another
				waste of taxpayer money. I'd rather you sorted
				out some other local services with this cash.
<sup>1393</sup> Resident	No	As a resident in Highbury this appears to diminish	Yes	Would increase visibility of local level issues,
Resident	110	represention for my immediate area	163	potential to implement shared solutions for
		represention for my infinediate area		common issues across the town or unique
				·
<sup>1395</sup> Resident	No		No	approaches for individual wards
<sup>1396</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1399</sup> Resident	No	Not necessary.	No	Why on earth would anyone vote for another
		•		layer of bureaucracy which increases the
				Council Tax and no benefits in return.
				Letchworth have just spent years and
				thousands of pounds to get rid of their Town
				Council. What buffoon allowed it to get this far,
				it stinks of nepotism and empire building to
				stroke someone's ego. If this goes through it's a
				total miscarriage of iustice

<sup>1406</sup> Resident	No	I disagree with the larger Town Council proposal	No	I think this is a poor idea that will not serve
Resident	110	raisagree with the larger rown country proposal	140	residents or provide tangible benefits for the
				town.
<sup>1414</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary if the Hitchin Town Council proposal fails,	No	I see no benefit of any sort to the creation of
		which it should do.		this body. Any duties it might undertake are
				already the responsibility of other bodies. While
				I appreciate that Hitchin Initiative may feel it
				has been successful with its past projects, this
				smacks of overreach. It is a business
				organisation and should stick to business issues
				- if it feels its work in this field is complete, it
				may perhaps be time for it to disband rather
				than attempt a larger power grab. I also do not
				accept the argument for Hitchin needing its
				own voice. Its history and geography binds it to
				its neighbouring towns in North Hertfordshire, and the District Council represents the best way
				·
				to reflect this. A town council might attempt to
				take on this role, but the attempt would fail. It
				would simply be a question of who would be
				quickest to ignore it - other tiers of government,
				or the residents of Hitchin.
<sup>1418</sup> Resident	No	The extra cost and second layer won't be beneficial to	No	I don't believe this will be beneficial for residents
		residents		
<sup>1419</sup> Resident	No	In the absence of pros and cons I'm saying no change.	No	Do we need to pay more people to decide how
				we spend money? It's in short supply. If you
				have any money kicking around let's not spend
				it on a council - spend it on the disadvantaged
				or improving goods and services. Before we
1420 D:-I	NI-	16	NI-	know it we will have 8 bins.
<sup>1420</sup> Resident	No	If your leaflet selling this can't come up with one good	INO	As above
		reason why it would be better and my council tax is		
<sup>1424</sup> Resident	No	going up its a no brainer.	No	
<sup>1431</sup> Resident	No	I am strongly against St Ippolyts being included with	No	There is no need to amalgamate. Leave things
1/22 Desident	No	Hitchin.	Na	as they are currently. I wish to avoid an increase in council tax.
<sup>1432</sup> Resident	No	l wish to avoid an increase in council tax.	No	I WISH to avoid an increase in council tax.
<sup>1436</sup> Resident	No		No	I do not see why we need a new town council
				and will not pay any more council tax. I pay
				enough for only me in a house, you cut services
				and increase council tax
<sup>1444</sup> Resident	No	No evidence provided as to why this would benefit any	No	No evidence provided as to why this would
		residents.		benefit any residents.
<sup>1446</sup> Resident	No		Yes	I believe a Hitchin council will serve the
				residents of Hichin better than has NHDC.

<sup>1454</sup> Resident	No	Residents in that area tend to use village school and	Yes	
		amenities		
<sup>1460</sup> Resident	No	Do not see St Ippolyts as part of Hitchin	No	Additional cost to residents at a time of high
				living costs, wrong time when wider
				reorganisation of local government underway.
1477 Resident	No		No	
1480 Resident	No		No	
1485 Resident	No		No	I consider that a Town Council is unnecessary
				and that the resulting additional cost to
				residents is unacceptable at a time when many
				residents are struggling financially.
<sup>1488</sup> Resident	No	I'm not in favour of moving St Ippolyts North parish	No	The creation of a Hitchin parish and town
		ward from St Ippolyts to Hitchin as I believe there		council will add yet another line item to, and
		should be neither a Hitchin parish nor a Hitchin town		accompanying increase in, the council tax. I, as
		council.		a beleaguered tax-paying resident, simply
				cannot afford yet more increase in taxes in
				order to fund a ridiculous third tier of local
				government, especially as I already pay an
				astonishing (and annually increasing) amount
				of council tax for astonishingly little in return. I
				see no reason to throw good, hard-earned
				manay after had
<sup>1502</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts residents chose to live separately from	No	Don't understand what this will offer from their
		Hitchin, so should remain so.		proposition. Everything that they have said that
				they will do SHOULD already being done by
				HDCC, so we would end up paying more for a
				lot less value of service and community benefits.
1505 Resident	No	Don't see benefits	No	Don't see benefits
<sup>507</sup> Resident	No	Cannot see a reason for doing it.	No	Less control over overall planning, decision
				making and action for residents. Cannot see
				the point of doing it, other than to raise more
				money out of it from residents. What will
				residents gain from being carved into smaller
				parishes?
<sup>1508</sup> Resident	No	We don't seem to cope with keeping other parts of	No	See my comments in 7
		NHDC clean of street rubbish and overfilled bins		
		currently why add more?		

<sup>1516</sup> Resident	No	I do not understand the benefit of this change as no	No	I am strongly against a new Town Council for
		justification has been provided to voters by North		Hitchin. I don't think anyone has put forward
		Herts Council.		the arguments as to why this would be an
				improvement on the current arrangement -
				especially when this would involve an increase
				in council tax for residents. There needs to be
				more debate with residents, setting out the
				cost/benefit analysis and whether this would
				improve local democracy. I am also very
				strongly against another tier of local
				government - we already have the North Herts
				Council and Herts County Council who are both
				largely having to meet their statutory
				requirements around education/adult social
				care/roads/housing/etc and have very limited
				powers to change things at a local level. So we
				need more information and a dedicated
				website/webpage clearly setting out the case
<sup>1517</sup> Resident	No		No	An extra layer of governance means more
				costs, increased council tax with no obvious
				benefit to residents
<sup>1522</sup> Resident	No		No	We do not need this.
<sup>1539</sup> Resident	No	We already pay enough council tax	No	
<sup>1543</sup> Resident	No	Benefits not clear.	No	Additional costs to each resident with no
				additional benefits outlined.
<sup>1550</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1575</sup> Resident	No	No reason has been given for this change, that I can	No	Why is this change being proposed? What will
		see.		this achieve? I don't see any gain but it will add
				a layer of bureaucracy and cost.
<sup>1583</sup> Resident	No	l don't understand why you want to do this.	No	I can't afford more council tax and don't see the
1504				benefit of this.
<sup>1584</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1587</sup> Resident	No	Clearer local ownership in current proposal rather	No	The benefits aren't clear and will add costs to
		than being subsumed into Hitchin		residents.
<sup>1592</sup> Resident	No		Yes	Hitchin is large enough to need a town council
				to organise activities in the area. It makes sense
				to devolve these activities into a dedicated
1604 D: ! .	NI.	Miles to the constitution of the constitution	NI-	council.
<sup>1604</sup> Resident	No	Whats the point!	No	My council tax is already to high without
				creating another 13 free loading councillors and
				expecting me to pay for their free loading. If
				these dead beats want to play politics they
				should pay for it themselves.

<sup>1605</sup> Resident	No		No	This is a redundant level of local government
				being formed as a golden parachute for
				councillors who will be lost in the formation of a
				unitary authority. Letchworth GC went through
				this ridiculous approach some years back and
				are a case study in how little Town Councils add
<sup>1606</sup> Resident	No	Not enough information has been supplied to justify	No	This will be a costly endeavour and has no clear
		the change and all the cost implications as a result		rationale as to any benefit for residents in the
		•		information that I can find associated with this
				online consultation. I already pay a lot of tax,
				only getting a 25% single person discount.
				Judging by the spending review yesterday the
				financial climate is not improving. Paying more
				money to increase bureaucracy at this time
				doesn't feel proportional or sensible
<sup>1610</sup> Resident	No	Just another level of bureaucracy that will cost more	No	In the current financial climate residents can
		money and have no effect.		not afford another rise in council tax to fund
				councillors. Additionally, we can do without
				another level of bureaucracy (a Town Council)
				that would only benefit business owners of
4647				Hitchin.
<sup>1617</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is, and always has been, a village on its own	No	It seems that the only change would be that
		and I feel should remain the same.		NHDC Councillors would simply move over to
				the new Town Council and continue business as
				usual. I am also extremely worried about the
				possibility of a hike in the Council Tax,
				especially as we are struggling in the current
<sup>1618</sup> Resident	No	If it isn't broke don't fix it	No	political climate as it is. As before
Resident	INO	II It ISTIT DIORE GOTT TIX IT	INO	AS DETOTE
<sup>1619</sup> Resident	No	We were told that this change would increase our	No	See above
<sup>1620</sup> Resident	No	council tax but no reasons or benefits given.	No	Absolutely against another tier of local
Resident	INO	Why split the parish of St Ippolyts?	INO	Absolutely against another tier of local government which will cost us more council tax
				which is already too high. We already have
				district councillors representing Hitchin so why not use them to vote on and discuss matters
				that relate to Hitchin. Surely it can't be difficult
				to set up a Hitchin committee? Also
				presumably a Hitchin town council would not
				have the necessary powers to act that the
				District council has so would probably be
				nointless anyway

<sup>1622</sup> Resident	No	I can't see any benefit in making Hitchin even bigger	No	A New Town Council will cost us the taxpayers
				more and by encouraging tourists make the
				town centre even busier and more expensive,
				pricing out the local residents.
<sup>1623</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary, more expensive, cannot see any	No	Unnecessary, more expensive, cannot see any
		benefits listed in the recommendations		benefits listed in the recommendations
<sup>1625</sup> Resident	No	It should be down to the St Ippolyts wards residents to	No	This would be a huge waste of money! We
		decide what they think would work best for them.		already have a district council and county
				council to run services for the area. The real big
				issue we have currently is potholes which are
				haphazardly filled (if at all) and then break
				again. If these can't even be fixed, what would
				adding an extra layer of bureaucracy do for me.
				Council tax is already extortionately high so
				adding to this will make it even harder for those
				already struggling thanks to the poor welfare
				system we have in this country. A complete
1616 = 11				waste of resources if this goes ahead
<sup>1646</sup> Resident	No	l do not want increased council tax bill	No	Happy as is
<sup>1653</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1663</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1664</sup> Resident	No	Retain the historic identity of a 'typical English village'	No	North Hertfordshire, as is currently organised,
		that St. Ippolyts represent		is a manageable entity without the need to
		Reduce the possibility of the expansion of Hitchin and		break it up and add unnecessary administrative
		save the countryside.		expense. I still feel fully democratically
				represented in the local council as it currently is.
				We need a recycling centre in Hitchin.
<sup>1679</sup> Resident	No		No	
1682 Resident	No	Keep as is and reduce costs for residents.	No	Reduce costs for residents
<sup>1695</sup> Resident	No	Anything that adds that amount to the council tax is	No	Same as above, I don't want anything making
4700		not something I will agree with		council tax even costlier
<sup>1700</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
Resident		No access of the confidence of the confidence of	No	This new body seems to have no terms of
1706 Resident	No	No reason given or benefits provided. Therefore no		
	No	justification for change. Doesn't make sense for part		reference, but stated aims overlap with what
	No	,		reference, but stated aims overlap with what NHDC councillors are elected for and the great
	No	justification for change. Doesn't make sense for part		
	No	justification for change. Doesn't make sense for part of St Ippolyts to be governed from Hitchin and not St		NHDC councillors are elected for and the great

<sup>1712</sup> Resident	No	Benefits have not been established.	No	No Town Councils should be established:
				1) Whatever benefits are perceived, new bodies
				and cost centres are not a spending priority for
				householders.
				2) Recent bad experience in Letchworth tells us
				that Town Councils do not function well or win
				public approval in our district.
				3) Town Committees consisting of the currently
				elected District (or any future Unitary)
				Councillors can effectively represent Town
				interests to the District (or Unitary) Council at
				·
				little or no new cost.
<sup>1714</sup> Resident	No	It has been admitted that Council taxes will rise as a	No	Again how will I benefit?
		result of the proposals and I cannot see how residents		
		of Hitchin will benefit.		
<sup>1717</sup> Resident	No	We lost £300 winter alowance. Another £121 cost is	No	We lost £300 winter alowance. Another £121
		unacceptable.		cost is unacceptable.
<sup>1719</sup> Resident	No	I think the needs of those who live in St Ippolyts North	No	I see no reason in creating another layer of local
		are different to those who live in Hitchin Priory - rural		government bureaucracy which I will have to
		vs. urban - and therefore the two wards should not be		fund through an increase in my council tax. An
		combined.		extra layer will only serve to complicate and
				lengthen any decision making process and is a
				waste of council tax payers money in my
				opinion.
<sup>1727</sup> Resident	No	We are not prepared to pay any additional fees on our	No	
		council tax for something that is absolutely not		
		required.		
<sup>1731</sup> Resident	No		No	I do not wish the establishment of a new Town
				Council as things work fairly well and I would
				not like to see an increase in my council tax to
				pay for the establishment and upkeep of a new
				Town Council.
<sup>1737</sup> Resident	No	We do not think there is any need to change the	No	We do not think there is any need to change
		current system. Also, we do not agree with any		the current system. Also, we do not agree with
		increase in the Council Tax to pay for these proposals.		any increase in the Council Tax to pay for these
				proposals.
<sup>1743</sup> Resident	No	No cap on rate rises each year. Would district council	No	No cap on rate rises each year. Would district
		rates go down as district will not be providing some of		council rates go down as district will not be
		the services devolved to town council.		providing some of the services devolved to
				town council.
<sup>1744</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1754</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1765</sup> Resident	No	If this is going to cost more money in council tax then	No	See above
		as a retired person I'm not in favour		
<sup>1768</sup> Resident	No		No	

<sup>1772</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1782</sup> Resident	No		Yes	I am in favour of a Town council for Hitchin
				provided its representative are not chosen
				specifically by the political Parties.
				Men or women of independence should be
				chosen
<sup>1787</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1798</sup> Resident	No	Why would I vote for something that would increase	No	What is wrong with our current situation
		my council tax. We are pensioners and have already		
		been hit hard by the government. What important		
		would I see?		
<sup>1799</sup> Resident	No	I do not see any reason for it, and none is given in the	No	This will be an extra unnecessary expense for
		leaflet		the householder. I do not agree to or accept the
1002 5				need for an extra level of councillors
<sup>1803</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1808</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1815</sup> Resident	No	Unless St Ippolyts want this to happen.	No	We do not need more bills or increased council
		We do not need more bills or increased council tax.		tax. These new positions maybe unpaid, but
		These new positions maybe unpaid, but they will all		they will all receive expenses which tend to be
		receive expenses which tend to be exploited by many.		exploited by many. In these difficult financial
		In these difficult financial times, now is definitely not		times, now is definitely not the time to increase
		the time to increase the burden on residents.		the burden on residents.
<sup>1816</sup> Resident	No	A small change now may prove to have disadvantages,	, Yes	This option points to a single, clean start
		requiring further subsequent proposals, approvals		incorporating the proposal above.
		and changes later on.		
<sup>1822</sup> Resident	No		No	Based on the conversation I had yesterday at
				the Hitchin town council stand in market square
				, there was very little understanding of the roles
				and responsibilities of current local government
				authorities and not enough clarity of the role of
				a town council. Apart from giving Hitchin a
				voice. I find this current process unnecessary
				use of funds under the current financial
				challenges especially as the upcoming move to
				local government devolution which has several
				options to choose from.
<sup>1827</sup> Resident	No	Yet more administrative burden paid for by the	No	As above
		residents!		
<sup>1834</sup> Resident	No		No	Having looked at the proposals, I do not see any
				good reason for this change. The system as it is,
1011				is working perfectly adequately.
<sup>1844</sup> Resident	No		Yes	

<sup>1845</sup> Resident	No	Why change something that is not broken	No	So if it doesn't happen we still get 13 councilors	
		,		without being charged extra . It's just about	
				getting more money from us . Stop coming up	
				with stupid ideas and do your job for the	
				people of north herts .	
<sup>1846</sup> Resident	No	l cannot see the justification	No	The cost	
<sup>1847</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree	No	The additional cost on Council Tax	
<sup>1848</sup> Resident	No	I do not believe this move is necessary.	No	I do not believe that the addition of a town	
				council will provide enough benefits to justify	
				the extra costs levied on the council tax.	
<sup>1864</sup> Resident	No	l regard this as totally unnecessary	No	Again it is totally unnecessary	
<sup>1872</sup> Resident	No	this introduces additional council tax charges that are	No	We dont need yet another layer of local	
		not regulated by the 5% maximum increase as		government. We need councils to focus on core	
		implemented by HMG.		services & implement cost reductions	
				particularly in pension funding & care home	
				funding.	

<sup>1875</sup> Resident	No	No arguments for or against have been put forward	No	No I do not want to pay extra on my Council
		by those affected by the change proposed. On that		Tax to be spent annually to support the Town
		basis I think that the current arrangement should		Council or to be spent by the new Town Council.
		continue.		Being asked to vote without any substantial
				outline of the advantages, or disadvantages, is
				undemocratic.
				I would like to know answers to several
				questions before I would support the change
				proposed.
				I would also like to know which groups in
				Hitchin are in favour of this proposal and how it
				was put forward.
				Why is there no public dialogue, can someone
				explain.
				The Hitchin Forum website appears not to be
				commenting on this proposal. I imagine that
				they have a view and I would have expected
				them to share it given their focus on the town. I
				expected to see this via local media as well as
				their own website.
				North Herts Council as meeting it's obligation of
				putting this proposal forward but I can't see any
				advantage to the town, other than creating a
				pot of money to be spent on the town lifted
				from its tax payers.
				I know how my council tax is being spent, I
				don't want an extra bit added on with no clear
				idea of the objective. More flower baskets or
886 Resident	Na		No	food banks, how can we tell.
	No		No	Current set-up is okay, no change is required.
<sup>887</sup> Resident	No	This is a prelude to creating a new Town Council for	No	A new Town Council for Hitchin will create
		Hitchin and my reasons for objecting to that are set		another layer of bureaucracy that will impede
		out below.		and delay public decision making for the town
				and will also delay and increase the cost of the
				determination of private planning applications.
				I also strongly object to any proposals that will
				have the effect of increasing council tax for
				Hitchin without any corresponding increase in the provision of public services
1900 Resident	No	No advantage and don't want to pay any more council	No	same as above
		tax		

<sup>1911</sup> Resident	No	There's no clear justification of what the benefits are for residents in making this change, weighed up	No	As above.
		against the additional cost that will be levied to		
		residents. Until this is evidenced I cannot see what		
		grounds there are for taking this forward.		
<sup>1913</sup> Resident	No	It's seems not logical to split part of existing parish to	No	There is no indication what benefits it will add
		Hitchin.		to people living in Hitchin by creating new town
				Council. It also seems excessive to have 13
				people in council for the size of Hitchin. All that
				money could be put at better use of making
				sure streets are safe for children, and ensuring
				not holes are fixed.
<sup>1925</sup> Resident	No		No	Ineffective answer to improving local
				governance.
<sup>1945</sup> Resident	No	It's a completely unnecessary additional layer of	No	As the proposals are linked my feedback is the
		bureaucracy at a ridiculous extra cost. There should		same. It's a completely unnecessary additional
		be an external review of how this idea ever reached		layer of bureaucracy at a ridiculous extra cost.
		the stage of being made public.		There should be an external review of how this
				idea ever reached the stage of being made
				public
<sup>1947</sup> Resident	No	Extra layer of administration controlled by well	No	Extra layer of administration controlled by well
		meaning but amateur representation will add extra		meaning but amateur representation will add
		costs and achieve no improvements. The		extra costs and achieve no improvements. The
		administrative process can not currently run our		administrative process can not currently run
		libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding		our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc;

<sup>1978</sup> Resident	No	After reviewing the material delivered, as well as the	No	As above.
		content at the URL https://www.north-		
		herts.gov.uk/community-governance-review, I note		
		that it does not clearly outline the tangible benefits of		
		the draft recommendations. Additionally, the material		
		fails to provide an indicative cost impact on my council		
		tax.		
		For clarity, I am not opposed to a Community		
		Governance Review (CGR) or any reassessment of		
		council tax. However, the material supplied offers no		
		clear guidance on either the benefits or the associated		
		_		
		costs. In doing so, it presents itself merely as a		
		potential increase in bureaucracy at the expense of		
		local taxpayers.		
		More education and effort are needed to demonstrate		
		the value that town councils and councillors provide to		
		•		
		the area. Until a far more accurate and transparent		
		set of costs and benefits is presented, I would strongly		
		reject both recommendations.		
<sup>1980</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>1984</sup> Resident	No	not required	Yes	Hitchin deserves its own town council to deal
1005				with things that North Herts neglects.
<sup>1986</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1987</sup> Resident	No	I am in favour of Hitchin having a Town Council but it	No	As before I am in favour of Hitchin having a
		does not have to include St Ippolyts North ward that		Town Council but it does not have to include St
		should remain in St Ippolyts Parish.		Ippolyts North ward that should remain in St
		St Ippolyts North ward is already in Hitchin Priory		Ippolyts Parish.
		ward and has been for many years.		
<sup>1989</sup> Resident	No		No	Do not want to pay more
<sup>1991</sup> Resident	No	Villages deserve their own representatives	No	Hitchin already has three levels of
				representation. MP, Herts County council and
				North Herts council. It is already hard to find
				which one is responsible for what services.
				Adding another layer would add to
				complication in finding representatives and also
				add to resident costs (council tax). It is not at all
				clear what a town council would give residents
				for important issues - E.g. pot hole reparation
				and bin collections. There is a fear there would
				be an increase in implementing policies that are
				not important E.g. 20 mph limits on roads
				where there have been no injury accidents any
				1080

<sup>2086</sup> Resident	No		No	
2092 Resident	No	I have voted NO, but I would rather have had the	Yes	I feel sure that after the NHDS is dissolved, the
		option to abstain. I live in Bearton Road in Hitchin, and		County Councillors will do their best to serve
		I feel that this decision should be decided by the		the communities that they represent. However,
		residents of St Ippolyts and Hitchin Priory.		I believe it will be better if a Town Council is
		., .		formed in Hitchin with local powers and local
				accountability.
<sup>2094</sup> Resident	No	But shouldn't this be left to those living in St Ippolyts	Yes	A Town Council in Hitchin will be better placed
		and the affected part of Hitchin?		to decide and act upon local problems, rather
				than leaving these matters to just the County
				Council in two years time.
2108 Resident	No	The current governance works well with North-Herts	No	Please see my answer to question 7.
		Council and Hertfordshire County Council. There is no		
		need for an additional layer of bureaucracy and		
		additional cost to our council charge. There is no		
		"business case" of the benefits/advantages of having a		
		town council. There are certainly disadvantages: above		
		all is additional cost. And (for example) a potential		
		disadvantage of confusion about who is responsible		
		for what and the risk of grey areas where no-one is		
		responsible or more than one body is responsible. If it		
		comes about, will the town councillors be paid any		
		kind of fee or expenses? If so, why should we be asked		
		to pay for an entirely unnecessary organisation.		
		If the governance model for Hertfordshire changes		
		whereby North-Herts Council is no longer part of the		
		governance, then there is still no need for a town		
		council. Part of the design of any new governance		
		model will ensure that elected representatives at the		
		county level will be representation for all areas in the		
		current north-herts area.		
		A town council has no beneficial purpose and is a		
		complete waste of money.		
2109 Resident	No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	No	l do not want a town council
		do not want a Town Council		
114 Resident	No		No	I don't agree with asking people to pay more
				council tax at this challenging economic time. I
				also don't understand how these proposals will
				benefit us as residents, and how this money will
				be used.
2147 Resident	No	I cannot see any benefit to either community in	No	Hitchin and St Ippolyts are two quite distinct
		removing part of one Council to enlarge a new and		communities and these proposals ignore the
		untried entity.		realities of community coherence.

<sup>2177</sup> Resident	No	Please see 9 below for reasons	No	We have a county councillors and NHDC
				councillors who do not represent well the
				interests of their constituents. How will another
				tier of councillors help? It seems to me the
				proposed change is simply a cover to increase
				council tax. I live in Hitchin Walsworth. I have
				seen little if any action from councillors aimed
				at reducing the risk of flooding of local homes
				and businesses since the river Purwell flooded
				in September 2024. They also allowed a large
				'local' Sainsbury's on Cambridge Road which
				once open will only add to the traffic congestion
				on Cambridge Road and lessen further air
2194 Danisland	NI-	This would offer the communities	NI-	This would off at the site of the annual to
<sup>2184</sup> Resident	No	This would affect communities	No	This would affect the integrity of the community
<sup>2185</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2207</sup> Resident	No		No	i do not believe we need a Town council,
				another layer of unrequired management.
<sup>2214</sup> Resident	No		No	I think this is going to be the same old faces
				wasting yet more taxpayer money on expenses
				and not agreeing anything useful for 'paying
				residents'. I already pay some £2,000. for time
				wasters like leading to come up with
				useless ideas like 20 mph limits, bus lanes,
				riverside walks, unprofitable shopping centres
				and pointless relief roads through industrial
				areas and adjoining railway lines. As a
				pensioner I have limited funds and the thought
				of paying out more for yet another old boys
<sup>2221</sup> Resident	No		No	eluh makac ma ciek
resident	110		NO	I think it is unacceptable to make changes and
				nut up our council tay again, the constant rises
				put up our council tax again - the constant rises
				are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge
				are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge amount of financial pressure on residents. You
				are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge amount of financial pressure on residents. You should be streamlining services, not making
2222 Resident	No	Council tay is already high enough - I do not want it to	No	are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge amount of financial pressure on residents. You should be streamlining services, not making things more expensive.
<sup>2222</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is already high enough - I do not want it to		are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge amount of financial pressure on residents. You should be streamlining services, not making things more expensive. Council tax is already high enough - I do not
<sup>2222</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is already high enough - I do not want it to increase. I don't see how this change would benefit me and it's not something I want to pay for		are totally unsustainable and are putting a huge amount of financial pressure on residents. You should be streamlining services, not making things more expensive.

<sup>2103</sup> Resident	Voc	Voc. but also adjust its horder while voulre at it. The	Voc	Support creation of town council, particularly in
kesident	Yes		Yes	Support creation of town council, particularly in
		current parish and district ward boundary goes		light of anticipated change to unitary
		through the middle of a couple of houses on Gosmore		authorities.
		Gate, and adopting this boundary as the new parish		
		would split that fairly small street between Hitchin and		
		St Ippolyts parishes. Would suggest the boundary in		
		that area is realigned to match the green belt		
		boundary, which places Gosmore Gate entirely within		
		the Hitchin urban area. Would also suggest including		
		housing allocation HT2 from the Local Plan within		
		Hitchin rather than St Ippolyts. I am aware there are		
		rules about how parishes and district wards need to		
		align, but I also understand that the Local Government		
		Boundary Commission regularly does minor adjusting		
		reviews to match district wards to parish boundaries		
		following a Community Governance Review.		
		Therefore, please don't feel that the only option to you		
		here is to rigidly stick to the existing parish and district		
		ward boundary - draw a sensible boundary and notify		
		the boundary commission that you'd like them to		
		tweak the ward boundaries to match.		
<sup>34</sup> Resident	Yes	The northern end of St Ippollitts parish is simply part	No	Why provide an additional - and costly - layer of
		of Hitchin		bureaucracy with no real powers when the
				government's thrust is to reduce two-tier
				council systems to Unitary authorities? l
				remember the fiasco that was Letchworth Town
				Council, despised by all but those who
				petitioned to have it set up, and which lasted
				just a few years. the same would happen with
				Hitchin
<sup>1791</sup> Resident	Yes	This is effectively now a suburb of Hitchin and should	Yes	
		be treated as such; it has clearly detached from St		
		Ippolyts village itself.		
	Yes	Its in the ONS BUA.	Yes	I think all areas in England should be parished
organisation				and making Letchworth unparished again was a
(I'm				big mistake. This will only become more
representing				important when larger districts are formed in
myself as part				the next few years.
of a proposal				
to parish all				
non				
metropolitan				
metropolitan				
area in	Yes		Yes	

<sup>3</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes more sense geographically	Yes	Hitchin needs its own council with the ability to
				raise a precept for particular Hitchin issues. It
				will be important for there to be local input to
				deal with day-to-day issues without reference to
				a more remote layer of government once
				national government reorganises areas into
				Unitary Authorities.
<sup>5</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems to border the main Hitchin town more than St	Yes	Hitchin has been badly served in the past
		Ippolyts		because it hasn't had a town council. Also with
				the proposed reorganisation of Hertfordshire
				into unitary authorities a town council will be
<sup>15</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	required
<sup>19</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>28</sup> Resident	Yes	Centralised governance cuts down on waste	Yes	Centralised governance cuts down on waste
<sup>37</sup> Resident	Yes	I think that moving St Ippolyts North into a new	Yes	A Town Council for Hitchin is long overdue and
		Hitchin Town authority is a matter for the residents of		would create a much better forum for residents
		St Ippoltys especially as they already have a parish		and improve accountability (and would
		council so I would have preferred to be able to make		probably save money if as I assume it is
		no comment on that proposal rather than be given		alongside the abolition of District Councils)
		just Yes/No		
		However if the move is necessary to make a Hitchin		
20 5 11		Town Council viable and efficient I would support it	.,	
<sup>39</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>41</sup> Resident	Yes	Having lived off Newlands Lane for almost 45 years	Yes	
		I've never, ever been in St Ippolyts village shop, so a		
		switch from St I to Hitchin seems inevitable.		
<sup>46</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I'd want to see a clear and concise plan for how
				this council will provide value.
				Any inefficient governing body would be a drag
				on the town and it's residents.
				With rises to Council taxes in question, a high
				amount of disclosure and justification must be
				met before any implementation.
<sup>50</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>54</sup> Resident	Yes	St Ippolyts north fits naturally into the compass of	Yes	Hitchin residents should have a greater say in
		Hitchin		matters relating to Hitchin as a community
<sup>68</sup> Resident	Yes	It appears only the A602 creates a boundary	Yes	Working in partnership, rather than
				contrafiction

<sup>71</sup> Resident	Yes	I have no objection to this proposal	No	I do not believe we need another tier of local
				government at town council level. I was a public
				sector audit manager for many years and my
				work included the audit of Town Councils. I do
				not think that the additional council tax levied if
				reflected in additional benefits. The operation
				of local committees within existing local
				government tiers is sufficient.
<sup>81</sup> Resident	Yes	Logically makes sense.	Yes	Need a Town Council desperately.
<sup>88</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>89</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense to include the elite North Parish as it's	Yes	I feel hitching is under represented in North
		still part of Hitchin		hearts and the people of Hitchin will have more
				control over its community whilst at the same
				time supporting the wider district creating a
				better community for not just Hitchin but all of
				North hearts
<sup>91</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Hitchin should only have a new town council if it
				doesn't cost any additional money to residents
				because it sounds as if it is creating a third tier
				of local government. How does this fit in with
				the government proposal to get rid of District
				Councils?
<sup>96</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Councils:
<sup>101</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>104</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>113</sup> Resident	Yes	x	Yes	
120 Resident	Yes	Logically these properties are more affixed to Hitchin	Yes	We need local representation if the district
Resident	163		163	council is abolished
<sup>121</sup> Resident	Yes	than St Ippolyts	Yes	council is abolished
<sup>122</sup> District	Yes		Yes	
Councillor	162		162	
128 Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>146</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
				Town Council would be a superconnectional
<sup>157</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Town Council would have unnecessary local
170 p	.,		.,	control, and would cost us more.
<sup>178</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>193</sup> Resident	Yes	No strong view	No	Understand this would increase council tax so
		-		no, don't do it
<sup>210</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	·
<sup>212</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I'm happy with current structure and see no
				reason to add extra layers of bureaucracy

<sup>213</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Increase in council tax is not acceptable. More
				bureaucracy does not mean better services.
				Just fix the potholes!
<sup>223</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The last thing any resident needs is a further
				layer of bureaucracy together with further cost.
				The only people to benefit would be those who
				have a burning desire to control the lives of
				others, those that want to stand for election -
				those who think the state (the town council)
				knows best. Please, please, please don't
				introduce a "town council"
<sup>243</sup> Resident	Yes		No	l pay for allotment to nhc. Why should I also
				pay the new authority as well.
				The information I have seen so suggests an
				increase in the cost to me.
<sup>283</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Hitchin is a distinct area with its own character,
				and is an easy geographical area for people to
				relate to. Changes and events in one part of
				the town impact on the whole, so it makes
				sense for it to be governed as one unit. I hope
				this might also prevent our local community
				being subsumed under the umbrella of a
				Hertfordshire wide council. Local areas should
				he locally managed
<sup>286</sup> Resident	Yes	We need smaller less expensive government, not	No	We need smaller, lower cost government not
		larger. I am in favour if this achieves lower overall cost		larger and more expensive. I do not with to see
				my council tax rise to pay for more local
				government administrators
<sup>292</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>297</sup> Resident	Yes	whatevs	No	unnecessary additional layer of local
				government
<sup>301</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	

<sup>304</sup> Resident	Yes	The area is contiguous to the urban areas currently	No	I don't think it's been explained - for the
		within the Hitchin parish, whilst there is open fields to		additional council tax precept I would pay, it's
		the south between this area and the village of St.		unclear what we expect the total sum raised
		Ippolyts.		would be and what budget the town council
				would have, compared to it's responsibility. For
				example, the district council are currently
				responsible, for the cemetery and the
				perimeter wall and fencing is falling apart - how
				is this job going to be any better done via a
				town council? How has the parish council model
				been used elsewhere in North Herts District to
				deliver services more efficiently in VfM terms,
				and more effectively (i.e. what is the return on
<sup>305</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Council tax is already eyewateringly high and
				with wider cost of living pressures, absolutely
				no work should be under development for
				schemes that increase it further.
				A leaflet with a vague indicative range of £22-
				121 expected increase for one example band is
				not good enough to show people what is being
				asked for, and I can see no mention of what the
				benefits are?
				There may well be a compelling case, but in
				that event the proposal should be to fund it
				from reductions to less compelling existing
<sup>309</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes absolute sense. St Ippolyts is part of Hitchin.	Yes	Hitchin is in need of more representative
				governance. Especially if and when unitary
				authorities are introduced. At present voluntary
				groups, businesses, sports and other clubs and
				associations have no representative focus or
				means to solve mutual problems and create
				synergies between themselves (e.g. town
				twinning is almost dormant and offers no
				opportunities to young people, creative and
				sports people) . The commercial Hitchin bid fills
				some of this space but we need a
				raprasantativa hadiv

<sup>310</sup> Resident	Yes		No	This is completely unnecessary - there is
				enough bureaucracy and cost already without
				adding another layer of governance - the
				Government has been clear on clearing out
				unnecessary duplicative processes and here
				you are looking to do exactly the opposite - I
				think residents will strongly object to a higher
				council tax hill for no additional nuroose
316 Resident	Yes		No	Additional council tax is unwelcome and
				unacceptable. The point of removing north
				herts district council was to reduce duplication,
				unnecessary cost and confusion over
				governance. How would creating new town
				councils not just be replacing one expensive
				and inefficient with another?
321 Resident	Yes	I do not oppose it	No	I just question if now is the time, given potential
				local govt reorganisation (Herts as one council,
				losing North Herts) and cost of living pressures
				and rising taxes.
				Also, Hitchin town centre seems to be a pretty
				vibrant place with the town centre manager's
				leadership and I am not sure that a town
				council would really help.
				I would prefer for district or other rep
<sup>337</sup> Resident	Yes	This makes perfect sones siven the goography and	Vas	councillors to be involved (influential.
ss, Resident	res	This makes perfect sense given the geography and	Yes	This would give another level of governance for
		demographics of the area. The community in the		our town. I can understand the concern of
		proposed area are aligned naturally with the CBD of		increased bureaucracy but this is a welcome
		Hitchin and historical expansion has meant the		addition to enable local people to be more
		boundary between Hitchin and St Ippolyts is arbitrary		involved in local decisions and to see the town
<sup>367</sup> Resident	Yes	and should definitely be moved. This makes sense given how Hitchin has developed	No	flourish. Unless this can be made cost neutral or even a
307 Resident	165	over time.	NO	saving by removing other layers of governance,
		over time.		
				I am opposed to adding another layer of
<sup>373</sup> Resident	Yes		No	governance. The proposal means yet another layer of
Resident	163		NO	councillors, another layer of officials, more
				·
				expense for residents - all for no discernable
				benefit. It is additional "governance" for the
<sup>378</sup> Resident	Yes		No	sake of it.  Reviewing the cost that it would incur to
- Mesiderit	163		INO	implement the changes, I don't see the
				•
				proposed changes having enough benefit to
				each area to justify the cost

Resident Yes No Extra cost without the benefits being clearly explained	
<sup>381</sup> Resident Yes Yes	
<sup>383</sup> Resident Yes Yes	
395 Resident Yes No I cannot believe that, at a time when people are	
struggling with costs and governments are	
looking to reduce costs, you are considering	
adding extra cost with a completely pointless	
town council which in reality will make virtually	
no difference to the everyday lives of the	
residents. The survey has been sent out with	
virtually no supporting information that will	
allow people to make an informed decision,	
particularly around what would be the actual	
400 Resident Yes No I fail to see the need for yet more local	
governance. We have NHDC councillors so do	
not need any more. It seems to work well	
enough as is.	
I also dislike the prospect of my council tax	
going up to pay for something which has no	
material value to me.	
403 Resident Yes No Council tax already too expensive without	
another layer of bureaucracy to fund	
404 Resident Yes It makes sense not to have St Ipps split. No I don't believe an additional layer of	
government is in the best interest of residents.	
410 Resident Yes Yes	
424 Resident Yes No Another layer of local government is abhorrent	
to me. The two tiers that we already have do	
not seem able to deliver local services	
effectively (eg roads without potholes to name	
but one thing) and I do not see how another	
layer will do anything else apart from take up	
even more of our council tax in bureaucratic	
expense. The pure administrative expenditure	
will increae bills from day one and I forsee yet	
more opportunities for matters to fall between	
the three tiers of management. I have already	
experienced a significant rise in council tax this	
year without any evidence at all of benefits and	
I strongly object to the principle of paying more for another layer of Kafkaesque bureaucracy.	
433 Resident Yes This is a long overdue simplification Yes	
resident 1es 11115 is a folig overdue simplification 1es	

<sup>457</sup> Resident	Yes	Incorporating St. Ippolyts North into Hitchin Priory	Yes	However, does this amalgamation result in a
		only if it will saves money by cutting down on the		larger area under one voting system?
		number of employed councillors. I don't believe 13		
450		councillors is sustainable.		
<sup>459</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Unnecessary bureaucracy with no clear tangible
				benefit which couldn't be delivered through
460				other means.
<sup>460</sup> Resident	Yes	N/A	No	I can't see how adding another layer to decision
				making will add any benefit to Hitchin, whilst
				increasing residents council tax bills to pay for
465 Danieland	V		\/	it. Seems completely unnecessary.
<sup>465</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>466</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>467</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>477</sup> Resident	Yes	Hitchin is an evergrowing town with a high population	Yes	Hitchin is a trade centre and must be
		and many shops that are very selective in where they		superiority governed
		operate. Hitchin is a very large place and a central		
		trading place. Although we are already governed we		
		need more to let this great place be greater.		
<sup>478</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>484</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>494</sup> Resident	Yes	I look forward to having a Hitchin Town Council	Yes	I look forward to having a Hitchin Town Council
<sup>500</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>506</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
526 Resident	Yes		No	I don't believe adding another layer of
				beurocracy, the cost of which is paid for by the
				residents is in our best interest
<sup>535</sup> Resident	Yes		No	l have lived in Hitchin for 14yrs without a town
				council and do not see the need for one now,
				just another level of unnecessary bureaucracy
536 Resident	Yes		No	Why change what's not broken
<sup>542</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Unnecessary.
555 Resident				
sss kesident	Yes		No	Want more info on the benefits of creating a
				town council before I can be happy this is a
<sup>560</sup> Resident	Yes		No	good solution I do not see the benefit of introducing a parish
Residerit	162		INU	council that will result in an increase in council
<sup>561</sup> Resident	Yes		No	tax. Ridiculous idea
RESIDER	163		140	Malcalous raca

<sup>565</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Smells like another layer of bureaucracy that
				would cost an increased level of council tax. The
F77 D 11 .	.,			taxpayer wouldn't see a tangible benefit.
<sup>577</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>580</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The government is trying to reduce costs and
				bureaucracy by merging council entities and
				reducing waste. This appears to be trying to
				circumnavigate this. I don't think we need
				another cost on our tax bills especially for the
				limited benefits the town council might be
				focused on.
<sup>581</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>584</sup> Resident	Yes		No	A town council would be expensive and
				unnecessary.
<sup>585</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>591</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	More local representation for the town can only
Resident	103		103	be a good thing. Cost is modest if we see
				improvements.
<sup>594</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	At the moment the advantages would probably
Resident	165		103	be marginal. However, rumours of removing
				District Councils would change this and make a
				town council even more necessary.
<sup>595</sup> Resident	Yes	The area touches Hitchin but not the rest of St	Yes	NHDC covers too big and disparate an area for
		Ippollyts. The boundary is odd — why not expand it		any town's interests to be considered properly.
		slightly more in the south-west to include a few		My recent discovery that there is no Emergency
		additional houses?		Plan for Hitchin strengthens my view that more
		additional modes.		devolution is necessary.
				I'm aware that this is directly at odds with the
				current rumours that all counties will effectively
				become unitary authorities — I think that
				proposal is absurd
<sup>598</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>604</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
613 Resident	Yes	I'm actually agnostic on this point but if there are	No	Am strongly opposed to more government.
Resident	165	efficiencies and cost savings to be made then I am in	110	Same reason I voted for Brexit. The state is
		favour of including St Ippolyts North within Hitchin		already bloated with bureaucracy and is
		tavour of including 5c ippolyes from Within Fincerin		inefficient. We should have less layers of
				governance not more. We should be doing
				more with less resource not adding more
				resource and cost for no tangible benefit other
				than job creation for the state. How does
				anyone think this is a good idea when we are in
				a cost of living crisis. About as sensible as
				reducing the frequency of bin collection and

<sup>615</sup> Resident	Yes		No	l do not believe the benefits (if any) of a new
				Town Council for Hitchin will be worth any
				increase in council tax.
<sup>617</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>628</sup> Resident	Yes	The area is geographically part of Hitchin so the	No	Introducing another level (4th!) of elected
		change makes sense		officials will increase bureaucracy, slow decision
				making and not increase accountability. North
				Herts Council already covers a relatively small
				population of very similar towns and it is totally
				unnecessary to complicate local management
				further. The proposed increase in taxes would
				be far better spent on delivering front line
				services or funding the implementation of the
				small town projects that these officials would be
				debating
<sup>631</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems to make sense given the way the town is	No	Additional taxation for no benefit. That's not
		growing.		welcomed, wanted or needed.
<sup>633</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems sensible but I don't live in the area	No	It's unclear what value this would bring over
				and above what our councillors are already
				doing. Given the demands on our already
				stretched finances, adding an extra layer of
				bureaucracy at a significant cost does not seem
				like the right thing to do

<sup>635</sup> Resident	Yes	Might as well. They are practically joined up now,	Yes	
		geographically speaking, with all the housing estates.		I support the proposal to establish a Town
				Council for Hitchin. Hitchin has grown
				significantly in recent years, driven by rising
				housing demand from London and the town's
				strong schools, and it now requires more direct
				local governance to ensure that development is
				managed responsibly and in the best interests
				of residents.
				A Town Council would provide greater local
				control over planning and transport, two key
				areas where Hitchin needs more strategic
				oversight. With increasing pressure from
				housing development, it is essential that
				decisions about new builds, infrastructure, and
			conservation are made with Hitchin's unique	
			character in mind. A Town Council would be	
				better positioned to advocate for sustainable
				growth, ensuring that new developments are
				properly integrated with existing services,
				school places, and transport links.
				Additionally, transport and parking issues
				require local solutions. Hitchin's commuter
				population continues to grow, and the town
				needs a council that can push for improved
				public transport, better parking strategies, and
				enhanced pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.
				More control over these issues would allow
				Hitchin to develop policies that support both
				residents and businesses while managing
				congestion more effectively.
646 Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>655</sup> Resident	Yes	reducing costs	No	this would increase costs, and there is no
665 Resident	Yes		No	tangible benefit for the change
<sup>683</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Don't want an increase in council tax. This
				change feels unnecessary.

<sup>686</sup> Resident	Yes	There are no pros and cons as to why we should or	No	There are no pros and cons as to why we
		shouldn't do this and it just seems like it'd just add		should or shouldn't do this and it just seems
		more bureaucracy and make it more expensive to get		like it'd just add more bureaucracy and make it
		anything agreed as well as being an additional		more expensive to get anything agreed as well
		unnecessary cost for staff, offices etc which have to be		as being an additional unnecessary cost for
		borne by residents		staff, offices etc which have to be borne by
<sup>694</sup> Resident	Yes		No	residents
710 Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>715</sup> Resident	Yes	Sounds like a good way of saving money. St Ippolyts is	No	You have not explained the financial
		part of Hitchin geographically, so why carry the		implications of the proposal, but it sounds like
		overhead and additional unnecessary complexity of		unnecessary additional infrastructure and
		having a separate council. The less people, complexity		therefore cost. Why do any of those district
		and cost in the local government infrastructure the		wards need more than 1 councillor?
		better		As per previous response, the less complexity,
<sup>730</sup> Resident	Yes	l am neither in favour of or against this	Yes	people and cost the better  BUT while in this questionnaire it's an abstract
Resident	103	recommendation	165	proposal, there is no clear definition of what is
		recommendation		involved, where such a proposal sits and what
				the alternatives are. There should be better
				supporting information on the flyer that came
				through the door so people can get some idea
				of what this part of the consultation is about.
				Furthermore, some justification should be given
				for the increase in council tax.
				And yes I have snaken to the sound offices in
				And yes, I have spoken to the council offices in
				Letchworth about it.
<sup>731</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Dagarda Cooff Look
740 Resident	Yes		Yes	
743 Resident	Yes	Makes sense to combine with hitchin	Yes	Will give residents greater say in their local area
<sup>750</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>759</sup> Resident	Yes	Dont mind as does not affect me i think	No	Cannot pay more council tax! Absolutely cannot.
775 Resident	Yes	But not if it increases council tax. Hitchin need a level		But not if it increases council tax. Hitchin need a
		of representation that it does not get from Letchworth		level of representation that it does not get from
		nor Hertford CC But not at the cost of increasing		Letchworth nor Hertford CC But not at the cost
		Council tax - transfer of funds is fine but not a back		of increasing Council tax - transfer of funds is
<sup>780</sup> Resident	Yes	door CT increase.	Yes	fine but not a back door CT increase.

<sup>786</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	While there was already a good case for a town
				council, this has greatly strengthened in the
				light of proposed Unitary Authorities. We need
				a council with a specific responsibility for the
				town.
<sup>797</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Absolute waste of money and resources to
				have a town council. They add no benefit.
<sup>798</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Complete waste of money. People making noise
				and doing nothing about anything.
				Yet another way to rinse money out of those
				that don't have enough to live off as it is.
				People won't read as to the extra costs
<sup>801</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
824 Resident	Yes	This move is a sensible adjustment, especially given	Yes	Each area is discretely different and warrants
		that St Ipps is really part of Hitchin and has little		separate councillors. Hitchin will
		infrastructure of its own.		donwellmtonhave a town council.
<sup>841</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>857</sup> Resident	Yes	The housing developments in this ward are better	Yes	Although there is a general trend to reduce
		aligned to the urban community of Hitchin		layers of government it is important that all
				significant communities have a voice. Hitchin is
				a vibrant and growing community that needs a
				strong voice in its development that speaks
				only for Hitchin.
877 Resident	Yes		Yes	Better representation
882 Resident	Yes		No	Not for a raise in council tax? Wouldn't we be
				paying the current tax to hitchin council instead
				of where it is currently paid? Why would it
				increase?
<sup>885</sup> Resident	Yes	I have no strong feelings as either way	No	l see no benefit to it. I think a new town council
				will add an extra, unnecessary layer of
				bureaucracy, more confusion for residents
				around who is responsible for what, and at
				more cost to the council tax payer. I received a
				flyer promoting the new town council, and
				some suggestions appeared not to be very
				'green'- I don't understand how this would fit
				with NHDCs climate change policy

<sup>886</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I am not happy with the increase this would
				cause for council tax, given the state of the
				economy and people's finances, this is not a
				burden that should be placed on residents.
				Additionally, sufficient information has not
				been provided on how this council would
				actually benefit all residents and be value for
				money. Whilst I understand the reasoning I do
				not see the benefit. There are already a number
				of initiatives and people who successfully work
				together to serve the common cause of Hitchin
				and adding an extra layer of bureaucracy is not
				necessary and could hinder people and/or
				wards working together.
888 Resident	Yes	Happy either way if honest	No	Doesn't seem like a necessary extra expense to
				residents. NHDC are already financially
				stretched, so adding another team to do things
				that are already being done seems pointless.
				I'm sure there are arguments for this idea, but
				the whole thing smacks of 'busybodyness'.
<sup>890</sup> Resident	Yes	I am in favour of this Town Council proposal for	Yes	As per my above answer to question 7.
		Hitchin as residents will be given much more of an		
		opportunity to have their say about Hitchin and to		
		speak about any issues etc and to get more swift		
<sup>906</sup> Resident	Yes	action to resolve.	No	
<sup>911</sup> Resident	Yes		No	In the cost of living crisis, thank you so very
				much for proposing to add extra charge to
				council tax on a top of already huge increase
				but most importantly, let add more burocracy!
				Instead of making structure more simpler and
				more effective.
				It's great proposal in addition to bus lanes for
				buses that are run once per hour and reduction
				of household waste collection
<sup>916</sup> Resident	Yes	A more local council would be an advantage to	Yes	A good move.
		residents. An increase in council tax might be enough		
		to discourage some.		
<sup>919</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Not keen on the increase in council tax though!
<sup>920</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	

<sup>925</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	The importance of local representation once
				the unitary authority is decided upon will be
				even more important.
				I'm fed up with not knowing who to talk to
				about local issues with the present arrangement
<sup>928</sup> Resident	Yes	Hitchin needs better management	Yes	St Ippolyts North is hitchin reealy
Resident	103	The minimude of the management	165	scippoly a North is internit recally
<sup>937</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>938</sup> Resident	Yes	I would like Hitychin to be more independen t.	Yes	
941 Resident	Yes	Anonymous. Anything that keeps Hitchin and	Yes	As above
Resident	163	surrounding areas together is a good thing certainly.	163	As above
<sup>958</sup> Resident	Yes	surrounding areas together is a good timing certainly.	Yes	
<sup>959</sup> Resident		We would love to have a Hitchin Town Council. Please	Yes	We would love to have a Hitchin Town Council.
939 Resident	Yes	can one be created.	res	Please can one be created.
<sup>983</sup> Resident	Yes	can one be created.	No	Cannot see point of new town council.
		·		Cumot see point of new council.
<sup>997</sup> Resident	Yes	This ward is clearly part of the urban area of Hitchin	Yes	
<sup>999</sup> Resident	Yes		No	No need to add additional layer of bureaucracy
				that comes with an additional cost
<sup>1016</sup> Resident	Yes	If that is what St Ippolyts North residents want. If they	Yes	Hitchin should have its own council. I've lived
		don't then I'm in favour of Highbury having three		here since1968 and I have always thought so.
1024 Docident	Vas	councillors, since I live in Highbury.	No	Increase an equalitary
<sup>1024</sup> Resident	Yes		INO	Increase on council tax
<sup>1032</sup> Resident	Yes	No view here. I have not received any information to	No	Council tax is high enough and we do not need
		describe why the change has been proposed and what		a town council. Why ask people to pay more for
		the true positives/negatives are. Hence I am not		a town council? Communication has been none
		informed enough to make a judgement		existent on what this is, what the town council
				will achieve, what their goals are and how you
				can justify up to £120 per year extra tax to pay
				for it. I lived in Letchworth 13 years ago and they had a form of town council which was
				expensive to set up, took an age to disband and
				from what I could see there was very little
				benefit to anyone other than giving some
				councillors something to keep them busy! I
				would rather not have the extra tax burden and
				would rather donate £120 to charity than to a
<sup>1065</sup> Resident	Yes		No	It another level of bureaucracy
				it another level of bulleautracy
<sup>1067</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1071</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I don't want higher taxes

<sup>1107</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Another level of bureaucracy, thought we were
Resident	163		140	supposed to be stream lining councils, not
				making more levels. Pay high council tax now,
				do not wish for it to be any higher. Money being
				spent on this review could be better spent on
				our existing services.
1125 Resident	Yes	It makes sense, but due to the increased housing	Yes	A Hitchin Town Council would be a step
		development in Oughton Ward, representation with 3		towards addressing the current democratic
		councillors should be considered		deficit compared to other localities within the
				district and essential when considering its voice
				in future potential changes to the unitary
				authority of Hertfordshire. Hitchin currently
				suffers from being a geographic road
				intersection, but suffers from lack of public
				transport and major road links serving already
				heavy and increasing East/West transport
				demands. I would hope that with a Town
				Council, this aspect can be better addressed in
				the future
<sup>1129</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The additional cost to residents is not justified.
				We do not need more elected officials
<sup>1151</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1155</sup> Resident	Yes	On the grounds that physically it is indistinguishable	Yes	
		from Hitchin		
<sup>1161</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense	Yes	Seems a fair allocation
<sup>1162</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems broadly integrated into Hitchin anyway, so	No	I'm not clear on what the benefits of having a
		providing the people that actually live there are happy,		TC will be beyond having a cost to residents.
		why not?		There has been no clear statement of what the
				TC will provide for the additional cost (which will
				surely only increase each year). At a time where
				many are struggling to pay essential bills, why
				would would we create more cost? Perhaps
				there are clear benefits, but they certainly
				haven't been communicated clearly, or widely.
1166 Resident	Yes		No	I don't see the need for another layer of local
				government especially if it adds cost to local
				residents. Depending on what happens with
				the devolution agenda in Herts, then there may
				be advantages to this kind of local body but
				while the structure of our new county council is
				unknown. Lam unsure on this point

<sup>1173</sup> Resident	Yes	It is basically part of Hitchin really and most people	No	I don't want to pay more money for another
		living there will do more and be more interested in		level of councillor, we have enough as it is and
		Hitchin		we should spend the money on current services
4476				and councillors rather than make more
<sup>1176</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1178</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1181</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
1200 Resident	Yes		No	We do not need another layer of government,
				particularly if this is going to cost us more
				money. There has been no information about
				how this may be of any benefit.
<sup>1232</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1252</sup> Resident	Yes	I don't care how you do it, as long as you don't create	No	If you can do it without residents paying for
		more jobs, that we have to pay for. If you can create a		your jobs, then maybe, but issues must be
		new council for Hitchin without increasing already high		already being dealt with someone, so NO, I
		council tax, then it may be a good idea, but I don't		don't want more councillors.
		agree to proposing this council tax increase do you		
		can pay for a newly created jobs.		
<sup>1256</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1266</sup> Resident	Yes		No	If this results in increased costs and hence
				increased council tax the I am firmly apposed to
				the proposal. Over the past few years council
				tax has continued to rise while council services
				have degraded. The council needs to wake up,
				recognise they are supposed to be a service
				provider, concentrate on improving efficiency,
				reducing costs and improving services
<sup>1272</sup> Resident	Vos	Not qualified to give magniful comment	Vos	As above
	Yes	Not qualified to give meaninful comment	Yes	As above
<sup>1273</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1288</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes a lot of sense.	Yes	The new Town Council should be based in
				Hitchin, so that residents can be more involved
				and participate in decision making.
				Rather than having assigned Councillors per
				ward, all 13 Councillors should be elected by
				Proportional Representation using a single
				Transferable vote system, so that every vote
				counts more equally, and residents feel it is
				worth their while coming out to vote, instead of
				the ever decreasing voters participation seen in
				for a long while in local elections. I would like to
				Total on the state of the state
				see true representative democracy flourish in

1201 D:-!	V		NI-	
<sup>1291</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1323</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems reasonable given the nature of the area	Yes	A Hitchin focused town council may provide
				better direction of public funds within the area.
<sup>1326</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Does it really need 3 councillors in a ward
				surely 2. would be adequate.
<sup>1336</sup> Resident	Yes	I think having a Hitchin town council is a really good idea	Yes	Bringing St Ippolyts into Hitchin makes sense
<sup>1352</sup> Resident	Yes		No	What's the benefit for the cost to residents?
<sup>1370</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Council tax is already sky high, supporting
				something that increases that makes no sense.
<sup>1376</sup> Resident	Yes	Logical given the geography.	No	Unnecessary. Don't need more local councillors
				who won't have any real powers. Given the big
				increase in council tax for 2025/6 residents
				certainly don't need to be paying any more for a
				town council.
<sup>1380</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Don't see the value. Already have too much
				bureaucracy.
<sup>1401</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The area of Hitchin Priory south of the
				Stevenage Road (polling area H-HPR-3) and the
				St Ippolyts North ward should both be moved
				to Hitchin Highbury, and Hitchin Highbury
				should have 3 councillors.
				In my opinion this would be a more natural
				area of community, rather than including them
				with the rest of Hitchin Priory.
				However, the movement of St Ippolyts North
				should principally be the decision of the
1426 Residents/com	Yes	As a group we are more interested in the formation of	Yes	Again, as a group we are more interested in the
munity		a Hitchin Town Council. We hope NHDC will not stop		formation of a Hitchin Town Council. We hope
association		this from happening.		NHDC will not stop this from happening.
(We would		11 0		
prefer not to				
sav) *				
	Yes	This seems sensible as the area is contiguous to	No	We already have a County Council, a District
		Southern Hitchin and is not attached to the village of		Council, A Police and Crime Commissioner and
		St Ippolyts.		a Town Centre Manager and Business
				Improvement District. In the current financial
				climate I have no interest in paying yet more for
				additional publicly elected officials who I rarely
				see anything from.
<sup>1443</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	

<sup>1445</sup> Resident	Yes		No	There have been no stated benefits from
				having a town council, only greater household
1447 D : 1 .				expense.
<sup>1447</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems logical	No	Most definitely not in favour. It just creates
				another layer of bureaucracy and wastes even
				more public money which should all be used to
				improve services rather than pay more an more
<sup>1452</sup> Resident	Yes		No	pen pushers. Action rather than talk. I see no reason for the creation of another layer
Resident	163		140	of paid bureaucracy. Living in Hitchin for 45+
				years, there have been times when I have been
				far from happy with NHDC and the
				performance of its statutory and discretional
				functions but I cannot see how this might be
				improved by more representation at more cost
				to council tax payers. I do oppose the idea of a
				single unitary authority for Hertfordshire but
				equally I am not in favour of further downwards
				devolution to a town council unless it can be
				shown to be of particular benefit to Hitchin.
				Shown to be of particular betreft to frictim.
<sup>1467</sup> Resident	Yes	We need a united group.	Yes	This should gives us more control over local
		0 1		issues
<sup>1471</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I do not see a need for this service and
				definitely do not want to pay more council tax
				than I already am paying
<sup>1472</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1483</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense as contiguous with Hitchin	Yes	Strongly support. As we move to a unitary
				council structure, local representation will be
				more important than ever.
<sup>1487</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1499</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Based on experience of other town councils this
				will be simply another layer of bureaucracy, and
				an increase in council tax spent on projects of
				value to the councillors not residents.
4504				
<sup>1501</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I do not think the proposal will provide me with
				enough benefit to justify an increase in my
1502 B 11 :		₩1	<u>.</u>	council tax
<sup>1503</sup> Resident	Yes	This is a logical addition	No	There is no need for a town council in Hitchin.
				The existing district councillors do a great job.
				Council Tax is already extremely expensive in
				this area with many people finding it hard to
				afford already, I shouldn't think many residents
				will look favourably upon this rising.

<sup>1518</sup> Resident	Yes	It will make little difference to me either way	No	It seems to me that this will just provide
				another layer of bureaucracy, and will cost
				more money to every Council Tax payer. There
				don't seem to be any positive reasons behind
				this.
<sup>1524</sup> Resident	Yes	If that is the wish of the residents of St Ippolyts North	No	Why add another level of bureaucracy? I think
		parish.		North Herts Council has done a good job overall
				with managing Hitchin. It is a thriving town with
				a pleasant and busy town centre. Just brighten
				up Churchgate without destroying its 60's vibe
				(which will come back into fashion).
<sup>1532</sup> Resident	Yes	No strong feelings about this.	Yes	Hitchin Town is a thriving community which
		-		would make good use of stronger community
				self-governance.
<sup>1536</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense as this area is functionally part of Hitchin	Yes	Only if lessons are learnt from the Letchworth
		and expect residents of this area use services/facilities		Town Council fiasco and the precept for Hitchin
		in Hitchin more than in St Ippolyts village		residents provides genuine additionality that
				will benefit Hitchin residents and not backfill
				funding cuts from services currently provided.
<sup>1537</sup> Resident	Yes	Hitchin really needs a Town Council to provide	Yes	
		dedicated focus on meeting community needs and		
		improving and developing town features, facilities,		
		services and environment		
<sup>1549</sup> Resident	Yes	No concerns	No	I'm against a new town council at this stage, i
				feel it will great more wasted costs and not
				deliver value for the tax payer.
<sup>1557</sup> Resident	Yes	The cost of the council tax is too high. There is no	No	All needs can still be met.
		need for additional costs.		
		The needs of towns people can still be found with		
		Option 1.		
<sup>1571</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense as it's near Hitchin.	Yes	Before deciding I do hope residents of said St
				Ippolyts North have been consulted on their
				views regarding this matter
<sup>1579</sup> Resident	Yes	should provide broader representation for local	Yes	should provide broader representation for local
		residents		residents
<sup>1586</sup> Resident	Yes		No	It is not necessary and would add further to the
				Council Tax bill
<sup>1598</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I don't want to pay more council tax
		I think we are already part of hitchin and would like	Yes	More accurate representation by people who
<sup>1616</sup> Resident	Yes	i triirik we are aiready part of filteriiri arid would like	162	More accurate representation by people wito
<sup>1616</sup> Resident	Yes	that clarified by the local council. Also a local town	res	live locally and taking more local decisions

<sup>1627</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Work is already in place for the changes in the
				County and District Councils to reduce costs
				and increase accountability, while this proposal
				simply adds another layer of costs and
				administration to the taxpayer.
<sup>1656</sup> Resident	Yes	No objection.	No	Proposal fails to make a case for change apart
				from the change itself. Councillors need to
				provide a business case and draft proposals on
				how the money raised will be spent and outline
				the benefits of those investments. There will
				also be a significant rise in Council tax without
1657 Davidant	V	NA	V	establishing purpose.
<sup>1657</sup> Resident	Yes	More uniformity	Yes	Residents of Hitchin currently have little say in
<sup>1658</sup> Resident	Ves		Ves	what happens locally.
Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1660</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1666</sup> Resident	Yes	It would be very helpful were your leaflet to set out	Yes	
		the responsibilities of the proposed Hitchin Town		
		Council.		
<sup>1668</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I don't think there is any need for a town
				council in Hitchin. Local services are run well
				and it would only increase costs
<sup>1672</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1674</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	A Town Council for Hitchin is long overdue
<sup>1681</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1684</sup> Resident	Yes	To be honest with you i dont understand this or why	No	cant afford to pay further council tax!
		its even necessary - however i really object to the finer		
		print that you would add £22-£121 to our council tax		
		bill for the privelage of something that doesnt appear		
		to be not needed. It seems that the council are doing		
		everything to penalise the public for just living here		
		and this seems like a tax grab at the most incovenient		
		time. We are already paying a huge amount - for very		
		little service - so i am not exactly sure why this is even		
		needed - especially when the cost of living is so high. It		
		seems very optunistic of the council to do this at such		
		a time and it isnt very fair for something that doesnt		
		seem as important and could leave people financially		
		vunlerable - pehaps you could explain why you feel		
		that this is necessary to do this now, why it wasnt		
		done before and how are you expecting people to		

<sup>687</sup> Resident	Yes		No	From the background information you appear
				to be proposing this based on a request in only
				ten responses to (requests in) a previous
				consultation. Ten out of an electorate quoted as
				27,088. Those ten responses were out of a total
				of only 16 responses. So, while a majority of the
				responses at that time, explicit support of less
				than 0.04% of the electorate.
				than 0.04% of the electorate.
				The proposal also, to me, provides no
				information on benefits of the move, only the
				significant cost to households, at a time of rising
				cost of food, energy, and general living, by way
				of increased council tax.
				I see no reason presented to support the
				creation of a town council from the information
				provided and would suggest that this
				information is developed, distributed, and the
				CGR or other appropriate consultation is held
<sup>697</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems fine, if they want it. Not really my business.	No	This seems an entirely unnecessary governance
				structure which would have jurisdiction over
				things that are already handled perfectly well.
				It's an additional cost to residents at a time of a
				cost of living crisis. The activities it offers seem
				like something that could be organised through
				collaboration without needing an additional
				structure. It feels like self aggrandisement from
				people who want a fancy job title and position,
				rather than something that would actually
				return on the spend.
<sup>710</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Cost
<sup>721</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>733</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>746</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>753</sup> Resident	Yes	Anything to assist local decision making and ease of	Yes	
		councillors. Not sure of impact to Highbury with less		
		councillors.		
<sup>764</sup> Resident	Yes	I comment as a business owner in Hitchin. Hitchin	Yes	
		would benefit from the additional layer of governance		
		especially as we move towards unitary authorities.		
		especially as we move towards armary authorities.		

<sup>1769</sup> Resident	Yes		No	NO while a two tier council situation
				YES if we have a Unitary Authority covering
				Hitchin. Three tiers is not acceptable.
<sup>1776</sup> Resident	Yes	Hitchin is a large & diverse community that should	Yes	The number of Councillors per ward seems fair
		have it's own local Council. This should include a village		with density of population.
		so close to Hitchin boundary.		
<sup>1781</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1800</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1801</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Rubbish leaflet drop, very confusing. Noone
				answered the phone line as well.
<sup>1802</sup> Resident	Yes	l pay council tax for Hitchin and not for any other town	Yes	Poor leaflet job and very confusing
<sup>1807</sup> Resident	Yes	This community looks more connected to Hitchin than	No	There is no reason provided to introduce a
. testae	. 03	St Ippolyts		further council, with the extra costs to residents
		or ippolyto		that would be incurred.
				How can residents be expected to approve such
				an idea without a much better understanding
				of what would be gained from this?
				of what would be gained from this:
<sup>1811</sup> Resident	Yes	I have no particular view on this, although the St	Yes	We need a Council that is focussed on the
		Ippolyts north ward does appear to be part of south		needs and requirements locally within Hitchin.
		Hitchin?		
<sup>1813</sup> Resident	Yes	This area is clearly part of Hitchin town rather than a	Yes	I believe it is important to have a democratic
		separate village.		local voice for Hitchin, particularly in the light of
				the forthcoming move to unitary local
				authorities, which seems likely to make local
				government more distant from residents. For
				this to be fully democratic, we need elections to
				be conducted on a proportional representation
				system such as STV rather than first-past-the-
				post which leads councils to be dominated by a
				small number of large parties instead of a more
				representative set of local residents.
<sup>1821</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1823</sup> Resident	Yes	Leaflet drop was rubbish	Yes	
<sup>1824</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1828</sup> Resident	Yes	Not fussed to be honest, but you provide no option to	No	Strongly disagree with a town council- 1. With
		say this		local government reorganisation and
		•		devolution commencing now is not the right
				time to create additional councils 2. The case is
				not sufficiently made in any event for a town
				council 3. Many areas including locally have
				removed town councils after their creation
				removed town councils after their creation

<sup>1829</sup> Resident	Yes	This makes sense to me as the St Ippolyts north is very	No	It's too much added cost for residents, and
		close to Hitchin		adds further bureaucracy where it's not needed.
<sup>1855</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Hitchin deserves it own council, as it was
				historically.
<sup>1876</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1879</sup> Resident	Yes	This area the St Ippollitts North used to be part of	Yes	The town of Hitchin needs a council of it's own
		Hitchin ward.		to be able to represent the views and the need
				of the residents particularly with traffic,
				infrastructure, planning proposals and the forth
				coming proposed expansion of Luton Airport,
				which will undoubtedly bring more through
				traffic on the A602 and residential areas. These
				and many other important issues need to
				addressed at source with a town council.
<sup>1880</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	assuming a new north and east herts authority,
				a Hitchin town council would be good way to
				support and maintain the special nature of our
				wonderful Hitchin community
<sup>1883</sup> Resident	Yes	I am strongly in favour of establishing a Town Council	Yes	My reasoning for supporting the transfer from
		for Hitchin. My starting point would be the former (to		St Ippolyts is given above. Even if this transfer
		1974) Hitchin Urban District Council area. But with		does not take place it is still essential that a
		regard to this proposed transfer from St Ippolyts to		Town Council be formed for Hitchin. This body
		Hitchin I agree it makes logical sense given the pattern		will be vital in representing Hitchin interests if,
		of extra suburban expansion that has occurred since		as seems likely, we move to a unitary structure
		1974.		within Hertfordshire which will enable the (to
				me welcome) abolition of the current North
1000 5	.,		.,	Hertfordshire District Council
<sup>1890</sup> Resident	Yes	It is a logical adjustment. I believe it reverts to prior	Yes	The Town needs local representation. the
		boundaries.		proposals will help improve Hitchin and its rural
<sup>1902</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	areas.
<sup>1904</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Hitchin needs a town council to better manage it
<sup>1918</sup> Resident	Yes	St Ippolyts is small in comparison to Hitchin	Yes	Hopefully this will give more independence to
1024				Hitchin to decide local matters for itself.
<sup>1924</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Please can you define the impact that this will
				have on planning control for Hitchin. My
				concerns are that this will make the current
				local government body smaller, and less
				powerful when looking at planning proposals
				for Hitchin and new housing developments.
				The other concern is that this is just a way to
				increase council tax above and beyond the
				limits already in place

<sup>1939</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Seems a waste of money
				No idea what value this will bring
				Complete waste of time and money
				Seems poorly thought out with no view of why
				it's being established
<sup>1940</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1943</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1944</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	We need to have out own Town Council,
				particularly in the light of possible changes
				creating Unitary Authorities in Hertfordshire,
<sup>1949</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1952</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>1956</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I strongly oppose the creation of any new town
Resident	165		110	council requiring additional funding. Any
				changes to governance should be paid for by
				savings in other areas of governance, not by
				savings in other areas of governance, not by savings in services or additional council tax.
<sup>1965</sup> Resident	Yes		No	I don't see the need for an additional layer of
Resident	163		110	local government and I do not wish to pay any
				more council tax.
<sup>1977</sup> Resident	Yes	No strong feeling either way	No	Given the governments White Paper on local
Resident	103	No strong recining entries way	140	government reform and devolution, any
				changes to council structures should happen
				first before making decisions on creating new
				councils. So, whether it's right or wrong, the
<sup>1981</sup> Resident	Yes	There is a closer geographical affinity with Hitchin than	Ves	timing is now not right As the government plan is for unitary
Resident	103	St Ippolyts village.	163	authorities, this is a practical means of
		St ippolyts village.		maintaining local democracy and control.
<sup>1985</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	maintaining local democracy and control.
<sup>1988</sup> Resident	Yes	Hitchin is well overdue to have a Town Council. This	Yes	A very well thought out plan for each ward in
Resident	165	would give the community of Hitchin a voice in the	165	Hitchin
		future of the town		Hedin
<sup>2025</sup> Resident	Yes	future of the town	No	
<sup>2062</sup> Resident	Yes	BUT: elected representative councillors should be	Yes	BUT: elected representative councillors should
	. 55	chosen using the Single Transferable Vote (STV)		be chosen using the Single Transferable Vote
		electoral system or the 'closed proportional list		(STV) electoral system or the 'closed
				·
		system' chosen for the Welch Senedd.		proportional list system' chosen for the Welch
<sup>2075</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Senedd.
ResideIII	162		162	

2007 Resident Yes					
school to save people money etc. This just seems like muddled thinking yets tup petra councils that will cost people more. Should only hancen fill reduce councils that will cost people more. Should only hancen fill reduce councils.  1996. Resident  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is not appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is no appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is no appropriate reflected talking shound council for this new the propriate of the town council for Platic appropriate of the town council is of the decident of the town council is of t	<sup>2095</sup> Resident	Yes		No	It'll cost more, but at the same time the Labour
seems like muddled thinkingWhy set up extra councils that will cost perms should only hausen if I'll reduce council law.  1 well just be another layer of bureaucracy and administration that we would have to pay for. Council raxes are agoing up as it is, so I favour a lean and mean system of government as local level, not another cultural salings shoo.  2 1293 Resident  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes  It is highly destable to have a town crunoll for Hitchin as Hitchin has very of pairsh councils and forwar or community councils are quite restricted, it is not permet effectively on behalf of the local community as we see in town councils and comparable settlements such as Harpender and Ill glieswade. Although the statutory comparable settlements such as Harpender and Ill glieswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Herifordish where are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Herifordish (Friederish).  Establishing a town council in Friederish Hill yet that this is the direction of rowel, and should a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leafler. The Council pager says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council for Hitchin. E					government is cutting uniform requirements for
counds that will cost people more. Should only hancen fill if reduce contains and fill reduce contains and mean system of going up as it is, so if shown a lean and mean system of going up as it is, so if shown a lean and mean system of going up as it is, so if shown a lean and mean system of going up as it is, so if shown and mean system of going up as it is, so if sho					school to save people money etc . This just
Abace of Interruptive councilities.   Abace of Interruptive four-presentation of the very and administration that we would have to pay for.   Council traves are given for government at local lean and mean system of government at local lean and lean					seems like muddled thinking - why set up extra
20% Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2139 Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2149 Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2150 Resident Ves Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2160 Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2170 Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin.  2170 Resident Ves This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built-up area of Hitchin has been under-represented compared with other areas with parish councils, Although the areas with parish councils are quite restricted, but is the town council for the local community, as we see in now not that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in now not built it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in now note in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleewade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Heritordshire, it is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Heritordshire, it would be a sessential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a low council for Hitchin, lichtin, it is his might be factual, but it is his might be					councils that will cost people more. Should only
administration that we would have to pay for Council taxes are politique as it is, so I frovour a lean and mean system of government at local level, not another cluttered talkines alrow.  2138 Resident  Yes  This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the built up area of Hitchin.  West another cluttered talkines alrow.  Helchin as Hitchin has been under-represented compared with other areas with parish councils.  Although the statutory powers of parish councils or quite restricted, it to to the houre or community councils are quite restricted, it to to the houre or community councils are quite restricted, it to to the houre of the total community. As we see in town councils control to that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and ligiglewade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-lier unitary authority structure for Heritorishire, it seems highly likely that this is a single-lier unitary authority structure for Heritorishire, it seems highly likely that this is required in or Hitchin. Establishing a tor, unough for or council nor would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin. It is, in inject the factual, but it is find readers.					
Council taxes are going up as it is, so I favour a lean and mean at local level, hot dental state of the part of government at local level, hot dental state of the part of th	<sup>2096</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
lean and mean system of government at local leved, not analysis shop.  2139 Resident Yes This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the Yes It is highly desirable to have a town council for built-up area of Hitchin.  Hitchin as Hitchin has been under-represented compared with other areas with parish councils.  Although the starturory powers of parish councils and to the parish councils and to the represented compared with other areas with parish councils.  Although the starturory powers of parish councils are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council sed on the comparabilities to the worn council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpender and Bigglewand. Find of the local community as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpender and Bigglewand counting the rear eurrently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for throsthine, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitory abstractly for formed for this part of Hertfortshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin. Its only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but this will be					, ,
level, not another dutured talking shop.  It is highly desided to have a town council for built-up area of Hitchin.  Yes This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the Yes It is highly deside to have a town council for hitchin as Hitchin has been under-represented compared with other areas with parish coundls. Although the statutory powers of parish councils (and town or community councils) are quite restricted its to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plants to result as single-ter under a single-ter under youthority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a undertyle promote for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective own council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but to short with the sixth of the incompletion. This might be footcall, but its hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the bullt-up area of Hitchin.  Yes This is an appropriate reflection of what is now the bullt-up area of Hitchin.  Hitchin has been under-represented compared with other areas with parish councils.  Although the statutory powers of parish councils are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town council so that it can operate effectively be health of the health of the parish councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Pittchin.  Establishing a town council for a unitary authority entry the consultation leaflet.  The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral buck testing approach to the required without stating any benefits. This might be festual, but it is hardly neutral. Trust this will be					· · · ·
built-up area of Hitchin.  Hitchin as Hench other areas with parish councils.  Although the statutory powers of parish councils (and town or community councils) are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cade specific responsibilities to the tow council so that lick can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpende and Biggleswade, Although there are currently no plans to create a single-liet unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but connerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be forctual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be	2120 5 11			.,	
compared with other areas with parish councils. Although the statutory powers of parish councils (and town or community councils) are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Bigglewade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that his is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neural but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it is not yindicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neural. I trust this will be	2139 Resident	Yes		Yes	
Although the statutory powers of parish councils (and town or community councils) are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town councils or that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils or comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that his is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this par of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. It trust this will be			built-up area of Hitchin.		
councils (and town or community councils) are quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town councils or that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire; it, would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					·
quite restricted, it is to be hoped that the District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council mow would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
District Council will cede specific responsibilities to the town council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Bigleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tiler unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					•
to the town council so that it can operate effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					·
effectively on behalf of the local community, as we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
we see in town councils in comparable settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council nor would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					·
settlements such as Harpenden and Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
Biggleswade. Although there are currently no plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					·
plans to create a single-tier unitary authority structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					·
structure for Hertfordshire, it seems highly likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					<del></del>
likely that this is the direction of travel, and should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
should a unitary authority be formed for this part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to have an effective town council for Hitchin.  Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					
have an effective town council for Hitchin. Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					should a unitary authority be formed for this
Establishing a town council now would be a realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					part of Hertfordshire, it would be essential to
realistic preparation for a unitary authority environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					have an effective town council for Hitchin.
environment.  A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					Establishing a town council now would be a
A minor point about the consultation leaflet. The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					realistic preparation for a unitary authority
The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					environment.
The Council paper says the leaflet should be neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					A minor point about the consultation leaflet.
neutral but concerning a town council for Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					•
Hitchin, it only indicates the likely cost range without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					· · ·
without stating any benefits. This might be factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					-
factual, but it is hardly neutral. I trust this will be					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
·					
taken into account in assessing objections on					taken into account in assessing objections on

<sup>2140</sup> Resident	Yes	These houses adjoin Hitchin. It makes sense for them Yes	Now that NHC and HCC will be replaced by a
		to be treated as part of the town of Hitchin, not of the	unitary authority, I think it is best that Hitchin
		village of St Ippolyts.	has a town council (I would marginally not
			support it if we were to continue with NHC and
			HCC). However, I would prefer there to be a
			delay in its formation so that it only comes into
			being within a year (either side) of the unitary
			authority, just in case the move to a unitary is
			abandoned. Financially, it would be efficient to
			schedule the town council elections to take
			place at the same time as the unitary elections.
			Also, while the boundaries suggested are
			reasonable at the moment (and I have no
			objection per se), I think that it would be best to
			wait to see what the unitary division boundaries
			will be before taking a decision; in some
			circumstances it might be better to align to the
			unitary boundaries if they neatly cover the
			whole town. It will be important that the town
			council precept does not start off as being too
			high at least without an election so that the
			candidates can put forward their vision for what
			the town council will do and how much it will
			cost. Something like £60 pa would seem
			reasonable as a starting level if it is to be
			determined by NHC (instead of by the first
2148 Resident	Yes	Not that relevant No	We don't need a Town Council right now before
			we know what is happening at Unitary level.
			It seems backward to bring another tier just as
			we're eliminating a tier to make local
			government more efficient and closer to local
			population.

<sup>2186</sup> Resident	Yes	At this stage it is impossible to know how to decide. It	Yes	See answer 7 above
		all depends on what happens with the re-organisation		
		of local government and the establishment of unitary		
		authorities. If Hertfordshire becomes one unitary		
		authority for the whole country then a parish council		
		for Hitchin will be essential. To have a councillor in		
		Watford making a planning / schools / welfare decision		
		involving, say, Royston would be a nonsense. In this		
		case a new Town Council for Hitchin would be		
		essential. If Hertfordshire is spilt into two unitary		
		authorities - one for the south and west and another		
		for the north and east then a Town Council for Hitchin		
<sup>2192</sup> Resident	Vas	should not be necessary	Ves	
2192 Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>2211</sup> Resident	Yes	There is a natural geographic linkage.	No	I do not think that the financial commitment
				has been fully detailed. The leaflet mentions a
				figure of £22-£121 for a band D. As a band F
				council taxpayer on a pension l have no idea
				what we will be expected to pay for the initial
				year and subsequent years. This is on top of a
				substantial increase for this year. Also, I would
				also like to know what is going to be provided
				that is not covered by the council tax or
2212 B				through the Hitchin RID process
<sup>2213</sup> Resident	Yes	Being simple, I can't see any issue with the proposal	Yes	Same as my response to question 8; I can't see
<sup>2228</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	any issue with the proposal  No good reason given for change - since 1974?
Resident	162		res	NHDC has served area adequately and another
				tier of Local Government not neessar as far as I
				can see - trend it to unite areas (Government
				policy) not fragment them - economies of scale
				better with NHDC ratehr than Hitchin Town
				Council.
<sup>2231</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Hitchin ward I am in has 3 councillors at
				present for NHDC - this appears to be changed
				to only 2 if town council set up.
001 Resident			No	Implication that Council Tax will go up - I pay

<sup>/001</sup> Resident	No I recently received a leaflet regarding a possible	
	Town Council. Personally it is not an April Fool	
	joke.	
	1) Who is pushing for a Town Council?	
	2) What are the claimed advantages?	
	3) Why is the suggested cost between £22 and	
	£121?	
	I already have to pay extra to have my garden	
	refuse collected. Why would I want to pay even	
	more for this Town Council?	
	This idea gooms half halved	

IOLWELL		
		Election dates
ID Capacity	Response	Reason
<sup>246</sup> Resident	No	This is not the best use of public funds.
<sup>487</sup> Resident	No	There are term limits for a reason.
<sup>766</sup> Resident	No	I want to be able to exercise my vote on time, I would
		shorten it if I had the choice so I can exercise my
		democratic rights on poorly performing elected
		officials.
<sup>1010</sup> Resident	No	Extending the duration of office does not benefit the
		people, only those who are elected. Extending the
		term has the potential to lead to anuse of power.
<sup>1128</sup> Resident	No	Adding or removing another year again seems
		unnecessary. Why is another year needed. This survey
		cannot provide enough accurate responses as the
		questions are baseless in context.
<sup>1431</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1583</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>500</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1252</sup> Resident	No	Why do you want do change it. Again, no explanation.
		Do it every 4 years, to uphold democratic values.
<sup>1571</sup> Resident	No	I feel the term is too long. I despair of trying to contact
		councillors at times, so shorter terms, I feel are better

<sup>76</sup> Resident	No	
		Hiring out an unsafe building should be investigated
		before children are seriously injured.
		Mis use of public funds should also be investigated as
		Parish percentage has just increased by 23% to cover
		building a community pavilion to domestic standards
		instead of commercial - no fire doors is the biggest
		issue that needs urgent investigation.
		t
		One third of the Parish precept is paid to Clark as
<sup>1073</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1119</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1706</sup> Resident	Yes	Happy for terms to be aligned. Presumably this has
Resident	103	cost savings and enables schools not to have to shut
		for elections as frequently.
<sup>1744</sup> Resident	Yes	To desire as nequently
655 Resident	Yes	potential cost savings
<sup>715</sup> Resident	Yes	It's just common sense and reduces unnecessary
		complexity and gives the opportunity to remove
		inefficient resource in local government
<sup>911</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>999</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1272</sup> Resident	Yes	Whatever council arrangements are made the council
		must engage vigorously with the Police and Crime
		Commissioner regarding his/her collusion with Lister
		hospital management over the abuse of vulnerable
		elderly people. This is a dreadful scandal, covered up
<sup>1557</sup> Resident	Yes	by Lister and the police.
1263 Parish/Town	Yes	
Councillor		
(Holwell Parish	1	
Council )  2199 Parish or Towr	ı Yes	We have no objection to this change.
council	1 163	Holwell Parish Council wanted to confirm that agree to
(Holwell Parish	1	the proposal to be represented by 5 parish councillors.
Council) *		the proposed to be represented by a partial continuous.

		Election dates		N Cllrs		Grange ward
Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>976</sup> Resident	No	Nothing wrong with what Ickleford has already. Leave	No	Change for the sake of change is not progress.	No	No need for it.
		it as it is.		Change always comes at a cost and is usually a	t	
				the suggestion of people who haven't or don't		
				live in the village. In this case, no change is goo	d.	
<sup>40</sup> Resident	No	As it's Bedfordshire let them Stondon/Shefford parish.	Yes	No answer	No	See Q 7.
<sup>468</sup> Resident	No	The proposal does not add any advantages and a	No	8 required due to workload and projected	No	Insufficient numbers.
		robust argument that it does has not been presented.		growth.		
<sup>1</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		Yes	
122 District	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Councillor 890 Resident	Yes	Makes sense to align the elections	No	No logical reason to do it.	No	The Lavender Grange community is clearly part of
		C		<u> </u>		Lower Stondon. It is too far from Ickleford for it to be
						considered part of Ickleford. It is a land-grab of no
						merit.
<sup>2</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		Yes	As a resident of Lavender Grange I feel this does a lot
						to improve our representation as an often forgotten
						about corner of the parish, however I think a better
						long term solution would be to transfer the area to a
						S
						combined parish with Lower Stondon and the
						southern end of Henlow parish within Central Beds so
						that local governance actually reflects the local settled
<sup>12</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense to align with district elections	Yes	Not sure about this, I don't have a strong	Yes	area not archaic boundaries  The lavender grange area has a few very specific issue
Residerit	165	Makes selise to aligh with district elections	163	•	165	(the mismatched post code / official address, with its
				opinion either way		•
						impacts on access to NHS services, schools, etc) that
						need dedicated attention. It's also well separated from
						the main residential areas in Ickleford, and it's instead
<sup>64</sup> Resident	Voc		No	All the Inklatory responsibilities marit ?	No	much closer to Lower Stondon.
- Resident	Yes		INO	All the Ickleford responsibilities merit 8	INO	Lavender Grange is 2¼ miles from Ickleford and ¼
				councillors.		mile from Lower Stondon. Therefore Lavender Grange
						should have representation on Stondon Parish Council.
<sup>105</sup> Resident	Yes	Logical action	Yes	I will not have a signicant impact	Yes	Ickleford is growing in size and will continue to do so
<sup>244</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense to align	Yes	There is no need for 8	Yes	Although proud to be part of lckleford, there is
						enough distance between lckleford village and
						ourselves that what suits one area won't necessarily
						suit the other, so our views would be better
						represented by our own councillors

<sup>936</sup> Resident	Yes		No	8 Councillors since 1896, why change something that is not broken. From a retired parish councillor of 47 years service.	No	l answered this question to item 10
<sup>1251</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Service.	Yes	
<sup>1565</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		No	
1742 Parish or Town council (Ickleford Parish Council)		It makes sense to align parish council elections with NHC elections.	No	There hasn't been an explanation provided as to why this recommendation has been made. Please see further comments regarding question 13 for a more comprehensive reason.	No	The response to Q13 is 'partly' but there is no option to choose it. Ickleford Parish Council agrees with the proposal to create a new ward for the Lavender Grange community.
						However, the parish council does not consider it a reasonable proposal to split the councillor numbers as suggested for the following reasons:
						1. In the three years or so that Lavender Grange has been occupied, only one resident from the development has ever expressed an interest in joining the parish council, despite ongoing and targeted recruitment efforts from Lavender Grange - and the one resident who was initially interested changed his mind just before applying.
						2. It has been impossible to get any engagement from the residents there – even when the parish council has expressed a wish to assist with issues and has reported issues on their behalf such as mould, lack of bins, lack of signs, the postcode problems, etc. residents there have been extremely reluctant to engage, even becoming openly hostile towards the parish council.
						3. Given that the number of residents at Lavender Grange represents around 14% of the total number of Ickleford residents, perhaps 14% of the total number of parish councillors should come from the new ward this would mean 1 parish councillor from the Lavender Grange ward with 7 from the rest of Ickleford. Otherwise the parish council foresees that it

<sup>19</sup> District	Yes	This may need amendment depending on proposed	No	There are currently eight parish councillors for No	I am in favour of creation of the Lavender Grange
Councillor		changes to local government.		the existing Ickleford ward. Given that two of	ward (subject to engagement and a positive response
				the seven proposed councillors are to represent	from residents). However the the proposed 5:2 ratio of
				a proposed Lavender Grange ward, the work	councillors does not reflect the population split
				currently undertaken by these eight parish	between the areas within Ickleford. Both parts of the
				councillors would effectively be carried out by	parish are likely to see future development of the
				only five parish councillors under the new	order of 150 - 200 homes in the future. If the
				proposals. Given that local plan sites IC1 and	minimum number of councillors is two, then a better
				IC3 with ca 160 homes have still to come	split would be 6:2 or 7:2. Five parish councillors for
				forward in Ickleford, the parish requires more	Ickleford parish ward is not enough. I think the views
				than seven parish councillors.	of Ickleford parish councillors should be given great
					weight in this matter as they are best placed to judge
					the number of parish councillors required in each part
					of the parish.

KIMPTON						
			Election dates		N Clirs	
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
	<sup>190</sup> Parish/Town	Yes		Yes		
	Councillor					
	(Kimpton					
	Parish Council	)				
1	1609 Resident	Yes	On balance this is a bad idea. Kimpton does not	No	No explanation given by NHC to make such a	
			usually need a ballot to elect Parish Councillors.		change.	
			Changing both District and Parish councillors at the		With only 7 councillors there is greater risk of	
			same time would create a greater change at one time.		meetings not being quorum.	
1	<sup>1795</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		

<sup>1860</sup> Parish or Town Yes	No	Kimpton Parish Council (KPC) considered the
council		Community Governance Review
(Kimpton		recommendations for Kimpton at the Full
Parish Council)		Council meeting held on Wednesday 26th
*		March 2025. Councillors agreed that they are
		strongly in favour of keeping the status quo i.e.
		to retain 8 seats and not reduce the number to
		7 seats.
		The main considerations in coming to this
		decision are:
		1.Representation of the Community: With 8
		seats, the parish council can offer broader
		representation of the community. A higher
		number of councillors means that more
		viewpoints and perspectives can be brought
		into discussions.
		2.Historical Precedent: KPC has operated with
		8 seats since its conception in December 1894.
		In the census 1891 there was a population in
		Kimpton of 991 of which 174 were scholars
		(children). It is unknown how many were adult
		males as this formed the electorate for the
		parish. In 2021 census, the population in
		Kimpton was 2,259. KPC can see no justified
		reason for reducing the number of parish
		council seats due to representation ratios.
		Reducing the number of councillors will disrupt
		established procedures generated over many
		years of successful operation.
		3.Workload: More councillors can help spread
		the workload. KPC has monthly full council
		meetings, 1 committee and 9 working parties.

KINGS WALDEN										
			Election dates	N Clirs						
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response Reason						
1972	Resident	Yes		No						

<sup>2234</sup> Parish or Town Yes	No It is more likely that meetings won't be quorate	
council (Kings	if some Parish Councillors send their apologies.	
Walden Parish	This could result in delays in key	
Council) *	decisions on Parish Council business.	
	Eight Parish Councillors mean that individual	
	tasks can be shared more widely and equitably	
	to balance the workload.	
	Eight Parish Councillors enables a wider	
	representation from our growing, diverse	
	community, allowing a broader range of views,	
	backgrounds and experiences to be aired and	
	heard.	
	The parish covers a large area with many	
	smaller hamlets and villages. Eight councillors	
	enables a better wide range of councillors from	
<sup>2236</sup> Resident Yes	No The parish covers a large area with many	
	villages / hamlets etc. Eight councillors enables	
	these areas to be covered more fairly.	

KNEBWORTH					
Election dates					N Clirs
<sup>ID</sup> Cap	pacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>614</sup> Res	sident	No	We do not need another council, just another expensive waste of time and money	Yes	
<sup>2011</sup> Res	sident	No	By keeping the Parish Council elections and the District Council elections separate by two years, it helps residents focus on the issues that are relevant to each body. For example, local Parish Council are not responsible for planning policies (which are the responsibility of District Councils) but residents often think that they are a parish issue. It helps to make clear the responsibilities of each body and who to contact with queries.	No	Parish Councillors may be elected, but they are volunteers and therefore unpaid . They do a lot of work locally and are very knowledgeable about their own parishes. They understand and help promote local views which may go unnoticed by District Councillors. However, there is a lot of time involved and reducing the number of Councillors would make much more work for the other volunteer Councillors.
<sup>2224</sup> Res	sident	No	l see no benefit or rationale	No	Less voices and views can't be a benefit!  Diversity of opinion is key to good governance and decision.

<sup>2225</sup> Resident	No	There's no benefit to our local community in these	No	There's no benefit to the community in
		proposals.		reducing the number of unpaid councillors by
				25%. It will reduce diversity and will place more
				pressure on the fewer councillors. In a
				democracy, it is fundamental to have as many
				representatives as possible to be a voice for the
				people; the proposal is anti-democratic. It will
				adversely affect the governance of the PC.
				It is a parish council which serves the locality
				and, frankly, NHDC should stop meddling in
				village affairs, whereby they negatively affect
				local people whilst ever-increasing our
				community charges
<sup>63</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>637</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>955</sup> Resident	Yes	More elections gives residents more say in local	No	Less councillors may lead to less diverse
		governance. This is good.		representation, which will result in less
				representative governance. This is bad.
<sup>1328</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1597</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Job and responsibilities need to shared among
				councillors. As a councillor responsible for play
				areas and recreation grounds, jobs have to be
				shared
<sup>1661</sup> Resident	Yes	If this reduces administration costs and helps to	No	Whilst in principle I have no objections to
		streamline planning then I am in favour		reducing the number of Councillors, I do not
				see how a smaller number can manage the
				level of work that is required, given that most
				Councillors are also employed and their NHC
1022				role is unpaid and additional to their day iobs.
<sup>1932</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense to bring things into line.	No	The current parish councillors do a lot of work,
				fewer councillors would mean less people to
				work together for the benefit of the community.
<sup>1933</sup> Resident	Yes	This will be more efficient and cost effective	No	I do not see any need to reduce the number of
				parish councillors. They do a good job and
				having more spreads out the work they do, all
				on a voluntary basis. There are various
				locations to be checked and looked after, as
				well as the committee work and all 12 can be
1027 5 11	.,			used for this.
<sup>1937</sup> Resident	Yes	It is easier to vote for parish at the same time as	No	Less people is more workload for those who do
		district. More people may vote		this work. It may discourage people from
				standing. Less people may lead to less diversity.

<sup>1950</sup> Resident	Yes	I have no objection to recommendation number 1 but No	Reducing the number of parish Councillors for
		do object to recommendation number 2.	Knebworth would put undo stain on those
			remaining as councillors in view of the work
			load in Knebworth in particular,
			Knebworth parish Council has peculiar extra
			responsibilities such as the Station Pub.
			Also, the proposed extensive housing
			developments in Knebworth will be very
			demanding of Councillors' time.
			It is proving difficult enough to attract members
			of the public to fill these positions and It would
			be unreasonable in these circumstances to
			expect fewer Councillors to manage an
<sup>1953</sup> Resident	Yes	No	Knebworth Parish Councillors have added
			responsibilities such as The Station Pub and the
			allotments which require extra time. Nine
			members are not enough for all the duties.
<sup>1957</sup> Resident	Yes	No	There is a lot going on as group oversee Village
			pub, parks and a reduction of 2 will increase
			workload & reduce level of expertise within the
			group , therefore retain 12 people
<sup>1961</sup> Resident	Yes	No	Knebworth Parish Council is supposed to have
			12 counsellors. At present there are 10 with two
			vacancies. As I understand it, the council has
			difficulty in recruiting two more counsellors.
			However, the workload is already high and the
			Councillors have difficulty in completing the
			tasks. To reduce the number of counsellors to 9
			would make it even more difficult to complete
			the necessary tasks expected of them.
<sup>1962</sup> Resident	Yes	No	I think that reducing the number of councillors
			to 9 would be counterproductive. The present
			team of ten is finding it difficult to cover the
			many and varied aspects that Knebworth
			needs. Reducing it to nine would make even
			more work for fewer Councillors and make
			recruiting new ones more difficult too. They
			really need the twelve that they have had in the
			nast

<sup>1963</sup> Parish or Tov	vn Yes		No	The Parish Council met on April 16th to discuss
council				the Community Governance review. They were
(Knebworth				not in approval of the reduction in the number
Parish Counc	Parish Council)			of Councillors to be on the Parish Council. This
*				is due to the following reasons:-
				1.There will be greater onus on individuals to
				'do things' i.e. and increase in workload
				2.There will be a reduction in diversity and
				experience
				3.There will be a reduced quorum for every
				meeting.
				4.There will be the same cross-section of
				Councillors present for nearly every committee.
				5.The Parish Council viewed that the review
				should be based on workload and asset rather
				than population.
				6.The Parish Council wished to express the
				view that it will be harder to recruit and retain
				unpaid volunteers with the amount of work that
				will be needed by fewer Councillors.
				7.There will be less time to commit to
				aspirations of the Parish Council
				8.There is an expected 25% increase in the
				population of the Parish in the next 5 years
				9.Town and Parish Councils could become
				more important in devolution
<sup>1973</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	With a parish council of 12, there are rarely
				elections which results in an "old boys club" of
				long-standing councillors who have not justified
				their position for many years and do not
				represent the demographic of the village.
<sup>1992</sup> Resident	Yes	Makes sense for the Parish Council elections mirrior	No	We feel that to reduce the number of
		the District Council elections		Councillors to just nine would increase the
				workload and make it more difficult to fill the
				vacancies. It would also deplete the diversity of
				experience and skills that Councillors bring to
				the table

<sup>223</sup> Resident	Yes	I am in favour of this as it is an efficiency saving in	No	As a volunteer in a separate organisation, l
		terms of running elections that does not affect the		know how difficult it is to find willing volunteers
		overall set up of the Parish Council.		to give up their time and the Parish Council is
				no different. However I do not believe reducing
				the number of councillors is the solution- that
				will overburden those councillors, reducing
				further the likelihood of willing volunteers to
				take on the role and reduces the expertise and
				diversity of thought available around the 'table'.
				With the proposed increase in houses in
				Knebworth, the workload of councillors is likely
				to increase in the mid to long term and with an
				increased village population there will be more
				residents who may be willing to take on a
				councillor position. I am strongly against the
				reduction in councillors.

NGLEY					
D Capacity	Are you in	Please provide further comments to your answer33			
, ,	favour of the	·			
	draft				
	recommendat	ati			
	on?33				
<sup>319</sup> Resident	No	I'd like to see Langle being incoporated into Preston or			
		St.Paul's Walden. There is no democracy or contact,			
		the meeting named person is unknown and non			
		existent. Existing Parish would gain the Precept.			
		Currently higher than Parished Councils.			

LETCHWORTH	LETCHWORTH				
		Town Council			
ID Capacity	Response	Reason			
<sup>319</sup> Resident	No	Do not need to create more democracy when unitary			
		authorities will be implemented.			
<sup>179</sup> Resident	No	l would still like individual party's for example Reform			
		UK to run my local council			
<sup>269</sup> Resident	No	See respond to question 7			

1194 Resident	No	What you're proposing is to add yet another level of
Resident	NO	beaurocracy at the council tax payers expense (of
		course) I think the council tax has increased enough
		this year adding unbearable pressure to already
		stretched household budgets, we are already
		constrained by the whims of the LGCHF and as far as I
		can see the NHDC is an unapproachable and
		uncontactable private club for the "Boys".
		I will shortly be moving to Hitchin where at least I'll be
<sup>1539</sup> Resident	No	beyond the clutches of the LGCHE  We already pay enough council tax and the council
Resident	NO	already pay enough council ax and the council
<sup>34</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth suffered from a Town Council 15 years or
Resident	140	so ago. It served no-one, was universally derided and
		ended up collapsing.
<sup>1764</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has enough bureaucracy with the Heritage
resident		Foundation without the Town Council. A better
		approach would be to merge the Foundation into a
		Town Council that offered both functions.
931 Resident	No	The additional cost required to implement further
		bureaucracy that is not needed and that we can't
		afford. Letchworth is already well represented at
		district level.
<sup>1774</sup> District	No	There is no appetite for the creation of a Town Council
Councillor		in Letchworth, not least because of unsuccessful
		previous incarnations of a town council. Without a
		proper outline of the exact remit of "town council 2.0",
		accountability and how much it will cost each
		household (and what the benefits will be - if any), it is
		impossible to welcome this concept as being in the
		interest of the residents of Letchworth (and beyond).
<sup>1893</sup> District	No	The same reasoning as that of my submission for
Councillor		Baldock plus:
		There is no appetite for the creation of a Town Council
		in Letchworth, not least because of unsuccessful
		previous incarnations of a town council. Without a
		proper outline of the exact remit of "town council 2.0",
		accountability and how much it will cost each
		household (and what the benefits will be - if any), it is
		household (and what the benefits will be - if any), it is impossible to welcome this concept as being in the

<sup>10</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council. It was a disaster. Not to be
		repeated. Additionsally, given the Government's plans
		to abolish current local authorities and replace with
		massive unitary councils and even more massive
		strategic authorities (which should be srtongly
		opposed) it seems odd timing to have this
		consultation on parishes and town councils.
<sup>44</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>57</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council a few years ago. It provided no
		apparent benefit to tax paying residents, so why waste
		tax payers money setting up another?
<sup>60</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>65</sup> Resident	No	A Letchworth Parish Council was created some years
		ago. It was a waste of time and money and a campain
		was launched that successfully removed it. I do not
		want it back to avoid the need to go through all that
		again. See http://www.helpletchworth.co.uk/
<sup>66</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council a few years ago that served no
		useful purpose other than to be more "democratic"
		than the Letchworth Garden Heritage Foundation. It
		was abolished by means of a public vote. The only
		reason I might approve if Hertfordshire were to be
		split into a number of unitary authorities that would
		be more removed from the locality. But that would
		deny the HMG agenda of reducing the number of
		levels of local government!
<sup>73</sup> Resident	No	Too much beurocracy.
<sup>74</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>79</sup> Resident	No	I don't understand what this would improve?
<ul><li>Resident</li><li>Resident</li></ul>	No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council
		Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation.
<sup>84</sup> Resident	No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which
<sup>84</sup> Resident	No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation.
84 Resident 92 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money
84 Resident 92 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only
84 Resident 92 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of
84 Resident 92 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of bureaucracy. We already have NHDC, Herts County
84 Resident 92 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of
84 Resident 92 Resident 95 Resident	No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of bureaucracy. We already have NHDC, Herts County
84 Resident 92 Resident 95 Resident 102 Resident	No No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation. There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of bureaucracy. We already have NHDC, Herts County Council and the Heritage Foundation.
84 Resident 92 Resident 95 Resident 102 Resident	No No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation.  There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money  The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of bureaucracy. We already have NHDC, Herts County Council and the Heritage Foundation.  The Town Council was abolished in 2013. Letchworth
84 Resident 92 Resident 95 Resident 102 Resident	No No No	Why on earth does Letchworth need a Town Council as well as The Heritage Foundation.  There is already too many layers of government which simply waste money  The last time a Letchworth council was instigated it was a complete disaster and was dissolved after only about 2 years. We don't need yet another layer of bureaucracy. We already have NHDC, Herts County Council and the Heritage Foundation.  The Town Council was abolished in 2013. Letchworth Heritage Foundation is very active in taking care of the

<sup>123</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>124</sup> Resident	No	Extra cost with no measurable benefit
<sup>125</sup> Resident	No	Councils are already inefficient, filled with red tape
		and bureaucratic beyond belief. Adding another layer
		to this does not help residents or the town.
		Additionally increasing the financial burden does not
		help residents. Councils should be looking to make the
		most of the money they receive whilst improving the
		services provided to residents NOT forming a new
		council to take more money to debate on services
		whilst achieving nothing
<sup>126</sup> Resident	No	The previous town council's demise showed it to be an
		expensive, unnecessary and unpopular vanity project.
		We already have too many layers of "local
		government" as well as the overlapping interests of
		LGCHF
<sup>129</sup> Resident	No	Hell no. It took years to get shot of the last one!!
		Learn to be efficient instead of always trying to do less
		work for ever more money. The council wastes money
		hand over fist while the roads fall apart. Sort
100		yourselves out and stop asking for more.
<sup>130</sup> Resident	No	I see no reason to burden residents with the cost of
		another layer of administration. A waste of time and
<sup>131</sup> Resident	No	money Was disharded assuits take dealt wast it
		Was disbanded previously - don't want it
<sup>132</sup> Resident	No	We should be further streamlining local
		representation to reduce duplication and control the
		ever increasing costs to local council tax payers. We
		already have the local North Herts Council and the
		Unelected Letchworth Garden City Heritage
		Foundation. We do not need another local quango. I
		would rather see us consolidate into a single or dual
<sup>133</sup> Resident	No	council model for the entire county
133 Resident	No	It's a complete waste of money we have 2 layers of
<sup>134</sup> Resident	No	government already I do not wish to pay more council for these changes
134 Resident	NO	you propose. I already pay too much council tax and it
		would be unaffordable for me.
<sup>135</sup> Resident	No	It will add an extra layer of beaurocracy with the
Residerit	INU	associated costs. We should be looking to reduce this
		and consolidate resources. The council tax is already
		$\cdot$
		high, the council should be concerned with keeping
<sup>136</sup> Resident	No	this as low as possible. An unnecessary extra layer of bureaucracy
<sup>138</sup> Resident	No	More bureaucracy and more cost

<sup>140</sup> Resident	No	It is an additional layer of local government that is not
		needed and will cost extra money that no one has to
		spare
<sup>141</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council before which was a disaster
<sup>142</sup> Resident	No	The Town Council which was setup a few years ago
		was abolished because it provided another level of
		bureaucracy for no advantage to the residents.
<sup>143</sup> Resident	No	I do not not want to pay any more money towards my
Resident	140	council tax . What we have already is poor and I don't
		see any advantages .
<sup>144</sup> Resident	No	Needless extra bureaucracy.
	110	<u> </u>
<sup>145</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth Town Council was abolished why another
		one. More bureaucracy more money. We should be
		spending on more important things rather than
		millions setting up and running yet more meetings.
<sup>148</sup> Resident	No	Complete waste of my taxes. too many layers of
		government which is already inefficent without adding
		to those inefficiencies.
<sup>149</sup> Resident	No	I do not support any of these localised initiatives and
		would prefer to see all services delivered by the
		County who can easily establish local offices where
		appropriate
<sup>150</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council many years ago. What else can
		you think of to waste our money on. Was the previous
		vote to abolish town councils not a good enough
		indication. Too much beurocracy already without
		adding to it.
<sup>151</sup> Resident	No	l am a pensioner and having a town council means
		incurring costs which will reflect on my already
		expensive council tax is unacceptable.
<sup>152</sup> Resident	No	l see no need for another layer of bureaucracy
<sup>153</sup> Resident	No	This (if it is carried out) must be funded by cuts
		elsewhere otherwise it's just jobs for the boys.
<sup>154</sup> Resident	No	If it costs more it means there is yet more burocracy.
<sup>156</sup> Resident	No	Council tax will increase
<sup>158</sup> Resident	No	I strongly oppose the proposal to create a a Town
resident	110	Council on the grounds of the additional cost placed
		on residents, and additional layer of bureaucracy. The
		idea was tried a few years ago and was a total failure
		ending in a divided council of independent councillors
		with no common policies or strategies for the town. It
		was an expensive mistake which should not be
		repeated. I am perfectly satisfied with the current
		district council arrangements and see no reason to
		change

<sup>159</sup> Resident	No	Another layer of bureaucracy is not required in
		Letchworth. The previous Town Council was a disaster
		and eventually abolished. There is also the additional
		cost to Council Tax at a time when a large number of
		residents are struggling to pay bills.
<sup>160</sup> Resident	No	On 31st January 2013 North Herts District Council
		abolished the previous Letchworth Town Council and
		Parish arrangement with effect from 31st March 2013.
		This was the result of 5 years of campaigning and hard
		work on behalf of the HELP Eliminate Letchworth
		Parish Council group. For all the same reasons which
		led to the abolishment in 2013, I strongly object to the
		creation of yet another Town/Parish Council in
		Letchworth Garden City. It serves only to significantly
		increase Council Tax for residents without providing
		comensurate benefits in return for the local
		community. It has also proven to serve as a hindrance
		to proper local council governance.
<sup>161</sup> Resident	No	
		This is absolutely absurd and will add another layer of
161 Resident 163 Resident	No No	This is absolutely absurd and will add another layer of beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.
		beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.
		beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the
<sup>163</sup> Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!
<sup>163</sup> Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.
<sup>163</sup> Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in  effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in  effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another  tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what  benefits there are to me as a resident from these
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in  effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another  tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in  effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another  tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what  benefits there are to me as a resident from these  changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful  comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an  increase in council tax, so I am being asked to  comment on some administrative changes which will
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the  Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.  This is not a good proposition. I cannot support the
163 Resident 164 Resident 165 Resident	No No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.  This is not a good proposition. I cannot support the
163 Resident 164 Resident	No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.  This is not a good proposition. I cannot support the changes without knowing how I will benefit.  This creates more cost (and probably bureaucracy) for
163 Resident 164 Resident 165 Resident	No No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.  This is not a good proposition. I cannot support the changes without useful information This creates more cost (and probably bureaucracy) for residents. Why do we need another council?
163 Resident 164 Resident 165 Resident	No No	beaurocracy and cost for Letchworth residents.  It took us long enough to rid ourselves of the Letchworth Mayor some years back!  Why do we need another layer of governance which in effect will cost us more council tax? Absolutely not.  We don't get value for money as it is, so another tranche of councillors will not add anything.  There appears to be no information about what benefits there are to me as a resident from these changes - so not enough info for me to make a useful comment.  However the changes do appear to come with an increase in council tax, so I am being asked to comment on some administrative changes which will cost me money but without knowing how I will benefit.  This is not a good proposition. I cannot support the changes without knowing how I will benefit.  This creates more cost (and probably bureaucracy) for

<sup>171</sup> Resident	No	This has already need done and scrapped, would be a
Resident	NO	total waste of money. Seems irresponsible of the LA to
		even consider it.
<sup>172</sup> Resident	No	why spend more money on governance I don't think it
··- Resident	NO	is needed
<sup>173</sup> Resident	No	It was a bad idea to create a Letchworth Town Council
Resident	140	just over 20 years ago (with 10% of the town voting for
		it) and nothing has changed. They cost the people of
		Letchworth and achieved nothing. Fortunately HELP
		organised a campaign against the council, got
		themselves elected as town councillers and then voted
		to disband it.
		to dispara it.
		Extract from HELP leaflet. Abolition will clearly be an
		excellent outcome for the people of Letchworth. In the
		four years that HELP councillors have managed and
		wound down the Town Council, no Parish Council Tax
		has been levied on the people of Letchworth,
		representing a £2million saving, so far, when
		contrasted with the £0.5million annual bills imposed
		on the Letchworth tax-payers by the previous
		councillors. Abolition of the Town Council will secure
		this annual £0.5million tax saving for every year from
<sup>175</sup> Resident	No	http://www.helpletchworth.co.uk/ - It is only 12 years
		since we voted to get rid of the last town council. What
		has changed to make it a good idea now? We still have
		the Heritage Foundation.
		It seems Parish Councils often have a high level of car
		dependence as they can derive income from parking.
		This works against Active Transport and Net Zero
		plans.
		IF, and I don't think this is legally possible, LGCHF
		became the town council and improved democratic
		representation, then, and only then, can I see a
177 5		justification for a change to the current arrangement
<sup>177</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>183</sup> Resident	No	I don't see a need for a fourth layer of administration,
		on top of NHDC and LGCHF and Herts CC. I do not
		want more costs on my council tax, without any
		benefit.

<sup>186</sup> Resident	No	In light of the current cost of living crisis, alongside e.g.
		withdrawal of the universal Winter Fuel Payment
		Allowance, the resulting increase to Council Tax
		appears inappropriate. Baking this increase into the
		future bills. Was LTC not abolished back in 2013?
		Adding more layers of local governance now seems at
		odds with the national move to challenge existing
		layers of governance, e.g. most recently the
		disbandment of NHS England?
<sup>187</sup> Resident	No	Already voted to abolish the previous 'parish' council.
		Further, I would not want to increase my Council tax
<sup>188</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>189</sup> Resident	No	There has been no communication on what benefit
		this would bring except the additional cost. There is no
		information on what is felt is missing and what the
		purpose is to add another layer of opinions.
<sup>192</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>195</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth is well served already by NHDC and The
		Letchworth Heritage Foundation and does not need
		another layer of beaurocracy. There was a similar
		proposal to create a Town Council which failed to gain
		support in 2013 and which cost the residents a lot of
		money to get it defeated
<sup>197</sup> Resident	No	I have no idea why this is needed.
<sup>198</sup> Resident	No	I am totally opposed to this; we've had similar to this
		previously. It is an absolute waste of money, we do
		not need any further layers of local government.
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government. A town council was set up many years ago and was
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of public money as there is an ongoing review of district
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of public money as there is an ongoing review of district and county councils.
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of public money as there is an ongoing review of district and county councils.  Residents should be able to engage with district
<sup>199</sup> Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of public money as there is an ongoing review of district and county councils.  Residents should be able to engage with district councillors on things that matter to them. If you add a
199 Resident	No	not need any further layers of local government.  A town council was set up many years ago and was then dissolved. In the time it was in existence it cost the people of Letchworth a lot of money and did not appear to do anything. We already have the Heritage Foundation and NHDC who look after the town adequately. There are very few things that a town or parish council can do by law. This must be a waste of public money as there is an ongoing review of district and county councils.  Residents should be able to engage with district councillors on things that matter to them. If you add a town council it is another layer of bureaucracy unless

<sup>201</sup> Resident	No	Total waste of time and more important a most
		unnecessary extra expense leading to higher Councils
		Tax. This must not be allowed to go ahead. We used to
		have a Letchworth Town Council and it was
		disbanded. Why try to resurrect it?
<sup>202</sup> Resident	No	I do understand why we are making this change. I do
		not know what the difference would be aside from an
		increase in council tax.
<sup>203</sup> Resident	No	When Letchworth last had a Town (Parish) is was not
		particularly successful & it was a waste of council
		taxpayers' money. Letchworth IS unique & the
		Heritage Foundation does an excellent job supporting
		our community. We had a referendum on the last
		change we had so I DO think there should be another
		referendum is a change is proposed.
<sup>204</sup> Resident	No	This is an expensive extra layer of beurocracy. We
		already have N Herts district council and the LGCHF.
<sup>205</sup> Resident	No	Increased costs, increased bureaucracy
<sup>206</sup> Resident	No	We already pay a ridiculous amount of council tax.
		With the cost of living crisis and many people
		struggling as it is. People can't afford to pay anymore.
		My council tax reads, % change from last year, Herts
		county Council 5.0, North Herts D C 3.0, Herts police
		authority 5.6. I'd like to know what the public have
		received in return for the ridiculous increase. I can
		only think that the fat cats are just getting fatter and
		more greedy.
<sup>207</sup> Resident	No	As a pensioner I do not want to have to pay more
		council tax.
<sup>209</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>216</sup> Resident	No	We've been through all this before and it didn't work
		then.
<sup>217</sup> Resident	No	I don't think increasing the bureaucracy is the correct
		solution. I am in favour of local government
		rationalisation, that is to say a reduction in local
		government & a reduction in our taxes - not an
		increase.
<sup>218</sup> Resident	No	We had a disastrous experience around 15 years ago
		with a town council in Letchworth. We should not go
		there again. There was no observable benefit for fees
		there again. There was no observable benefit for rees
		•
<sup>222</sup> Resident	No	we paid to fund the council.  I see no justification for this which will increase costs
<sup>222</sup> Resident	No	we paid to fund the council.

<sup>224</sup> Resident	No	We don't need another costly bureaucratic level of
		local government. Please stop this WASTE of tax
		payers money, we are in a cost of living crisis - the
		answer isn't more local government.
<sup>226</sup> Resident	No	We voted against a similar Letchworth Town Council a
		few years ago. I do not agree to additional councilors
		and additional costs. The government wants councils
		to merge not to add additional staff and cost. Strongly
		object.
<sup>228</sup> Resident	No	An unnecessary level of bureaucracy, that will mean
		higher Council Tax. NHDC and Hertc CC already
		charge far too much for providing a poor service, ie
		poor road surfaces and untidy grass verges in LGC and
		elsewhere. Bin collection service is poor. Very happy to
		pay for planning regulation.
<sup>234</sup> Resident	No	With a limited size and budget I do not believe a new
		council would being sufficiently effective to represent
		value for money. I would prefer a more streamlined
		local government at district or county council level.
<sup>235</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another body in addition to county
		and district level. This will create further layers and
		confusion for residents. And we certainly do not need
		an increase in council tax for residents.
<sup>236</sup> Resident	No	l voted for a parish council prior to its formation in
		2008, but, for one reason or another, it became a
		useless (and expensive) body. It only lasted for 5 years
		and was abolished by a campaign (HELP) organised, it
		was generally thought, by Letchworth members of
		NHDC who were jealous of the potential powers of a
		parish council. There is no reason why the same
		would not happen again at great cost to rate payers.
		Forget it
<sup>238</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council about 12 years ago and
		residents voted to abolish it. It only existed for 19
		years. It was a waste of money, only about 10% of
		people engaged in elections and as far as I can recall
		it achieved nothing. Don't repeat the mistake!
<sup>242</sup> Resident	No	Something similar failed to work a few years ago. This
		will create more bureaucracy, more layers of decision
		making causing more delays and more expense. Just
		make what we have work more efficiently.

<sup>245</sup> Resident	No	I have lived in Letchworth since 1982. At some point,
Resident	140	and I can't remember the date, we did have a parish
		council for Letchworth, which did very little and
		eventually voted itself out of existence. I understand
		•
		that their largest item of expediture was for the chair's
		ceremonial chain or office. Why would we want to
<sup>249</sup> Resident	No	repeat the exercise? We have tried this in the past and it wasn't successful.
ricorderic		We also have the Heritage Foundation which makes
		Letchworth different from other areas.
		However, if Hertfordshire is forced into 'unitary'
		government in the future there may be more
		argument then for a Parish Council.
<sup>250</sup> Resident	No	I don't want the extra cost unless the benefits
		outweigh that cost clearly
<sup>251</sup> Resident	No	This will be a useless and powerless talking shop with
		no meaningful purpose. The previous town council
		was voted out by referendum because it achieved
		nothing other than spending £ thousands on a fancy
		gold chain for the "mayor" of Letchworth. I challenge
		North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) to put this
		proposal to a local referendum. This proposal makes
		little sense considering the national government's plan
		to eliminate the district council layer and establish a
		unitary council. Local government is wasteful,
		inefficient and commands little local interest or
		support - hence the low turn-outs in elections.
		···
<sup>253</sup> Resident	No	There's zero justification provided for the proposed
255		change. No thank you.
<sup>255</sup> Resident	No	We have been through this before, and it was not
		popular. It is just another layer of bureaucracy, costing
250 5 11		more money.
<sup>256</sup> Resident	No	I believe that Hertfordshire should have a single
		unified authority and this would be a move against
<sup>257</sup> Resident	No	that goal A town council for Letchworth would be an unwanted
237 Resident	NO	
		and unnecessary layer of additional management at
		significant cost. Our local representational needs are
		already adequately supplied by North Herts District
		Council.
		We already have the Letchworth Garden City Heritage
		Foundation, NHDC and the County Council, we don't
		need anything else.
		A Letchworth Town Council was imposed on us some
		years ago and was eventually disbanded as the local
		residents didn't want it

<sup>258</sup> Resident	No	We do not need any additional costly councillors!
<sup>262</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary extra council, increased cost to residents.
		Didn't Letchworth have a town council for a brief
		period some years back? NHDC can look after the
		towns in the area without extra town councils
<sup>264</sup> Resident	No	I am Opposed to the creation of a Town Council for
		Letchworth,
		A town council was formed in 2003 on the promise
		this would cost virtually nothing, 24 councillors were
		elected by less than 10% of the population. Nothing
		was achieved by the new town council and costs
		escalated from £185.000 to £600.000 in three years.(
		and there is no limit to how much can be charged)
		In 2008 Following an official Parish Poll 76% of the
		voters polled said Yes to dissolve the Town Council
		Corruption and mismanagement lead to its
		disbandment in 2011 following a Community
		Governance Review .
		So NO we do not need another level of bureaucracy,
		there is enough statutory power within the Heritage
		Foundation and North Hers Council to meet the needs
		of the community.
<sup>265</sup> Resident	No	A proposal for a Town Council in Letchworth was
		defeated only a short time ago. The case for a new
		one is even less appropriate or convincing now. Are
		the proponents of this proposal living in the real
		world? The country is effectively bankrupt and local
		council finances are in a dire state, witness the recent
		increase in Council Tax, well above the inflation rate.
		What on earth will a new town council bring to our
		area apart from increased expenditure and costs
		which are entirely unnecessary? The duty of NHDC is
		to provide cost effective and efficient local services.
		Spending tax payers cash on a worthless new layer of
		local government must be strenuously resisted. This
		proposal must be declared dead on arrival.
<sup>266</sup> Resident	No	NO TO A NEW TOWN COUNCIL
resident	INU	I am satisfied with current representation. All change
		costs money and causes short term inefficiency. I have
		seen no evidence of benefits to the community of the
		proposal. Surely this is a rerun of the ill fated efforts of
		one family many years ago.

000 = 11		
<sup>268</sup> Resident	No	We had a town/parish Council. It was a disaster. It
		spent all the time either enriching its members or
		fighting the Heritage Foundation. Letchworth has
		been far better without it.
		There is not one single thing that a parish council
		could provide that would benefit the town. The
		Heritage Foundation does a great job. We do not need
		anything that will just compete with it.
<sup>272</sup> Resident	No	Not again. Once hiten twice shy
272 Resident	No	In 2012 after a 4 year campaign the existing town
		council was wound up. This was achieved after the
		NHDC commissioned 2 seperate polls which showed
		that over 70% of the residents wanted to abolish the
		town council. There have been no significant
		governance changes since the last poll so why waste
<sup>274</sup> Resident	No	time and money on a further poll.  We already have a district council and a heritage
Resident	NO	foundation, the last thing we need is to squander
		money on more political bureaucracy.
<sup>275</sup> Resident	No	l already pay a great deal and see no need for another
Resident	110	level of bureaucracy. We have local councillors to
		represent our interests.
<sup>276</sup> Resident	No	Too much bureaucracy and additional expense.
277 Resident	No	Willian would be part of a larger area so no progress
Resident	NO	there and we voted to abolish Letchworth town
		council about 10 years ago. It was dissolved and it has
<sup>278</sup> Resident	No	not been missed. The expense is unjustified.  We had a town council a while ago and it didn't last
Resident	NO	very long. It seems a waste of money as we already
		have the Heritage Foundation as an extra layer of
		government
<sup>281</sup> Resident	No	This has already been tried once and was an
. testae. te		expensive disaster. Why put us all through it again?
<sup>282</sup> Resident	No	There is no explanation of the point of another council
riesiaerie		- nothing here to say what benefits the extra cost
		would bring - surely there is already local
		representation through the local councilors elected on
		the district council. If someone is making a
		recommendation then I expect them to say why they
		are recommending it.
		are recommending it.

<sup>284</sup> Resident	No	I have no understanding of what a Town Council
		would do, what it's powers would be, how
		responsibilities would be defined, how it's activities
		would be coordinated with NHDC, etc.
		Also it is totally unclear from the leaflet we received
		what the draft proposals are on any of these matters;
		it was only after crawling through council meeting
		agendas, reports, amendments and minutes, that it
		becomes clear that there no proposals on any of these
		points. More general websites only give possible
		examples of activities, and nothing on the limits on a
		Town Council's powers.
		In these circumstances, and given the unfortunate
		history in this area, I cannot support the proposal at
205		With any information bright manifest
<sup>285</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth is already too heavy in representation
<sup>293</sup> Resident	No	A new parish council for Letchworth will mean more
		bureaucracy and more cost. More layers of
		government means reduced efficiency. I am firmly
		AGAINST this draft recommendation.
<sup>294</sup> Resident	No	Do not want to pay additional council tax for more
		layers of government
<sup>295</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth is too diverse with different
		neighbourhoods/communities each with its own
		needs for a town council to represent effectively and
		having wards does not change this. In fact having
		wards emphasises the shortcomings of a town council.
		Between 2003 and 2012 Letchworth had a Town
		Council that failed dismally. Let's not repeat the farce.
<sup>306</sup> Resident	No	I have lived in Letchworth for 85 years and feel
Resident	NO	previous town councils to be a waste of money,
		another layer of bureaucracy. At this time creating
		more red tape should not be a priority. Also no
308 Resident	No	increase on council tax I have absolutely no idea of the added benefit of a
Resident	140	town council because this is not set out anywhere in
		the proposals. Moreover there is no clear rationale
		provided for an increase in council tax to pay for this.
		In the absence of any information to the contrary, this
		proposal appears to involve adding an additional layer
		of cost and bureaucracy but without any obvious
		henefit to residents.

<sup>312</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council. It was pointless and cost us
		money. It cost us even more money to get rid of it -
		and we voted to get rid of it. District and County
		council is fine as is. Adding to householders council tax
		in the current economic situation just to add another
		laver of politics is deeply disconcerting.
314 Resident	No	From what I have read, the town council would be in
		addition to NHDC. I feel adequately represented by
		NHDC at present and do not believe an extra layer of
		meetings and bureaucracy is likely to improve
		anything. It will also cost extra money and this is at
		present in very short supply.
		My recollection is also that a Letchworth town council
		was previously abolished - another reason for not
217 5		revisiting the matter
<sup>317</sup> Resident	No	I can't see any benefit to this proposed action. The
		wards referenced don't feel like they actually cover all
		of letchworth either. Though they might just be poorly
		named.
		My council tax is far too expensive as it is and
		essential services continue to be reduced, such as
		general waste collections. A town council is clearly not
		going to offer any improvement in such areas and is
		simply going to be an unnecessary additional drain on
222		rosources
<sup>323</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>324</sup> Resident	No	Increase in council tax.
<sup>327</sup> Resident	No	We had a parish council previously and it took years to
		get rid of it. It was ineffective and bad value for
		money.
329 Resident	No	At a time when there is a desire nationally to reduce
		costs, increase accountability and be less bureaucratic
		l cannot see the benefits to residents that would
		justify the new structure and increased council tax.
		The proposal also gives no other clear benefits to the
		changes that couldn't be achieved through
		amendment to the current structure

<sup>330</sup> Resident	No	This is another layer of expensive bureaucracy, with
		no tangible benefit for Letchworth. We already have
		the Heritage Foundation. We had a Town Council in
		the past, who spent money frivolously and fought
		continuously with the Heritage Foundation. I'm totally
		against going down this road again. We don't need
		more unqualified councillors who are more interested
		in the power than local issues. We also cannot afford
		the additional cost to already astronomical council tax
<sup>331</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council before it just increased cost,
		division and was eventually disbanded. Stop meddling
		and start delivering on the services in your remit.
<sup>333</sup> Resident	No	I have not been able to find any information on North
		Herts Council's website about what benefits a
		Letchworth Town Council would bring, just the cost in
		council tax increases, therefore I cannot see any good
		reason for a Letchworth Town Council. Furthermore,
		there is already the Letchworth Heritage Foundation
		which has to be consulted on any planning matters (or
		if a homeowner wants to make any changes to the
		exterior of their property), adding an additional layer
		of red tape. A town council would just further increase
201 - 11		hureacracy for no henefit of the town
<sup>334</sup> Resident	No	I don't see the need or benefit
<sup>335</sup> Resident	No	Not required
<sup>336</sup> Resident	No	In a time when money is hard, why would you want to
		increase the council tax in any way.
338 Resident	No	Town council was created and abolished by public
		vote. No need to recreate. Have a Letchworth Panel
		instead. It's complicated enough having Heritage
		Foundation and District,,don't need a third layer.
343 Resident	No	I have no idea why you would need 13 people to do
		this.
<sup>347</sup> Resident	No	To pay more council tax is a luxury many people can't
		afford
352 Resident	No	The last PC was a complete waste of money. They
		spent it on expensive Scandinavian furniture &
		overpaid staff & benefits.
		Do we really have to bring back HELP (Help Eliminate
		Letchworth Parish) and fight this battle all over again.

354 Resident	No	Why do we need an extra level of local government
		that needs to be paid for by residents? The last
		Letchworth Town Council lasted less than 3 years and
		was dissolved as the electorate thought that it served
		no purpose.
355 Resident	No	Can't afford a rise in council tax AGAIN
256 D		
<sup>356</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. We already have
2E0 D . I .		the Heritage Foundation looking after Letchworth.
<sup>358</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money, last one was voted out by 90%
250		respondents
<sup>359</sup> Resident	No	we have sufficient admin and costs now
<sup>360</sup> Resident	No	We don't get value for money now with our council
		tax. If you reach out to your local councillor to raise
		concerns, like I have with the untold damage to grass
		verges where I live, they don't even have the decency
		to respond. I won't pay any additional money for
		something that I see no benefit from
<sup>362</sup> Resident	No	We need less Government not more, there is too
		many layers of bureaucracy that add no value. We
		need a root and branch review of local and national
		government who intervene far too often in the daily
		lives of the citizens.
<sup>365</sup> Resident	No	There was one 12-15 years ago it was a complete joke
		and one of the members brought a gold mayor chain
		for an estimated £5000 it was rumoured and last a
		short while.
<sup>366</sup> Resident	No	Since Letchworth Council was disbanded in 2013 with
		75% believing it should go, I don't see a good reason
		for a new one. When people are already struggling
		financially the extra cost of the council is hard to
		justify.
<sup>368</sup> Resident	No	A camel is a horse designed by a committee.
		Each area only needs 1 town councillor maximum,
		why am I spending money for something that will
		negatively affect me.
		We had one from 2009 to 2013, achieved little but cost
<sup>370</sup> Resident	No	We had one from 2007 to 2013, achieved little but cost
<sup>370</sup> Resident	No	a fortune. Why start this again? We need to restart

<sup>371</sup> Resident	No	We have County Councillors and District Councillors.
		Increasing bureaucracy (and cost) is, in my view, not
		productive. Engagement with local elections is
		generally abysmal and I am therefore not convinced
		adding more councillors to the pool, albeit Town
		Councillors, will be beneficial. Not to mention more
		elections! Residents are already able to contact one of
		their ward councillors, who sit on the District Council,
		so a Town Council is simply not needed
<sup>372</sup> Resident	No	Please not again. The council circular just received in
		the post mentions the additional costs involved as a
		supplement to council tax. We've just had a hefty
		increase. We don't want, or need, more costs piled on
		to us. When Letchworth had a town council it was
		awful but expensive. A local referendum succeeded
		in getting rid of it. An excellent result. Please don't
275 D 11 /		resurrect the wretched thing
<sup>375</sup> Resident	No	this was tried about a decade ago, the only thing that
		appeared to happen was the purchase of an
<sup>376</sup> Resident	NI-	expensive chain of office
Resident	No	I think we should reduce the levels of bureaucracy not
<sup>385</sup> Resident	No	add new ones.  Work is going on with national looking at District
Resident	NO	councils and county councils in order to unitary
		$\cdot$
		authorities. The district and the county Council
		currently don't want to do this. Establishing a town
		council as you've put please note costs between 22
		and £121 additionally per year per household as a
		part of the council tax. As a single person that wages
		has not increased in line with cost of living for a
		number of years, I can't afford that. many households
		are struggling like local authorities with budget
		deficits. This is not fair to create something in the cost
		for money What further work is going on to establish
		the position?

88 Resident	No	There has been two previous attempts at creating a
		Town Council for Letchworth. The second attempt saw
		the creation of a Town Council which lasted for a
		couple of years and subsequently was dissolved.
		There was considerable cost involved in both the
		creation and in dissolving of the organisation. During
		its time as another tear of local government, I failed to
		see the relevance, purpose or benefit to the town at
		all, except for an additional precept on the council tax.
		Since the ending of Letchworth Urban District Council
		in 1974, there have been grumbles of Letchworth
		Town being under represented in the affairs of the
		wider North Herts District, but generally, I think that
		District and County Councillors have done their best to
		represent the town and its problems.
		If a Town Council is deemed to be established, what
		functions would they be better able to perform than
		the current system. Additionally what budgets would
		be transferred to the organisation from the District
		Council to enable it to function and what pro rata
		reduction would be made in North Herts precept.
		There are going to be extra costs involved for
		providing Office Accommodation, Salary of a Town
		Clerk together with administrative staff and other
		infrastructure for the running of the organisation.
		Other bits in terms of direct costs would be things like
		Employer National Insurance, Employer
		Superannuation contributions, liability insurance and
		the like. These costs would have to be funded by a
		new precept and funded by the Council Tax Payers.
<sup>96</sup> Resident	No	More expense for residents
<sup>99</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay and more council tax and there is
		no need for even more councillors and layers of
		bureaucracy.

<sup>402</sup> Resident	No	Nowhere in your information do you state what the
		purpose of this extra layer of bureaucracy is for. What
		powers would the town council have? What about its
		relationship to the existing wards and the Heritage
		Foundation? It would create yet more confusion and
		slow down anything that needs to be done. The
		inefficiency of the NHS with all its bureaucratic
		mayhem should warn us against creating more and
		more talking shops and "speed bumps" in getting
		anything done.
		As a final straw, we have to pay more council tax to
		fund it
<sup>405</sup> Resident	No	l do not see the reason for any additional town
		Council whatsoever; in addition to the local authorities
		Letchworth Garden City already has the Heritage
		Foundation; other towns may well benefit from town
		councils but that is not needed here. Yet another layer
		of governance is over the top and expensive and just
		not required.
<sup>407</sup> Resident	No	Just another tier of bureaucracy we don't need or can
		afford .
<sup>411</sup> Resident	No	I don't think we need another tier of councillors on top
		of what we have already. We already have the council
		and North Herts Heritage. Why would we need to pay
		for 13 more people that most probably won't be able
		to achieve anything more than what we have now.
<sup>413</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has previously had a town council which
		did nothing to make the town better. It was voted out.
		Why on earth would we want to try it again. It was just
		an added expense which we cannot afford.
<sup>414</sup> Resident	No	I think it's a waste of time money and resources to
		have another authority do something wrong they're
		already taking away stuff and sorting s*** out wrong I
		do not need to be paying for anything more.
<sup>415</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money
<sup>417</sup> Resident	No	Feel it would be an unnecessary additional codt
<sup>418</sup> Resident	No	I don't feel we need a town council, why add another
Resident		layer of bureaucracy and cost to tax payers, when
		layer of bareaderacy and cost to tax payers, when
<sup>419</sup> Resident	No	services are already being cut?
	No No	
<sup>419</sup> Resident		services are already being cut?

<sup>425</sup> Resident	No	I don't consider it necessary to have another layer of
		bureaucracy, needing an extra financial burden on this
		community. We have Herts county Council, North
		Herts district Council and the governance under
		Heritage Foundation. Using g what i guess are
		unqualified people needing recompense,
		accommodation and equipment
		To do their inh
<sup>426</sup> Resident	No	Yet another layer of government if superfluous. Its
		powers would be limited.
<sup>429</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has the Heritage Foundation that carries
		out the role that a town Council would. The role of a
		Town Council in Letchworth would be very limited (
		wind the town clock, look after the allotments) as all
		decisions on planning waste collection etc are dealt
		with by NHDC. So a cost and time waste of money and
		effort.
<sup>432</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>434</sup> Resident	No	More unnecessary bureaucracy and extra cost
<sup>435</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has already been dragged through having
		a town council which cost the rate payers of
		Letchworth half a million pounds each year. The
		Letchworth Town Council and the Parish arrangement
		was abolished on 31st March 2013. I therefore
		question why you are trying to start one again so
		quickly as the motion was carried without opposition
		and only one abstention
<sup>437</sup> Resident	No	WE do not need another layer of council control
<sup>439</sup> Resident	No	This is an unnecessary addition to running the town. It
		will increase our council tax payment with no obvious
		benefit
<sup>440</sup> Resident	No	NO-NO! Another level of bureaucracy with what
		controls / brief / finance? Who controls finance and
		who will oversee this self funding committee? We
		already have county / district / Heritage - why another
		body?
<sup>444</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth Town Council was abolished 12 years ago
		saving ratepayers millions.
		There are no compelling reasons to reinstate it
<sup>445</sup> Resident	No	No more money, as an 80 year old pensioner I can
		hardly afford the standing council tax. I have no more
		money.
446 5 11 1	No	We don't need extra councillors. Council tac costs too
446 Resident		
446 Resident	.,,	much already for a reduced service provided. I will

<sup>448</sup> Another	No	More money to be spent with absolutely no gains for
organisation		residents
(HCC)		
<sup>449</sup> Resident	No	Answer based on the disastrous performance of the
		previous Letchworth town council.
<sup>450</sup> Resident	No	There was previously a town council that was
		abolished after consultations showed the vast majority
		of Letchworth residents wanted it to go.
<sup>451</sup> Resident	No	People can't afford the increase in money
<sup>453</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>454</sup> Resident	No	1. We had a town council before and it failed
		miserably because all it did was form an extra layer of
		bureaucracy and cost a lot of money. They even
		bought a chain of office but it delivered very little.
		2. We are potentially going to have a unitary authority.
		We should wait until this is decided before we decide
		on a town council. There councils is almost certainly at
		least one too many.
		3. Its already a challenge to find out who is
		responsible for what in the town without another
		layer.
		4. In this era of Government financial cut backs, why
		would we want another layer of bureaucracy which
		will cost a lot of money to set up and manage. Spend
		the money of something useful like improving local .
<sup>456</sup> Resident	No	This a pointless additional layer of costly bureaucracy
<sup>461</sup> Resident	No	Over complicates town management. Adds to council
		tax. Adds further layers of bureaucracy. Decisions will
		take longer and accountability will decrease. I am not
		in favour of a town council.
<sup>464</sup> Resident	No	Absolute waste of money. I pay far too much council
		tax for an appalling low standard of service already.
		Why should residents pay more
<sup>468</sup> Resident	No	We only got just rid of the Letchworth town council not
		long ago. Definitely want another one!
<sup>470</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>472</sup> Resident	No	We tried this a few years ago and it was a total waste
		of time and money, and took years to get it scrapped.
		Why is it even being considered again?
<sup>474</sup> Resident	No	It is my view that we does not need further expensive
		layers of governance. This view was shared by at least
		5,357 other people, when the last Governance review
		was held, and the last Letchworth Town Council was
		abolished only 8 years ago by 75% of votes cast.

<sup>475</sup> Resident	No	We do not need it - a complete waste of money &
		governance
<sup>476</sup> Resident	No	Last thing we need is yet another layer of governance.
		This issue was tried before and rejected after years of
		effort - it is incredible that it it should even be raised
		again.
<sup>479</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>480</sup> Resident	No	I see no advantage of a new addittional layer of
		elected bodies with the extra cost that results. The
		present arrangement has worked satifactorily. My
		comment applies to all the recommended areas the
		subject of this consultation. No benifits have been
		provided in the proposed changes to justify an
		increase in the council tax that would result.
<sup>483</sup> Resident	No	There is no information contained within your
		documents that actually helps make this judgment. It's
		a proposed solution to a problem which has not been
		clearly set out. The quality of this consultation is
		shocking, so why would we support a proposal to
		increase our council tax without understanding the
101 5		benefits?
<sup>491</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>492</sup> Resident	No	Our post code is closer to Willian which has its own
		Parish council?
<sup>497</sup> Resident	No	I strongly disagree with the proposal to form a town
		council for Letchworth for the following reasons.
		1)It will be an additional financial burden on hard
		pressed council tax payers.
		2) Letchworth is already fully represented by
		Hertfordshire County Council, North Herts Council and
		the Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation. An
		additional; council would be more bureaucracy for
		little or no benefit.
		3) Letchworth previously had a Town Council that did
		little of value, cost the residents a good deal and was
		so unpopular with residents that a referendum was
		help to abolish it. This was achieved with a large
498 Pacidont		Residents are already adequately represented by
<sup>498</sup> Resident	No	residents are already adequately represented by
<sup>498</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>498</sup> Resident	No	North Herts District Council. It is difficult to see how a
<sup>498</sup> Resident	No	North Herts District Council. It is difficult to see how a further layer of bureaucracy would enhance local
<sup>498</sup> Resident	No	North Herts District Council. It is difficult to see how a

<sup>503</sup> Resident	No	Sounds like a further level of (expensive) bureaucracy,
		a further obfuscation and dilution of transparency and
		accountability, more squabbling between it and
		existing agencies.
<sup>504</sup> Resident	No	Too much government
<sup>505</sup> Resident	No	The government id seeking to streamline local
		government by devolving more power to larger
		unitary authorities. We should be moving away from
		multi-tier local authority and toward single tier, not
		adding unnecessary additional tiers.
<sup>509</sup> Resident	No	A town council was set up a few years ago and
		became a pariah in the town. Just one example will
		suffice - it spent £11,000 to have a coat of arms
		created by the College of Arms for the self-styled
		'mayor. A group of us got together with the express
		aim of abolishing the council, which was finally
		achieved. I can't believe that this has been suggested
		again and I cannot stress how absolutely against it I
		am
<sup>510</sup> Resident	No	We do not need yet another layer of local government
		at an additional charge on council tax.
<sup>511</sup> Resident	No	This is actually proof of the incompetence of the
		council and the MP. Why would Letchworth need 13
		councillors what an absolut waste of our money.
		For a long time now it's been pretty obvious that the
		council's are just out to line there own pockets.
		You will do whatvis best for you anyway so why bother
		with this consultation. If you don't get the answers you
		want you won't listen.
<sup>512</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>513</sup> Resident	No	I don't see the need for three layers of local
		government. If town councils are necessary that
		implies district councils are not from my point of view.
		As such I cannot approve of a proposal that only
		considers town councils rather than a more
		comprehensive reform of local government.
<sup>514</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another layer of council control

<sup>518</sup> Resident	No	We do NOT need yet another level of bureaucracy. We
		already have three levels of governance, all competing
		against each other, blocking progress and costing
		money. This extra level of unnecessary management
		adds nothing, duplicates what is already there and
		increases costs. It has been tried before and was
		rejected by local residents.
<sup>520</sup> Resident	No	l do not wish for further layers of administration and
		higher council tax
<sup>524</sup> Resident	No	l don't want to pay extra council tax especially when
		it's already increased
<sup>525</sup> Resident	No	Not if it raises council tax
<sup>532</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>533</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>538</sup> Resident	No	We've already tried this idiotic idea some years ago
		and had a battle to get rid of it. Please don't insult our
		intelligence by going back down this expensive
		pointless road again
<sup>543</sup> Resident	No	Has any local authority in history ever come up with a
		more stupid pointless proposal than more councils,
		more layers of nonsense, more expensive waste of
		time and money. Many fought hard to get rid of the
		last experiment with a Town Council - mistakes are
		meant for learning, not repeating.
<sup>546</sup> Resident	No	-objections to more money for council tax spend
		- no obvious benefits outlined for this proposal for
		residents
		-increase in bureaucracy
554 Resident	No	It would be more expensive for residents in a time
		that the cost of living has increased
<sup>556</sup> Resident	No	
559 Resident	No	I strongly oppose this proposal on the basis that
		council tax will rise. Council tax is already high enough
		in these economically challenging times. A parish
		council for Letchworth was created a few years ago
		and abandoned following local public opinion. Do we
		really have to go through this again? I strongly believe
		the councillors who govern us need to be frugal and
		keen costs to an absolute minimum
<sup>566</sup> Resident	No	We don't need any more government, costing us yet
		more money.

<sup>567</sup> Resident	No	A town council was set up some years ago for
		Letchworth Garden City.
		It cost taxpayers money and achieved nothing of
		benefit for the community.
		A popular campaign to abolish this council grew to the
		point of having a local election/referendum for the
		community to vote Yes or No for the abolition of the
		Town Council. The vote was overwhelmingly in favour
		of abolishing the Town Council.
		Whoever is proposing to reinstate a Town Council
		needs to answer some simple questions:-
		1) What problem or deficiency of service is the Town
		Council supposed to solve?
		2) How much will the new Council cost the local
		taxpayers?
		3) How will the performance of the new Council be
		measured?
		Any proposed change to local governance must
		achieve either:-
		a) a reduction in local tax for the same level of service.
		b) a better service in terms of value-for-money if the
		local tax is increased.
		I cannot see how fiddling with the number of
		councillors will achieve any improvement in the level
		of service, whether it be for social care, fixing potholes,
		education or waste removal.
<sup>568</sup> Resident	No	Not necessary. Current council arrangements work
		correctly in my opinion.
<sup>570</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is too high, and we see nothing in return.
		This should be alot lower families are struggling with
		money.
<sup>572</sup> Resident	No	I see no reason why this should happen as it does not
		appear to provide any additional value. It will incur
		more costs for residents and more needless
		bureaucracy. I agree that the community needs its
		voice heard, but I have not been presented with any
		information with how this will be achieved. As far as I
		can tell, there already was a Letchworth Town Council
		and Parish which was abolished in 2013. How would
		this be any different from last time? This needs a
		drastic rethink with some solid explanations as to
		what nocitive impacts it would have for recidents

<sup>575</sup> Resident	No	l can't afford it.
<sup>582</sup> Resident	No	l do not wish to see another layer of bureaucracy and
		an increase in my council tax.
<sup>505</sup> Resident	No	I don't understand the benefits and don't want
		additional cost on top of current council tax rises
Resident	No	It's a complete waste of time and money. Adding
		another tier of local government is not necessary and
		won't in my view improve local democracy. I'd rather
		money went to service delivery such as social care and
		children's services, not setting up more unnecessary
		structures.
		l don't feel councillors have any impact on my life or
		are representative of the communities those serve so
		I'm strongly opposed to adding any more
<sup>08</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>6</sup> Resident	No	The proposed Town council will be an increase in our
		council tax which I already like many others struggle to
		pay. What service will the Town Council provide and
		how will I benefit.
<sup>8</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay more money for more levels of
		bureaucracy. These cost would be yet another burden
		on the tax payers wallet, and would undoubtedly
		spiral out of control over the coming years. If anything,
		local government officers should be looking to reduce
		the current tax bill not increase it.
		As they say "Actions speak louder than words". We
		don't need more people talking about it at endless
		meetings (costing a small fortune), we need people
		that are actually on the ground doing the real work
		that benefits all of us in our daily life.

<sup>625</sup> Resident	No	l am in strong opposition to the creation of a new
		Town Council. With public spending spiraling and
		services provided by the County which are not only
		waning, but also providing an increasingly poorer
		services to the tax paying residents whose basic needs
		remain unmet more often than not, adding an
		additional layer of bureaucracy will be greatly
		detrimental. And costly. As it happened with the NHS,
		adding increasing layers of management in public
		sectors will shift budget from the services to the
		decision (un)making, creating bureaucratic procedures
		which will bounce off from one executive committee
		to another, losing sight of the common goods and
		common needs as perceived by the taxpayers and not
		by wards, councilors, governors, MPs and whatnot.
		The creation of the Town Council will therefore go
		against the trend of simplifying and not complicating. I
		am also convinced that the new Councils will have
		limited decisional authority if in disagreement with the
		power-to-be above them. I have no doubt this exercise
		will results in increasing costs and reduced services,
		with the ongoing process already shifting budgets
		away from the on-the-ground activities.
<sup>627</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth is already governed by Herts County
		Council, North Herts District Council and the
		Letchworth Heritage Foundation . Residents do not
		need another level of bureaucracy to deal with for
		local matters; nor would residents welcome the
		additional burden of an increase in taxes to pay for a
(20.5		town council.
<sup>629</sup> Resident	No	I see no purpose for an extra layer of governance. We
		already have adequate representation through district
<sup>630</sup> Resident	No	and county councillors.  Costs need to be reduced to residents not increased
638 Resident	No	North Herts Council is sufficient
639 Resident	No	We already have enough councillors/persons who
Resident	NO	appear to nothing already, why pay for more
<sup>640</sup> Resident	No	appear to nothing already, why pay for more
<sup>642</sup> Resident	No	Another layer of bureaucracy not needed. We had a
		town council previously and proved totally worthless.
		Don't wish to pay increase in council tax to fund Town
		Council.

<sup>643</sup> Resident	No	another layer of expensive bureaucracy
		will greatly complicate decision-making process
		(timescales and petty internal squabbling)
		a retrograde step
<sup>645</sup> Resident	No	I feel this will just create an extra level of bureaucracy!!
<sup>648</sup> Resident	No	The creation of a Town Council represents an
		unjustified further layer of bureaucracy and more
		expense for council tax payers in Letchworth when
		they are already served by the County Council, District
		Council and also have LGC Heritage Foundation. At a
		time when council tax budgets are particularly
		challenging it seems that the priority should be to
		economise rather than increasing costs by introducing
		a non-essential tier of democracy and imposing a
		further financial burden on residents. I, therefore, see
		no good reason for having a Letchworth Town Council
		which would be of little, if any, benefits to the town.
<sup>651</sup> Resident	No	There is a previous (and highly ineffective) history of a
		Town Council in Letchworth. It was very difficult at the
		time to understand what benefit the council provided
		to the town other than adding another level of
		bureaucracy to an already well established planning
		system. More importantly the TC used its powers
		(which are not subject to capping procedures) to
		increase its precept out of all proportion tio the
		benefits it brought to residents.
		Whilst I understand that the current government is
		proposing to rationalise local government, as I
		understand it these proposals are not being
		introduced with this in mind. At the present time the
		powers of PCs are extremely limited. Thus I would not
		favour any change in the current system with the
		almost certain increase in cost with no resulting
		improvement in service levels. Depending on the final
		shape of the government proposals and what
		additional, if any, powers would be vested in PCs this
		view might change.
		In any event what is the purpose of this proposal
		whilst the whole nature of local government structures
652 Resident	No	I am unsure what they will actually do.

662 Resident	No	It is an unnecessary extra layer of governance for LGC.
		(Residents are already confused about the boundaries
		between HCC/NHDC/LGCHF responsibilities.) I believe
		that there was a campaign several decades ago to
		remove LGC Town Council because it was thought to
		be superfluous and costly for no gain.
<sup>668</sup> Resident	No	Had one before and complete waste of money 🐧
<sup>671</sup> Resident	No	Not necessary
<sup>672</sup> Resident	No	Any additional rate cost is unacceptable
677 Resident	No	How many layers of government will this create? We
		already have Herts CC, North Herts council and
		Letchworth Heritage Foundation. That's three. Please
		do not add another!
<sup>678</sup> Resident	No	I believe we have a sufficiency.
<sup>681</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another layer of bureaucracy. The
		only way I would support this would be if it led to the
		abolition of Letchworth Heritage Foundation.
<sup>684</sup> Resident	No	I don't see what this is going to provide and you are
		demonstrating no benefits to this recommendation
		beyond costing additional council tax. This already
		increases year on year with no visible increase to the
		benefits we receive (in fact a decrease in benefits
		specifically re: refuse and recycling). Cost of living is
		already impacting enough without having to pay for
		additional "services" which overall just feel like
		creating jobs and roles for no reason
<sup>689</sup> Resident	No	I do not feel that creating 5 wards with with 3
		councillors will improve the town also this is yet
		another additional cost to struggling families and
		pensioners
<sup>690</sup> Resident	No	Don't need it if we have to pay even more council tax
<sup>692</sup> Resident	No	What tangible improvements to public services would
		this bring? The leaflet has no information about what
		you hope to gain out of this decision? All I see is a
		higher council tax bill with an extra layer of
		bureaucracy.
<sup>693</sup> Resident	No	I believe that the old town council was abolished
		several years ago.
		I don't think that re-creating it again will add much
		value, rather it will push up council tax.
<sup>695</sup> Resident	No	We have previously had a Town Council which pushed
		up Council Tax and just gave Taxpayers money away,
		it was voted out and should stay out

596 Resident	No	I already feel that there is too much bureaucracy at
Resident		most levels of government - particularly local
		government. Too much time is taken up discussing
		things (sometimes of a trivial nature) - and there is not
		enough action. In my experience in life, the more
		committees you have (or the more people you have
		on the committee) the more it costs everyone and the
		more it slows down any decision process. I would be
		opposed to the move even if it costs nothing; but I
		would be even less happy if all our council taxes
		increase. The 13 people on the town council should
		have to prove - in advance - that their participation
		would somehow lead to a much more efficient council
		and better public services for the town. Can they
		and better public services for the town. Can they
<sup>597</sup> Resident	No	Firstly, I am not in favour of a new parish council for
		Letchworth Garden City. With specific regards to the
		number of proposed councillors, I do not understand
		how a Council can be created on the same boundaries
		as the District Wards, with the increase of one
		Councillor in the Grange Ward. This to me appears to
		be blatant gerrymandering, because there is no
		justification for the increase in one councillor in one
		ward. As a previous Councillor for the old Letchworth
		Grange Ward, which was previously a three member
		ward, when it contained the areas of Norton Road and
		Wilbury Road, I could understand the need for three
		councillors. However the Grange Estate alone does not
		require three councillors, and one could argue that the
		sole reason behind adding an additional member here
		is solely political, providing an additional Labour
		Councillor.
		Letchworth Garden City has a troubled past with our
		previous Town Council, which was a waste of tax
		payers money and a additional needless layer of
		bureaucracy, which was thankfully removed several
		years ago. I think the Council and the Letchworth Area
		Committee, would be better spent focusing on tackling
		the Heritage Foundation and not adding more layers
<sup>701</sup> Resident	No	Previously had a Letchworth town council which was
Resident	140	disbanded due a lack of need and deliverables, also
		including unnecessary costs.
<sup>703</sup> Resident	No	Ok in principle, but not ok for even more council tax
		increases. No thanks

<sup>704</sup> Resident	No	will affect my council tax.
<sup>705</sup> Resident	No	We had a similar town/parish council several years
		ago that was not very effective, given that we also
		have the Heritage Foundation in Letchworth, I doubt
		this proposal would be effective either from a cost or
		added unnecessary bureaucracy stand point.
<sup>706</sup> Resident	No	Another level of bureaucracy, more public money
		being spent on something that IS NOT providing any
		additional service to residents. Yes I might be better
		represented, but I think the majority of people would
		prefer the money to go on putting the public bins back
		across Letchworth (or a similar, real, value adding, job
		creating activity), rather than covering expenses and
		time from low level politicians.
		At no point in the details I've received does it state any
		tangible benefit to me or my family, but only that it
		could cost me £100+ in council tax.
<sup>708</sup> Resident	No	l strongly oppose this initiative as it will create an extra
Resident	110	layer of bureaucracy, which will serve no purpose. the
		current structure works well.
<sup>709</sup> Resident	No	Current structure works well.
711 Resident	No	We had a town council a few years ago and it acheived
Resident		nothing, just an increase in the council tax. Also in
		Letchworth we already have the Heritage Foundation
		so we do not need a further layer of bureaucracy.
<sup>713</sup> Resident	No	The last town council was useless
<sup>716</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>719</sup> Resident	No	Too many councillors will cost public funds. Not
		necessary to have 13 councillors, 5 councillors for 5
		wards is suffice. The less people we pay the better.
<sup>720</sup> Resident	No	No further bureaucracy needed. Make NHC work.
<sup>724</sup> Resident	No	Too expensive.
<sup>725</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money, time, and resources. No need for an
		additional tier of local governance - we already have
		the Heritage Foundation as well as NHDC

<sup>726</sup> Resident	No	We don't need an extra layer of
		administration/management. Particularly if, in the
		middle of a cost of living crisis, it increases council tax
		by up to £10 per month. If I had to pay an extra £10
		per month I'd prefer that to go on enhanced local
		services, not more councillor wages.
<sup>729</sup> Resident	No	I pay enough for very little
<sup>732</sup> Resident	No	I feel that there would not be any benefit for a new
		parish.All it would add is complexity, extra expense
		and bureaucracy.
<sup>733</sup> Resident	No	Would add an additional layer of bureaucracy to the
		administration with no immediate benefits to residents
<sup>734</sup> Resident	No	Due to council tax rises.
<sup>739</sup> Resident	No	The last attempt to create and run a town council was
		a massive failure, causing no end of aggravation, bad
		tempered public and media exchanges and very bad
		publicity for the town. Absolutely not.
<sup>741</sup> Resident	No	The last time Letchworth had a town council it was an
		expensive disaster. Luckily residents took it over with
		the sole objective of disbanding it.
<sup>742</sup> Resident	No	We've had a town council before which was
		disbanded. Rather than have more admin we should
		be concentrating on bringing Letchworth back to the
		state and condition it used to be. I cannot see it will be
		of any benefit.
<sup>746</sup> Resident	No	

<sup>752</sup> Resident	No	Most people I know in this whole area will be
		struggling to keep a car on the road this year, myself
		included. To keep money aside for a one week holiday
		this year. Will struggle to send thier child on a school
		trip this year. Will struggle to pay the already rising
		council tax. Will not be putting money into a personal
		pension for yet another year, hoping we will not get a
		debilitating health condition that will take months of
		emails/ phone calls/ Drs letters before any financial
		help arrives. So personally, I can't pay extra towards
		the town council. This month the inflation rate is very
		low, so if I do receive a pay rise, it will be reflected on
		that rate. Not taking into account that we have had
		rises in car insurance, rises in food, transport, gas
		electric, everything has risen, which does not equate
		to the very low rate being given out by Bank of
		England. My wife car insurance has gone up from
		£300-£700 in 13 months. This is just one example of
		ignorant price increases. My solar panels pay me 5p
		per kilowatt, but l pay over 20p per kilowatt. l am with
		the cheapest supplier and my solar energy is
		government run. I don't know who you are aiming this
		price rise at, but it won't help me or most of the
		people in my situation. My brother who is in one of
		these wards is unable to have his heating on and so
		this is causing damp and mold throughout his rented
		property, which is why his landlord won't sort out the
		property. Sand as you know there are thousands in
<sup>753</sup> Resident	No	We already have enough idiots on the council, who get
		paid by us, in my opinion for very little work. We have
		North Herts council, and have to pay extra for The
		heritage Foundation which is also a waste of our
		council tax. People are struggling due to the cost of
		living without this extra cost. This is a complete waste
		of money.
<sup>756</sup> Resident	No	It makes no sense to add a filter layer of government
		and cost which will add little to nothing except more
		bureaucracy. If anything the opposite should be
		occuring with a reduction in roles.

<sup>758</sup> Resident	No	This is completely unnecessary. 1) Letchworth is
		already adequately represented in local government
		through the district council. 2) Letchworth additionally
		has the heritage Foundation so this adds a 4th layer of
		local governance. 3) Letchworth previously
		overwhelmingly voted to remove its parish council -
		reversing that ignores, rather than strengthens, local
		democracy 4) This is not the time to add further
		council tax. The council is having to make tough
		decisions on e.g. bins - adding tax to pay for more
		councillors while removing services is a very bad look
		5) This is against the direction of travel set out by the
		national government
<sup>761</sup> Resident	No	I think we need to see what comes from the unitary
		authorities review and keep cost of local government
		to a minimum. We cannot afford the cost of estate
		and staffing levels of NHDC never mind another layer
		of pointless representation. I'd rather invest money in
		neighbourhood policing rather than a parish at least
		they could try to control motorbikes speeding around
		lackmans Estate.
<sup>762</sup> Resident	No	I do not see any added value to having a new town
		council apart from increased council tax which is quite
762 5 11 .		high as it is.
<sup>763</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has previously tried to have a town council
		and it was overwhelmingly voted to shut down as it
		costs too much and did not achieve anything of note.
		It seems silly to create one again given the history.
<sup>764</sup> Resident	No	We've been down this route before. It adds no value in
		my view. We have enough governance and
		bureaucracy already.
<sup>765</sup> Resident	No	We already have a North Herts District Council and a
		Herts County Council. I don't believe we need a Town
		Council. I am also concerned that the creation of a
		Town Council will result in an increase to my Council
		Tax bill. I already pay over £200 a month, I don't want
		this additional cost.
<sup>767</sup> Resident	No	It appears that residents voted by a large majority to
		abolish the previous town council in 2013. I can't find
		any information to say what the benefits would be to
		restarting this arrangement. Pros and cons should be
		made clearly available for everyone to see. I would be
		happy to reconsider my response if I had more
770 :		information.
<sup>770</sup> Resident	No	

771 Resident	No	
<sup>773</sup> Resident	No	We previously elected to abolish the town council so
		why is it being proposed again?
774 Resident	No	The last Town Council was abolished after public
		protests in 2013, having contributed nothing of
		consequence to the town, yet at enormous cost. It
		was a small but expensive 'talking shop', led by self
		interested individuals, and caused much difficulty and
		I cannot believe that after all that, the subject is being
		raised again. And at a time when the nation faces
		some of the toughest challenges, across the board,
		that we have faced since the end of the Cold War.
		As a very long term resident of LGC, I object forcefully
777 Resident	No	The proposal is adding further disconnect and admin
··· Resident	NO	layers with more added cost at the expense of less
		efficiency, at a time when streamlining and making
		things more connected and efficient is what is
		required. Please don't add more bureaucracy, and
		instead make the existing council setup more
		communicative to its various constituents.
<sup>782</sup> Resident	No	The Heritage Foundation fulfils many of the functions
		of a town council. The establishment of a town council
		would duplicate many of the functions of existing
		bodies whilst also resulting in increased cost to
		residents. Previous attempts at establishing and
		maintaining a town council have been unpopular and
		have failed. The proposal is itself unnecessary.
<sup>784</sup> Resident	No	Council tax has already increased too much. This new
705		town council is not needed.
<sup>785</sup> Resident	No	The previous Letchworth town council achieved very
		little during its lifetime apart from significant annual
		budget increases. It was successfully abolished by
		public vote. I have no reason to believe that the
		reintroduction of this wholly unnecessary additional
<sup>787</sup> Resident	No	tier of local government will be anv more successful.  We can't take any further increases in our out going
		costs
<sup>788</sup> Resident	No	There's no need for a Town Council. We are well
		enough served by District and County councillors.
		Another layer of bureaucracy is only a burden and
		expense.

<sup>790</sup> Resident	No	There is already an incredible excessive amount of
		beaurococy within Letchworth across both the council
		and heritage foundation.
		Residents are clearly are not satisfied with the service
		they receive from either party, with many community
		groups regularly commenting on inefficiencies and
		wasteful process from the council, and a lack of
		communication, large amounts of red tape and a lack
		of willingness to modernise from the heritage.
		This combined with the creation of additional Parish's
		will not only ensure residents will be required to once
		again bare additional costs for something which is
		completely useless, but it will be yet another layer of
		pointless beaurococy we will be required to jump
		through to create any form of progression within the
		community.
		We are seeing more and more people move to
		Letchworth from cities like London. These are often
		young, professional couples who are looking to start
		families, open businesses and invest in the local area.
		We should be creating environments reflective of the
		fast paced of modern life, and not setting up more
		councils, and committees which will ultimately halt
		progress and stop Letchworth from reaching it's full
<sup>791</sup> Resident	No	We currently have so much Anti-social behaviour on
		the Jackman's estate.
		Constant motorbikes riding along public footpaths,
		littering, drug dealing etc
		Maybe you should be investing more money on
		making Letchworth a nice place to move to and live,
		rather than on creating something as pointless as a
<sup>794</sup> Resident	No	Parish Council A further layer of bureaucracy along with the financial
Resident	INO	implications is completely unnecessary.
<sup>795</sup> Resident	No	implications is completely difficeessary.
<sup>796</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town Council, but it was disbanded
<sup>799</sup> Resident	No	Creating another layer of administration & expense

<sup>803</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth residents and tax payers have consistently
		shown they believe that the creation of a parish
		council was unnecessary since 2005, since then it
		proved itself unnecessary and an expensive waste of
		tax money taken from residents without limit.
		The parish council had cost Letchworth residents over
		2 million by the end of its first term (2009) with
		virtually nothing to show for it. North Herts wastes
		enough money as it is through bureaucracy as it is,
		waste in legal fees, paying huge sums of money for
		people who have left North Herts, nepotism and
		questionablly favourable contracts (which can be
		demonstrated through searching contracts on the UK
		Government public database) which year on year is
		then used as the age old coporate scam of "Spend the
		budget so we get more budget next year" to justify
		increases in tax (some of which is spent outside of the
		county).
		Another council will only further double down on
		Another council will only further double down on
204 D:	NI -	waste in my personal view, which is why I am not in
Resident	No	What is the clear benefit to do this in Letchworth?
		There hasn't been any links to documents supporting
		the measure. We went through this some years ago
		because a couple who were local architects and their
		friend, who appeared to be on a ego trip, registered a
		town council with very little input from the local
		community, then proceeded to take ~£50 precept
		from every house that mostly went on ceremonial
		chains and bugger all for the local community. It took
		us years as a town to get rid of it and in that time costs
		us hundreds of thousands of pounds! Unless you can
		show a clear benefit to the town, this just feels like
<sup>805</sup> Resident	No	There is no justification laid down / put forward to the
		benefits of an extra layer of governance in Letchworth
		We already have odds with NHDC and Heritage
		Foundation in planning rules and a further group
		would add to the concern.
		What would funding be used for? It is not clear.
		This doesn't feel transparent.
		rnis doesn't leer transparent.

<sup>808</sup> Resident	No	We had one before and it was a huge waste of money,
000 - 11		time and effort
<sup>809</sup> Resident	No	Further increased costs without any clarity on how
		increased governance will improve any areas or
		deliver material benefits. After several tax increases in
		recent years, value for the council tax is not perceived.
		Waste collection, traffic management, upkeep of
		public spaces, crime and anti-social behavior are all
		areas to be improved considerably. All areas are
		considerably worse off than 5 years ago
811 Resident	No	We have the heritage foundation in Letchworth which
		causes a lot of problems I do not think having an extra
		layer on the town council would be beneficial to the
		town
812 Resident	No	I strongly object as it would increase the already high
		council tax. An extra £22 to £121 is excessive - there
		should be cuts to the number of councillors, not
		additional ones
813 Resident	No	This would add an additional layer of bureaucracy for
		no clear purpose
814 Resident	No	Adding an extra layer of local bureaucracy would
		result in higher costs for local taxpayers, without
		bringing any significant benefits.
816 Resident	No	Another talking shop not required
817 Resident	No	This is just another layer of bureaucracy in addition to
		the Heritage Foundation and comes with additional
		cost. Don't see any value as a resident
820 Resident	No	An extra level of expensive councillors on top of the
		Heritage is not required. There are already too many
		conflicts. Spend the money on fixing the roads instead
821 Resident	No	We pay far too much tax as it is, only for most of it to
		be wasted. This questionnaire is completely pointless
		as I'm sure, even if 100% of residents voted against it,
		it would still go ahead. People like to pretend we live
		in a democracy.
822 Resident	No	Too many councillors for the area and too expensive
826 Resident	No	If the proposal is to replace the Heritage foundation
ricolderic		with an elected body, then I'm all for it, because
		they're nothing but a pain in the for residents. If
		you're proposing just adding another layer of
		powerless bureaucracy, then this would be a complete
828 Resident	No	waste of money. This is a waste of money. It was tried before and was
Resident	NO	•
		useless. I am not prepared to pay for something so
		unnecessary.

I can see absolutely no reason to install another level
of bureaucracy in the already complicated structure of
local government. This serves only to inflict more
burden on already hard pressed tax payers, and
would also point out, that this comes at a time when
central government is looking to introduce local
government re-organisation, that will likely mean the
introduction of unitary county wide authorities. At
what point would the creation of a town council for
Letchworth be deemed a good idea, and what would
its likely life span he?
There is no detailed benefit of having a new town
council but additional strain on the resources of
residents. A document detailing the pros and cons
would be beneficial. So far only 'con' has been detailed
and hence, I am not in favour of a new town council.
we have HCC / NHDC / Heritage Foundation which is
confusing and costly enough. Another layer of local
government would increase confusion and cost to
residents and add further delays in getting answers to
problems and things done.
We already have too many layers of governance in
Letchworth
I work full time and can barely meet my bills, I don't
need another increase in CT
This was done a few years ago which turned out to be
a complete waste of resources and ineffective. It was
in fact democratically 'unelected' by the people of
Letchworth who voted people onto the Letchworth
Parish Council with the specific remit of disbanding it.
One hopes this democratic decision by the people of
Letchworth is fully respected, by not trying to impose
another Letchworth Parish Council on us.
Any proposal resulting in increased contribution and
governance should not be considered. Despite ever
increasing council tax charges, services are reduced,
often under the guise of "CO2 reduction" etc. Focus
should be to work more efficiently, bring on-board
should be to work more efficiently, bring on-board technology and review existing processes to reduce
should be to work more efficiently, bring on-board technology and review existing processes to reduce overly complex bureaucracy and accountability.
should be to work more efficiently, bring on-board technology and review existing processes to reduce overly complex bureaucracy and accountability.  Creating additional governance layers is not the
should be to work more efficiently, bring on-board technology and review existing processes to reduce overly complex bureaucracy and accountability.

<sup>847</sup> Resident	No	Heritage foundation are bad enough already
850 Resident	No	The purposed changes will add additional financial
		strains on the house owners to pay for the 13 town
		councillors
851 Resident	No	The last town council established for Letchworth was a
		disaster, we don't need any more bureaucracy with
		the added financial burden on local residents at a time
		when many people are struggling with the cost of
		living. This is a very surprising proposal given the
		government is encouraging the rationalisation of local
		government to save money. The district council is the
		most appropriate body to manage local services.
		most appropriate body to manage local services.
<sup>852</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>853</sup> Resident	No	We are already sufficiently represented by North Herts
		Council so a new Town Council would be superfluous,
		a costly conceit.
<sup>854</sup> Resident	No	
858 Resident	No	Are these extra to what we have now? Or they
		replacing what we have now.
<sup>869</sup> Resident	No	simply not needed
870 Resident	No	Inevitable increase in council unacceptable. Previous
		town council which was abolished by public vote, was
		ineffective. Achieved nothing, but increased their
		budget every year.
<sup>871</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>872</sup> Resident	No	
873 Resident	No	We had one before spent loads of money on a chain
		of office did nothing useful and took 5 years to get rid
		of them. Completely unnecessary.
875 Resident	No	Did we not vote to remove this unnecessary extra
		layer of government just a few years ago when the old
		town council was disbanded? This country is broke
		and we can't afford it.
<sup>881</sup> Resident	No	We don't need a town council as proven previously!
<sup>887</sup> Resident	No	We don't need a third administrative body in
		Letchworth, we pay more than enough council tax and
		brown bin fees without further costs to the public. The
		previous Town Council was voted out in 2013 by
		residents.
<sup>891</sup> Resident	No	We don't need it. It's was abolished for a reason.
		Waste of time and money.
		Letchworth council seem to just ignore their residents
		views anyway.

892 Resident	No	We do not need a further layer of expensive
		bureaucracy in the form of a town council. When one
		was set up a few years ago it achieved nothing and
		cost residents increased council tax.
<sup>894</sup> Resident	No	No information is readily available on the matter- I
		searched for 1 hour online and found nothing. I have
		only found a negative which is a council tax increase
		(on top of the regular annual increases) but no
		positives. More information needs to be made
		available for this to be a democratic and transparent
		Drocess.
<sup>895</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>896</sup> Resident	No	This is an appalling idea. We used to have a Town
		Council and this was abandoned after a referendum
		because residents simply were not engaged with yet
		another level of bureaucracy. Elections for Town
		Councillors always received ridiculously low turnouts
		which clearly demonstrated a complete lack of
		engagement. How the Council can be even
		considering increasing the Council Tax for residents at
		such an economically difficult time simply to
		reintroduce a pointless and ineffective body is beyond
		comprehension. PLEASE ABANDON THIS STUPID IDEA
		AND STOP WASTING RESIDENTS TIME AND MONEY
<sup>897</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town council set up some years ago .This
		was deemed a failure and wound up after a few years
		.I don't consider that anything has changed and
		cannot see a reason to recommence a town council.
898 Resident	No	We don't need another tier of governance
902 Resident	No	Another layer of misgovernment is completely
		unnecessary. We have done without it for a century.
		The problem is that if people are appointed they will
		find things to do, required or not, and will use my
		money to do so. No thank you.
<sup>903</sup> Resident	No	We do not require an increase in council tax payment
		and more bureaucracy in times of increased cost of
		living. The last Letchworth TC was abolished not that
		long ago after consultation with people if LGC.
		Therefore this exercise appears to be repetitive and a
		waste of time and money. As a labour led council this
		proposal is contrary to your own party's rationalisation
		of local govt
<sup>904</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money

<sup>907</sup> Resident	No	There is no requirement for another level of
		governance. The last time Letchworth had a town
		council it proved to be ineffective, expensive and
		unnecessary and was abolished!
<sup>909</sup> Resident	No	Just another layer of bureaucracy and it was only
		abolished recently!
<sup>913</sup> Resident	No	Not necessary for another layer of governance.
<sup>914</sup> Resident	No	My council tax is high enough as it is without an
		additional charge.
<sup>915</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay more council tax.
<sup>922</sup> Resident	No	Yet more councillors costs and expenses to be met by
		hard pressed residents, no explanation as to what
		benefit will accrue other than aligning the dates of
		elections.
<sup>923</sup> Resident	No	I believe I pay enough for the current council charges.
		We have enough, people, departments, councillors to
		manage the current workload. More bureaucracy is
		not needed.
<sup>924</sup> Resident	No	It is another, unnecessary level of government. It will
		cost council tax payers more which is unacceptable
		and is likely to slow things down. Aligning wards with
		existing parish boundaries where parish councils exist
		does sound sensible.
<sup>926</sup> Resident	No	The previous Town Council failed miserably in
		Letchworth around 12 years ago because it becomes
		ineffectual by being sidelined by the local council and
		Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation controls
		and management. It becomes a useless quango that
		costs additional money for no return. I do not wish to
		finance this. The council tax is already increasing year
		after year with above inflation rises but with a
		decreasing level of nublic services. Forget it
<sup>932</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>940</sup> Resident	No	To many wards.

<sup>942</sup> Resident	No	We used to have a Town Council. It was abolished
		after a resident driven referendum because very few
		residents engaged with or supported it. At the very
		least you should hold another referendum (not just
		this feeble consultation) if you want to try and
		reintroduce such a pointless and unnecessary
		function. I suspect it is an underhand and somewhat
		devious revenue generating attempt. You're unable
		to raise the Council Tax more than the legal maximum
		so why not offload some of the existing tasks which
		you are currently required to perform to the new
		Town Council. Then raise the Council Tax further in
		order to fund this ridiculous new tier of local
		government. This attempt to squeeze more money
		out of local residents at such an economically difficult
		time for all of us should be soundly rejected. If you do
		go ahead with this ridiculous and cynical waste of
		money then I suspect you may well all be held to
<sup>943</sup> Resident	No	
945 Resident	No	Unnecessary expense
		Officessally experise
<sup>946</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>947</sup> Resident	No	A Town Council was created for Letchworth Garden
		City some years ago at great expense and little
		benefit. The move was reversed when residents
		realized the lack of value and I see no benefit in
0.40		reestablishing a further layer of bureaucracy.
<sup>948</sup> Resident	No	A new town council would affect my council tax.
		Letchworth vigorously resisted a new town council
		some years ago.
		There is already an extra 'layer' in Letchworth - The
		Heritage Foundation. We neither need nor want
<sup>949</sup> Resident	No	another 'laver'. We had a town council in Letchworth before. It was
Resident	NO	
		closed down in 2012 after local people realised it was
		costing more than £600,000 a year at that time - with
		no obvious positive actions by the council. There were
		several refendums when people of Letchworth voted
		overwhelmingly to have it closed down. Once one is
		set up it is very hard to close a town council down. We
		don't want to go through all this once again!
<sup>950</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town Council in the past and it was
		ineffective and costly - it added an extra tier of
		bureaucracy. We need less tiers not more.

<sup>952</sup> Resident	No	I see little value in adding another level of council to
		what we currently have - even considering the future
		prospect of larger unitary authorities replacing district
		and borough councils. Having another layer will only
		increase duplication and management costs, which
		will lead to an increase in council tax.
<sup>953</sup> Resident	No	We don't want even more tiers of governance. We had
		a town council before and it was costly and added no
		value to the town.
<sup>954</sup> Another	No	We have HCC; NHDC; LGCHF; and Letchworth BID and
organisation		only one is effective (the BID). We don't want or need
(Walkwel Ltd) *		another layer of bureaucracy, we need less. We had a
,		Town Council that was costly; ineffective; and added
		no value at all to the local area. Learn lessons from the
		past - please.
956 Resident	No	We had a toencouncil previously that was expensive
		and just a useless extra level of burocracy
<sup>961</sup> Resident	No	An unnecessary waste of money. The previous town
		council, which was recently abolished, achieved
		nothing and wasted taxpayers money.
<sup>962</sup> Resident	No	Town councils add little or no value and have very
		restricted powers we voted down the last town council
		for those very reasons and to stop the waste of money
		on the running costs of the council. We do not want
		even higher council tax.
<sup>963</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay an additional precept on my
		Council tax which is already very expensive.
<sup>965</sup> Resident	No	Unless the town council replaces the heritage
		foundation. In which case I would support it.
<sup>967</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay more council tax to get a Town
		Council. Previous Town Council was charging almost
		£1M per year (in today's prices) and delivering very
		little value.
		The previous town council was abolished due to local
		residents being very against it and campaigning to get
068 D : 1 .	•	it removed.
<sup>968</sup> Resident	No	I cannot afford to pay for more bureaucracy
<sup>969</sup> Resident	No	We have the Heritage Foundation and there is no
		need for a Town Council tier.
<sup>971</sup> Resident	No	completely unnecessary. Money and time is better
		spent elsewhere as opposed to more bureaucracy by
		the council.

<sup>974</sup> Resident	No	I think we should wait until reorganisation required by
		central govt. is decided and then see what might be
		necessary eg if no longer any district councillors.
<sup>978</sup> Resident	No	To much money added on council tax, we can't afford
979 Resident	No	We do not need another layer of government.
Resident	110	Especially when it means someone being on some
		local parish council whom only receives a couple of
<sup>980</sup> Resident	No	dozen votes. Why waste our money on this when nothing is ever
Resident	INO	actioned from residents?
<sup>982</sup> Resident	No	We don't need more councillors wasting our council
Nesident	INO	
		tax money adding more bureaucracy and getting
<sup>986</sup> Resident	NI-	nothing done The last time Letchworth had a Town Council it was a
Resident	No	
		disaster and was "disbanded." Therefore I am very
		much against this subject being revisited again.
		Especially if it is going to increase my Council Tax.
		Indeed I was one of the people canvassing to have the
001 D		previous Town Council removed.
<sup>991</sup> Resident	No	The existing arrangements work well enough.
<sup>992</sup> Resident	No	We already have the Heritage Foundation separate to
		the Council so don't think we need another layer of
		bureaucracy especially if it is going to increase council
		tax
<sup>998</sup> Resident	No	This is just adding another layer of bureaucracy that is
		not needed. It is a waste of money that could be
		better spent elsewhere.
<sup>1003</sup> Resident	No	I think I'm very poorly served at the moment by North
		Hertfordshire counsellor's and I can't see this being
		improved by creating a town parish.
		Was value include of payling anticodial habaticus and
		I've raise issues of parking, antisocial behaviour and
		given some suggestions about how the town could be
		improved but nothing has been acted upon.
		I've also highlighted this to the counsellor in the form
		of a letter and I've had no response.
		I would not vote for more bureaucracy when the
		current state of the bureaucracy is in such poor
		condition.
		It's already difficult to pay all the bills that are coming
		through on top of paying for further bureaucrats to

<sup>007</sup> Resident	No	We have tried a town council before and a
		referendum voted to abolish it.
		I fear this new proposal is only a means to circumvent
		the decision to abolish all local councils. If the idea is
		to save money then creating exactly the same number
		of councillors in the new town council seems like a
		way of keeping the existing councillors in situ.
		I can't recall the last time I saw a district councillor so if
		abolishing NHDC is a means to save money I am fully
		behind it
<sup>008</sup> Resident	No	I feel that we have enough beaurocracy in Letchworth
		with the council and the Heritage Foundation. What
		purpose would a Town Council have. My Mother lives
		in an area with a Town council and it does nothing
		except cost her more council tax
<sup>009</sup> Resident	No	I think it is incredibly poor decision-making to put
		forward this proposal, and the associated cost, during
		a cost of living crisis. I wonder what the salaries are of
		the people who put this forward? If a council tax
		increase was required in order to provide
		better/additional services, then I would likely be in
		favour, but adding (what is effectively) an extra level of
		administration serves only those who fancy the
		Councillor job title, and will not provide value for
		money
<sup>011</sup> Resident	No	If I understand it correctly this will increase council tax.
		Why would anyone think in the current climate this is
		a good idea. Nothing will change within the council but
		our bills going up.
<sup>012</sup> Resident	No	A Town Council is a waste of time and money. local
		government reform is reducing the number of
		councils, why would we want to fund these??
<sup>013</sup> Resident	No	The last time we had a Town Council it was a disaster
		with a self-interested one policy group becoming the
		council and pretty ignoring any sensible debate or
		reasonable approach. They were voted into non-
		existence at the first opportunity - it must have been
		the shortest Town Council in existence. Any repeat of
		that debacle would be sheer folly.
<sup>017</sup> Resident	No	Not sure what the benefits are other than adding
		another layer of 'management' which will likely cost
		more. If the extra costs will directly benefit Letchworth
		then it might be acceptable but without knowing key
		responsibilities and budget then my answer is No.

<sup>1018</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see how such a small geographical area has
		the population to afford better services than those we
		presently receive.
<sup>1019</sup> Resident	No	We don't need another civic body in Letchworth. The
		Heritage foundation and the herts district counsel are
		already enough - in fact if we could do away with the
		heritage foundation that would be amazing. Adding
		another level of civic red tape is a total no. We've had
		it before and it cost the residents of Letchworth
		millions for absolutely nothing in return.
		Lam not ius saving no. Lam saving no way, no how
<sup>1020</sup> Resident	No	I don't think we need a further level of bureaucracy
		and its associated costs. The councillors who
		represent Letchworth wards on NHC do an excellent
		job as is.
<sup>1021</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money, just like the previous Town Council.
<sup>1025</sup> Resident	No	This would be a complete a waste of money. Even the
		consultation is a waste of money. In the current
		climate to even suggest it is ridiculous. Are you not
		aware there is a cost of living crisis? Have you any idea
		what it's like for most people at the moment? This is a
		disgraceful suggestion.
<sup>1027</sup> Resident	No	Many of us remember the last time a Town Council
		was tried - and failed at a great cost
<sup>1028</sup> Resident	No	There is no administrative reason offered for the
		proposal.
<sup>1029</sup> Resident	No	It is not clear what quantified tangible benefit this
		change would bring. We should expect to see a drive
		to improved efficiency and utilisation of current levels
		of council tax, not an increase in multiple levels of
1020 5 11		bureaucracy at additional cost to local tax payers.
<sup>1030</sup> Resident	No	Much of the benefit/services of a parish council are
		already served by the Heritage Foundation at no extra
		direct cost to residents. Previous attempt at a local
		parish/town council resulted in extra costs with no
1031 Decident	No	discernible benefit for residents.
<sup>1031</sup> Resident	No	I don't understand the need for the extra red tape
		when Letchworth already has the Heritage
		Foundation, which seems to do the same thing.

<sup>1033</sup> Resident	No	I'll be honest, I don't really want to pay more council
		tax for a "Town Council" to which I have no idea of any
		tangible benefits. It would have been useful to
		understand what difference this would make to the
		average resident of Letchworth in the leaflet that has
		been put through my door. While we're on the subject
		of councils, I'm not overly impressed at the proposal
		that my general waste bins being collected once every
		three weeks. I look forward to the experience of 3
		week old nappies baking in the August sun. But hey, at
		least I'm getting another wheelie bin for my paper
<sup>1034</sup> Resident	No	No(t yet), on account that I do not understand the
Resident	NO	scope of the proposal or how the current system
		works.
		HOIAS.
		To agree, I must be convinced that proposed powers
		and influence of any newly established council, and
		subsequent improvements for residents will be
		commensurate with any associated increased cost in
		council tax and represent value for money relative to
<sup>1036</sup> Resident	No	not changing the system I can see no benefit to adding another council to
Resident	NO	Letchworth when we already have the district council
		and the heritage Foundation. It already feels as if
		neither of these organisation act well together or on
		behalf of the residents, so I cannot see how another
		body would fit in well to this.
		The only information given is that this will incur
		additional charges. At a time when everyone is
		struggling to make ends meet, I feel it is wrong to add
		further financial pressures to residents.
		Furthermore the previous town council took 5 years to
		dissolve, it clearly wasn't fit for purpose.
		It is clear the consensus in Letchworth is that this is
		not wanted as 11 out of 12 responses previously given
		where against the idea.
		I feel any additional budget would be better spend
		making the district council work better for the

<sup>1037</sup> Resident	No	l did not understand how anyone could think that
resident		Letchworth residents would be receptive to a town
		council considering the fiasco of the one that had
		been foisted on the town in the past and how long it
		took to get it removed, so I did some investigating.
		It seems that almost all the responses to the first
		consultation were negative but an amendment went
		forward to give us a say again.
		I understand that with the threat of the unitory
		authority there could be a situation where we might
		be left out - however - until then there is no need for a
		town council. When the issue is resolved I would
		suggest the residents of this very special town be
		asked again and a solution which includes the
		Heritage Foundation be sought but until then
<sup>1038</sup> Resident	No	LETCHWARTH ROSE NOT WEED A TOWN COUNCIL.
<sup>1039</sup> Resident	No	An unnecessary expense: ridiculous to put forward a
		proposal which entails an additional charge to council
		tax when people are so short of money and prices
		such as energy are so high
<sup>1040</sup> Resident	No	Waste of money
<sup>1042</sup> Resident	No	I do not see what improvement having a new council
		would make for residents
<sup>1045</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1046</sup> Resident	No	Before agreeing something like this would be good to
		understand the powers and budget they'd have.
		Potentially creating an extra layer of bureaucracy
		without much ability to do much. I'd welcome
		residents involvement but there needs to be clarity as
		to what would be the purpose. Would the district
		and/or county council devolve some responsibilities? If
		so. which?
<sup>1050</sup> Resident	No	Another level of burocracy and expense. Already been
		tried before and that was a disaster.

<sup>052</sup> Resident	No	This is not the time.
		It will increase bills during a stagnant economic period
		where we are all financially struggling.
		This will be complex and a time-consuming process
		that can place a significant administrative burden on
		all authorities when you should be focused on the
		things we care a out.
		The overall value proposition of this is not strong
<sup>055</sup> Resident	No	opough
<sup>058</sup> Resident	No	Previous experience showed little/nothing was
		successfully achieved by such a structure. Very
		expensive and we can't afford it.
<sup>061</sup> Resident	No	We pay enough council tax as it is, and lose services
		anyway, I do not agree with paying for a town council
		that continues to reduce our services
<sup>068</sup> Resident	No	The current system works perfectly well as it is.
<sup>069</sup> Resident	No	We've had a town council before and it was of no
		benefit to us, it was eventually disbanded.
<sup>070</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>072</sup> Resident	No	We dont need another layer of governance or
		bearocracy
<sup>075</sup> Resident	No	There is no obvious requirement for an additional
		level of governance in addition to the current county
		and district councils, and, in the case of Letchtworth,
		the trust which oversees the town. The fact that this
		additional level of governance will be accompanied by
		a council tax rise to pay for an unclear requirement is
077 Danisland	NI-	also a material issue that cannot be ignored.
<sup>077</sup> Resident	No	Much more information is needed to respond - what is
		the rationale for introducing a parish council
		structure? Is this linked to potential devolution
		proposals for Herts? What services will the parish be
		responsible for? This must be made clear to be able to
<sup>080</sup> Resident	No	make an informed choice As Letchworth already has the Heritage Foundation as
Resident	140	well as North Herts council, I see no additional benefit
		to creation of a town council. I particularly see no case
		for imposing additional costs on residents.
		It seems most likely that this proposal will create a
		further layer of bureaucracy which is more likely to
		delay than promote improvements to services in

<sup>1081</sup> Resident	No	No parish council needed
<sup>1082</sup> Resident	No	parish council does not add value
<sup>1083</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1085</sup> Resident	No	I cannot afford the rise in cost in council tax, I am
resident	NO	already on the breadline and not sleeping. I do not put
		the heating on, and cannot take any further pressure.
<sup>1086</sup> Resident	No	As we already have a county council, district council
		and a trust, I don't see the benefit of a 4th level
<sup>1087</sup> Resident	No	It's not clear what benefit this bring while also
		increasing cost in an economic environment where
		everyone's finances are being stressed
<sup>1089</sup> Resident	No	More layers of bureaucracy and more cost to residents
<sup>1091</sup> Resident	No	Added layer of bureaucracy. Additional cost to Council
Resident	NO	Tax . Not necessary .
<sup>1093</sup> Resident	No	The estimated additional cost is too excessive, given
Resident	NO	the 5% council tax rise this year.
<sup>1094</sup> Resident	No	There is no indication in this proposal of how life for
Resident	NO	people in Letchworth will improve in the event of a
		new town council being created, in return for a further
		increase in the already high and poor value-for-money
		council tax. What would a new town council do that
		the existing district council is not doing, or should be
		doing but isn't?
		At a time when council tax is increasing and service to
		residents is deteriorating, the last thing we need is
		MORE councils and more councillors with an unclear
		purpose.
		Please spend our money more wisely than this.
		l am opposed to these proposals. Please throw them
		in the bin and get on with improving services and
<sup>1097</sup> Resident	No	Struggle to the see the benefits of this change.
<sup>1098</sup> Resident	No	I'm astounded this is even being proposed. Are you
		completely disconnected to the difficulties working
		people are facing? The cost of everything has risen by
		such an amount people are struggling to buy food and
		you want to create a town council that took years to
		get rid of?!? Utterly ridiculous, you should be ashamed
		of even suggesting this at such a time. We don't need
		a town council, we need to get rid of jobs like yours
		and then maybe our already too high council tax could
		he reduced
<sup>1099</sup> Resident	No	No need for it and it adds expense onto households

<sup>1100</sup> Resident	No	I think we pay enough council tax without having it
		increased anymore
<sup>1101</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth already has a Heritage Foundation and
		District Council. The Heritage Foundation has elected
		community Governors very similar to Councillors, and
		is run under a Government Act. There is no obvious
		advantage to another tier of Government, indeed
		residents voted to abolish the previous Town Council
		after a short period of operation.
		If NHC wish to devolve services to a Town Council I
		would suggest a formal SLA be set up with LGCHF
		instead, and include requirements for more meetings
		in public.
1102 Resident	No	
<sup>1104</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary layer of town council that was defeated
		historically.
1100		Unnecessary expense to the taxpayers.
<sup>1108</sup> Resident	No	We tried so long to abolish previous perish not to
		replace it with another one. Also I don't see any
		benefits with the new proposed structure that will
1100 5		increase my council tax.
<sup>1109</sup> Resident	No	Why do we need a town council when all there is
		nothing in Letchworth but coffee shops and no decent
1111 D:	NI-	shops
<sup>1111</sup> Resident	No	No need for another layer of governance in Letchworth
		Not cost effective
<sup>1113</sup> Resident	No	Why do we need further councillors and pay for the
		privilege for something we don't want or need. We pay
		enough in council tax as it is.
<sup>1114</sup> Resident	No	We already have NHDC, HCC and the Letchworth
		Foundation. Adding yet another body will complicate
		things even more and cost us more.
<sup>1115</sup> Resident	No	I personally do not believe that the reorganisation of
		Letchworth's town council will provide any significant
		benefits, especially considering the additional cost it
		would add to council tax bills. The town already has
		several bureaucratic bodies managing its affairs, and
		this change would likely slow down decision-making
		and action across important areas within the town.
<sup>1116</sup> Resident	No	Expense

1120 D : L .		
<sup>1120</sup> Resident	No	I am against this as it is adding more bureaucracy and
		more cost to the residents. It is unclear what the point
		of a new town council is. What is their function that
		the council, district council and Heritage foundation
1122 Resident	No	are not doing? we do not need a Town Council in Letchworth
	INO	we do not need a fown Council in Lettriworth
<sup>1123</sup> Resident	No	I don't feel we need a town council. We already have
		NHDC, HCC and LGCHF. With the upcoming devolution
		of 2 tier authorities, now is not the right time to set up
		a new town council. How can we say what we
		need/want when NHDC and HCC will cease to exist
		and be replaced with 1-4 new unitary councils. This is
4404		really bad timing on your part NHDC.
<sup>1124</sup> Resident	No	It's just another layer of expensive government that
1127 5		rate payers would have to subsidise
<sup>1127</sup> Resident	No	It's fine as it is.
<sup>1136</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth Garden City has previously had a Town
		Council, it cost taxpayers money, it did not enhance
		local democracy and fell into disrepute because it was
4400		filled with self-opinated, self- serving individuals.
<sup>1139</sup> Resident	No	A Town Council was previously created with no
		material benefit to Letchworth and the residents
		elected to close the council. This will lead to a cost
1140 D : L .		increase to Residents at a time of a cost of living crisis.
<sup>1140</sup> Resident	No	I have found that the current Local Government
		organisation works very well. I cannot see any
		advantage in adding another level of burocracy. I
		presume that the new arrangment will require extra
		finance which iconsider is yet another burden we tax
1148 Resident	No	pyers do not need. I am not in favour of anything that increases my
resident		council rates and the establishment of another layer
		of administration by creating a letchworth town
		council inevitably will.Where is the financial benefit
		analysis behind this proposal?
1150 Resident	No	With other departments and businesses streamlining
		structural strategic roles with the aim to save
		residents from extra financial burdens your proposal
		would increase council tax for band d residents (which
		would be the majority of residents in that
		middle/working class sector) which would be an
		approximate proposed increase of +10%
<sup>1157</sup> Resident	No	There is no explanation as to what advantages or
		disadvantages there are to implementing this. The
		only information is this would increase the annual
		council tax rate for residents.

<sup>1158</sup> Resident	No	We need less government, not more. Town and parish
		councils convolute decision making and accountability.
		Having grown up under a unitary authority, since
		moving to Hertfordshire I find it frustrating that the
		buck is always passed between different levels of
		government. One authority makes it clear who is
		responsible and who to hold to account.
		I am simply not willing to pay more so one council can
		blame another.
<sup>1163</sup> Resident	No	No benefit recognised for this change. Also,
		Letchworth already has a management company so
		we would see likely duplication.
		Adding more layers of governance only makes things
		more complex.
<sup>1164</sup> Resident	No	No rationale provided, including what it would do.
<sup>1171</sup> Resident	No	LGC has the Hertitage Foundation. We do not need
		another layer of red tape incurring an additonal cost
		to ourCouncil Tax.
<sup>1174</sup> Resident	No	This seems completely unnecessary. There was a town
		council in Letchworth which was disbanded in 2013.
		This would be another layer of administration. We
		already have the County Council and North Herts
		District Council.
<sup>1185</sup> Resident	No	Additional layer of bureaucracy that is not necessary
		as we already have NHDC and LGCHF.
		Also extra costs when everyone is already under
<sup>1190</sup> Resident	No	pressure in terms of rising prices. I do not feel I have enough information as to why we
Resident	INU	would need another level of government.
<sup>1191</sup> Resident	No	A complete waste of money as the previous town
Resident	INO	council just wasted money on unnecessary items
		when the District Council could spend it more
		effectively
		enectively

<sup>1192</sup> Resident	No	We introduced a Letchworth Town Council a few years
		ago and then abolished it because it was useless and a
		waste of money, so I don't want to introduce another
		one now. Two tiers of local government here are
		necessary and sufficient.
		If the County Council and the District Councils were to
		be combined in a single new Unitary Authority I would
		then be in favour of creating a new Letchworth Town
		Council at the same time because a Unitary
		Hertfordshire Council would be incapable of
		satisfactorily dealing with the many local matters that
		affact our daily live
<sup>1197</sup> Resident	No	l expect the already elected representatives for
		Letchworth Wards on the N.H.D.C. to have the
		interests of both their own ward's constituents as well
		as for Letchworth town as a whole, foremost in their
		endeavours. If that is the case, as it should be, why do
		we need another layer of bureaucracy ?
		A town council will have little affect on the already
		unwieldy decision making processes of the N.H.D.C. to
		say nothing of adding to the existing burden of costs
		levied through the Council Tax system
<sup>1199</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1202</sup> Resident	No	With the cost of living in North Herts so high, I don't
		think the council should be making changes that
		increase council tax.
<sup>1209</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1210</sup> Resident	No	This will have no noticeable benefit to the day to day
		lives of residents. And yet it WILL have a noticeable
		effect to our wallets. There is no need for further
		expense. We should be looking for ways to reduce the
		council tax.
<sup>1211</sup> Resident	No	There does not seem to be any benefits as a resident
		by creating a new parish council for letchworth. I
		especially do not like that my council tax bill would
		increase.
<sup>1212</sup> Resident	No	Not interested in having higher council tax.
<sup>1214</sup> Resident	No	Given the history of Letchworth and local government
		and I'm sure what this new attempt would do
		differently to past efforts.
		No information is provided how the proposed town
		No information is provided how the proposed town
		council with work with the Heritage Foundation, in
		essence a too many cooks situation could develop.

<sup>1215</sup> Resident	No	It was a waste of money the last time serving no useful
		purpose. At present I see no reason it would be
		needed or would be any different
<sup>1216</sup> Resident	No	Not willing to pay the higher council tax
1217 Resident	No	
1218 Danisland	NI -	We do not need another level of a dealer mode.
<sup>1218</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another level of pointless, costly
		bureaucracy. How about you just do your jobs
		properly on a council level? Council tax has gone up
		and the service provided has declined. The move the 3-
		weekly bin collections and an extra bin is utter
1000 -		madness.
<sup>1223</sup> Resident	No	I haven't seen what services will be transferred to this
		council, neither have I seen how such a change will be
		funded, neither have I seen how this will impact either
		services or how it affects council tax. So to say yes to
		such a proposal is impossible at this stage.
<sup>1226</sup> Resident	No	We have just abolished a town council that was
		inefficient. Why would we create something that has
		recently been abolished.
<sup>1229</sup> Resident	No	I am concerned that this will mean an increase in my
		council tax
<sup>1230</sup> Resident	No	
1234 Resident	No	Better resources need to be supplied to current staff
		to be able to achieve smooth running of the current
		council and spread evenly throughout Letchworth. Not
		to make 5 wards
<sup>1236</sup> Resident	No	It is unclear about how this change will improve
		anything for residents other than costing more in
		council tax
<sup>1237</sup> Resident	No	Everything is getting more expensive and I don't see
		the benefit of paying even more council tax for this.
<sup>1242</sup> Resident	No	This appears to be unnecessary additional local
		government. This does not justify a significant increase
		in Council Tax for what I feel is little added value.
<sup>1243</sup> Resident	No	You should be reducing the councillors. After all, you
		have been out sourcing or reducing services anyway.
<sup>1246</sup> Resident	No	What a really stupid idea that cost working people
		more money.
<sup>1249</sup> Resident	No	The community rejected the last town council and we
		can't afford financial to suppprt this initiative. Services
		are deteriorating and budgets are tight so the last
		think we want it to see increase in our council tax to
		cover this initiative. Please do not do this.

<sup>1254</sup> Resident	No	Lots of work was done 12 years ago to abolish the
		parish council saving residents huge sums of money
		since. Why are we betraying the democratic will of the
		residents just 12 years later? I've seen no compelling
		argument for a change in the status quo.
1261 Resident	No	We already have a management company in
		Letchworth, we do not need a other layer of
		bureaucracy.
1265 Resident	No	The town council was abolished a few years back due
		to overwhelming lack of support for it. Very surprised
		to see it being proposed again. The feedback you've
		received so far is again aligned with this view!!
<sup>1271</sup> Resident	No	Warning that it may cost £22-£121 extra on council tax
		inclines me to refuse.
<sup>1274</sup> Resident	No	I don't see a benefit and I don't want an increase in
		council tax
<sup>1275</sup> Resident	No	The last attempt to establish a Town Council was an
		utter failure and did not provide any notable benefits
		for residents and was an unnecessary cost. We do not
		need to increase the cost of services for no return yet
		again.
<sup>1277</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth had a Town Council in 2008 and finally
		was disbanded in 2013. All it did was cost the
		taxpayer money and id nothing for Letchworth. In fact
		the very expensive mayoral chain is in the 1st Garden
		City Museum as a reminder to how the Town Council
		wasted money.
<sup>1278</sup> Resident	No	I do not feel it is needed. We already have NHDC. I
		cannot see how it would be worth the increase in
		council tax. There used to be a town council and l
		believe it was shown to be a waste of money.
<sup>1280</sup> Resident	No	I do not want my Council Tax to be increased
1281 Resident	No	
<sup>1282</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1285</sup> Resident	No	I have no idea of what it will do. Not been specified.
		Didn't work last time. I believe it to be a waste of
		money. We don't need another level of burocrats.
<sup>1286</sup> Resident	No	Already been through this and it failed.
		Why add another level of costly managemen.
		Never see nhdc councilors as it is.
<sup>1289</sup> Resident	No	The Town Council was a disaster when it was in place
<sup>1289</sup> Resident	No	•
<sup>1289</sup> Resident	No	many years ago, and was complex to disband. It will
<sup>1289</sup> Resident	No	•

<sup>1292</sup> Resident	No	l don't want any further increase in council tax. I do
		not want more talking shops. The council have enough
		people already to complete whatever new tasks are
		proposed for this new layer of administration.
<sup>1294</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1296</sup> Resident	No	We don't need another tier of government
<sup>1299</sup> Resident	No	It is a layer of bureaucracy that we don't need. We
Resident	140	have a Heritage Foundation as well who exercise
		powers over residents for planning, town centre
		development etc, maintaining the ethos of the Garden
		City for it's residents. It will add to council tax, provide
		wages for counsellors and will not return real value
		because of the size and authority of it's voice.
<sup>1304</sup> Resident	No	Absolutely not! Waste of money on stamps and leaflets
<sup>1305</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1306</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1307</sup> Resident	No	Too many layers of governance and no indication of
		any benefit for increased cost to residents
<sup>1308</sup> Resident	No	The proposal puts forward no rationale for creating a
		token council! Even if it did, there are enough layers of
		local government as it is and I would be extremely
		concerned about additional costs to council tax
<sup>1311</sup> Resident	No	I feel the existing council seems to work ok at moment
<sup>1312</sup> Resident	No	Too costly, you should consider changes that will
		reduce council tax not increase it
<sup>1314</sup> Resident	No	l recall that Letchworth formerly had a Town Council.
		It proved to be ineffectual and amounted to nothing
		more than an additional tax on residents. The
		residents therefore chose to have the Town Council
		dissolved, which was a long and costly process. I see
		no possible benefit to repeating the failed experiment.
<sup>1318</sup> Resident	No	A town council may be needed if a unitary authority is
		established otherwise, it's totally unnecessary in
		Letchworth.
<sup>1320</sup> Resident	No	Who wants to pay any more of our limited incomes
		out for no gain. When this so called working class
		government taxes us enough & has caused our
		employers massive national insurance hikes, leading
		to a pittance for a pay rise. While I pay for Joe blogs
		who doesn't work to live here.

<sup>1321</sup> Resident	No	I am aware there used to be a Town Council which
		was then disbanded. I understand this was due to the
		Council being expensive and not doing anything useful
		for residents. Why would we want to pay extra council
		tax for that?
1324 Resident	No	waste of tax payers money for even more councilers
		that will be overpaid and as ineffective as coucilers
		already inplace
<sup>1325</sup> Resident	No	This would be just another tier we can well do without.
<sup>1329</sup> Resident	No	There was a Town Council appointed some years ago,
riesident		all it did was to provide a further tier of bureaucracy
		and increase the cost of Council Tax
<sup>1331</sup> Resident	No	and increase the cost of countri rax
<sup>1333</sup> Resident	No	The previous town council was not wanted and
		abolished in 2012. The last thing we need is additional
		bureacracy, we already have hcc, nhdc and the lgc
		heritage foundation. Extra councillors with extra costs
		to be added to council tax are absolutely NOT
		required, the draft recommendation should be
1224		refused/withdrawn.
<sup>1334</sup> Resident	No	I don't agree with additional costs when council tax is
		rising substantially and services are being cut already.
		To increase administration costs when bin collection
		services and quantity of public bins within Letchworth
		have been reduced seems counter intuitive especially
		having recently abolished a town council to contain
4220		costs.
<sup>1338</sup> Resident	No	We had an unsatisfactory Town Council in Letchworth,
		abolition of which took us a great deal of effort. It was
		able to increase our Council Tax by an unacceptable
		amount despite having nothing useful to spend the
		money on.
		Please do not make it necessary for us to have
1245 5 11 .		another Town Council
<sup>1345</sup> Resident	No	We have already had a town council in Letchworth
		before and it was a disaster. This is just an
		unnecessary layer of governance that will cost
		residents money and make area committees even
1246 D 11 4		more redundant.
<sup>1346</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1350</sup> Resident	No	It seems to me that this will be an extra layer of red
		tape for very little gain to residents.
<sup>1353</sup> Resident	No	Why create another layer of bureaucracy that will cost
		me more in council tax - what we have is ineffective
		The Thole III Council tax - what we have is ineliective

<sup>1354</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1358</sup> Resident	No	There is no clear information as to the benefits this
		would produce.
<sup>1362</sup> Resident	No	It's another layer of bureaucracy. We have a district
		and county council, we don't want more. We want to
		pay less for our council tax. Yer we are paying more
		and more and getting less and less.
<sup>1364</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1365</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1367</sup> Resident	No	The previous town council cost us money and was not
		fit for purpose I do not want that situation again
1368 Resident	No	This was disbanded several years ago as it was not
		required.
<sup>1369</sup> Resident	No	Do not want extra expense and beurocracy
<sup>1373</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth already has the heritage foundation which
		does a good job looking after the town. I don't think
		adding another layer of government will help.
<sup>1374</sup> Resident	No	The creation of this new town council would result in
		increases to council tax - these are increases that
		many will find hard to bear.
<sup>1377</sup> Resident	No	Just another costly layer of bureaucracy
<sup>1381</sup> Resident	No	"History repeats itself, first as a tragedy, second as a
		farce" Karl Marx. Why are you trying to revive a town
		council after the pantomime of the last time.
		Duplication, people being elected on a platform to
		dissolve the town council, a court case, nepotism, a
		referendum and an appalling waste of money. All at a
		time when we have a cost of living crisis. I presume
		this proposal is because of the forthcoming local
		government re-organisation. Most of the current local
		councillors will lose their sinecures and this is an
		attempt for them to retain their titles and
		entitlements. My late wife was a senior LGO, so I am
		well aware of the self-importance and
		superciliousness of many local councillors, and their
		super emousiness of many local councillors, and their
		determination not to lose their positions. "Democracy

<sup>1383</sup> Resident	No	Like most people, I don't believe the current
		arrangements represent good and effective value for
		money. Suggesting we pay for another 13 councillors
		with their excessive benefits packages against a
		backcloth of significant increases in council tax bills is
		insensitive to say the least. It is interesting and
		significant that there is no mention of the benefits that
		an additional 13 expensive resources will bring to
		residents. An extra 13 expensive resources can only
		take money away from frontline service delivery which
1206 5 11 1		is average at hest
<sup>1386</sup> Resident	No	We already have other organisations who are active in
		the town such as the BID and the Heritage
		Foundation. We don't need an extra layer of
		government (this may change when we get a unitary
<sup>1387</sup> Resident	No	authority) or the costs associated with it. I don't believe the proposed additional council will
1307 Resident	INO	provide any additional value to residents in return for
		the likely increase in council tax. The focus should be
		on the more effective and efficient running of the
		existing council organisation to deliver better services
		more cost effectively. The addition of yet more
		bureaucratic structures is not going to do this.
<sup>1388</sup> Resident	No	More money and more tiers of local governance
<sup>1391</sup> Resident	No	
1392 Resident	No	We do not need another ineffective layer of
riesiaerie		bureaucracy at additional cost. The last council was
		disbanded not too long ago as it was so ineffective
		and a total waste of time and money and nobody
		wanted it. What has changed and what is the possible
		justification for raising this issue again. It is a complete
		nonsense.
<sup>1397</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1398</sup> Resident	No	We already have a small district council and the
		Heritage Foundation overseeing the town. We do not
		need another layer of bureaucracy and the costs that
		go with it.
<sup>1400</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1402</sup> Resident	No	We don't need an additional layer of local governance
		and I can't afford extra tax
<sup>1403</sup> Resident	No	This is of no benefit to me an not something I wish to
		pay for.
		Pag year.

<sup>1404</sup> Resident	No	We have had a previous Town Council which was
		disbanded and did not prove effect for the community.
		Also this would be another layer of bureaucracy and
		red tape that residents would have to endure for no
		doubt planning applications etc.
		I believe that it is the responsibility of the elected
		councillors to provide the support and help for their
		particular ward.
		Professional Control of the Control
<sup>1405</sup> Resident	No	We have been here before, the previous Town Council
		was a waste of time and money and was disbanded.
		We already have 3 layers of local council - HCC, NHDC
		and Heritage Foundation, we really do not need
		anything else. Especially at this time when all costs
		are rising, we do not need our council tax payers to be
		funding another layer of bureaucracy and increasing
		our already high council tax. Leave well alone!
1100		
<sup>1408</sup> Resident	No	Additional increases in council tax, at a time of severe
		financial challenge for so many, seems inappropriate
4400 =		and unnecessary.
<sup>1409</sup> Resident	No	Not in favour of reforming the council. We had one
		disbanded in 2013 which had achieved nothing, cost
		residents dearly to pay extortionate wages
		to councillors sitting on the council. We have a
		heritage foundation and a north Herts council which
4442		more than copes with our requirements
<sup>1412</sup> Resident	No	I do not understand what benefit there would be. In
		addition I note that there would be an increase in
		council tax. I already feel council tax is too high- rising
		substantially each year while service decrease
4442		substantially.
<sup>1413</sup> Resident	No	We already have suitable tiers of local government in
4445		Letchworth.
<sup>1415</sup> Resident	No	Unnecessary extra level of administration, involving
1416 D : 1	N.1	unnecessary extra expenses
<sup>1416</sup> Resident	No	We don't need another level of administration; people
		are disengaged from politics enough! Just make NH
1417 5 11 .		council work better.
<sup>1417</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see the need for it. It creates layers of un-
1421 D: ! ·	NI-	necessary bureaucracy and needless expense.
<sup>1421</sup> Resident	No	There is simply no need

<sup>1425</sup> Resident	No	I am strongly against the creation, once again, of a
		Town Council for Letchworth. This is another layer of
		community authority that never worked last time it
		was introduced and will certainly not work this time.
		We need a streamlined system that is efficient and
		works for the community at minimum cost. This is
		another layer of bureaucracy that will add further
		costs to residents monthly bills, which are already
		overstretched, with absolutely no improvement in
		services
<sup>1428</sup> Resident	No	It is unnecessary as we already have 3 District
		councillors for the ward and they should be capable of
		representing the residents. It also seems poor value
		for money and duplicative
<sup>1429</sup> Resident	No	There is enough representation and I do not feel the
		additional cost and bureaucracy warrants it.
<sup>1430</sup> Resident	No	l do not believe there is any need for it. It costs money
		with no real benefit.
<sup>1433</sup> Resident	No	This will cause an increase in council tax and is not
		required
<sup>1437</sup> Resident	No	People don't need the extra cost for something that
		seems unnecessary. The potential uplift in costs stated
		on the leaflet were so broad that during a time when
		many local households will be struggling with cost of
		living I think it's unreasonable. The leaflet stated costs
		that at the high end were five or six times more than
		the low end. How can such a range be given? You can't
		expect residents to consider something with that
		amount of variance built in, especially when it's in
		addition to existing council tax. This is clearly an ill
		thought out plan financially - and that's very worrying.
<sup>1448</sup> Resident	NI-	It should be cronned
1440 Resident	No	With NHDC and the heritage it's already complicated
		enough, I don't see a benefit to adding a further layer
1449 District	No	of bureaucracy Letchworth once had a Town Council. It served no
Councillor	NO	
Councillor		purpose for the residents. It provided no services that
		were not already available and was a total waste of
		money. It was abandoned after a public vote in which
		75% of the Letchworth residents supported its
		abandonment. So what has changed - nothing. There
		are enough financial pressures on residents with out
<sup>1450</sup> Resident	No	inflicting another wasteful quango. Sorry not exactly understand
Resident	INU	Softy flot exactly understand

<sup>1451</sup> Resident	No	There is no explanation as to how this will provide any
		benefit, only my council tax will go up to pay for
		additional councillors. If there is any money available
		for anything additional, please put the bins back that
		were removed. We already have an additional layer of
		administrative body in the Letchworth Heritage
		Foundation. We don't need another one.
<sup>1453</sup> Resident	No	I don't want my council tax to go up, also this seems to
		just be adding another level of bureaucracy
1455 Resident	No	I do not think we need a town or parish council it's just
		another level of bureaucracy that we have to pay for
		in our council tax
<sup>1456</sup> Resident	No	Adding another layer of bureaucracy to local
		governance is counter productive, this will also
		increase costs for households at a time many people
		already struggle with cost of living and already high
		council tax rises year-year
<sup>1458</sup> Resident	No	I can so no benefit to having a town council and do not
		want to pay extra in my council tax which is already
		extortionate
1459 Resident	No	We do not need another level of beaurocracy in
		Letchworth. The Letchworth Parish council was
		disbanded through public opinion and is not missed.
		Why is a new town council needed when existing
		district councillors carry the respnsibility for the
		wellbeing of their constituents.
<sup>1461</sup> Resident	No	We do not want to pay anymore council tax than we
		already do.
		Secondly it will make no difference to our part of the
		town and is therefore a waste of money.
1464 Resident	No	We had a Parish/Town Council in Letchworth and it
		was an expensive disaster, full of self-serving idiots
		who spent most of their time attacking the Heritage
		Foundation, invariably for personal reasons.
1469 Resident	No	We had a parish council before and it was a disaster
<sup>1473</sup> Resident	No	Not in favour of anything that will increase council tax
		other than cancelling the 3 weekly bin collections and
		going back to 2 weekly.
<sup>1474</sup> Resident	No	More unnecessary beaurocracy, less accountability
		because there will be more 'blame' placed on
		organisations outside of the parish council (eg Herts
		Council). More cost - what is the point of this? What
		objective do you wish to serve by doing this?
1475 Resident	No	

<sup>1479</sup> Resident	No	Extra expense of no use. This is a job creation scheme
		for people seeking unwarranted influence
		This proposal was rejected a few years ago
<sup>1481</sup> Resident	No	The draft recommendation is an unwanted layer of
		bureaucracy and expense. It is particularly bad timing
		in the current economic climate putting this proposal
		forward.
		A town council has been tried before and didn't work.
<sup>1482</sup> Resident	No	we had a town council a few years ago they did
		nothing spent a lot of money on what? we had to
		have an election to get rid of them. Why do we need
		another layer of bureaucracy we already have the
		heritage foundation who make life difficult enough we
		do not need another layer and I don't think at this
		time when people are struggling with finances this is
		an extra burden on their hard earnt money to pay
		hureaucratics rather than feed their family
<sup>1486</sup> Resident	No	
1493 Resident	No	There was a Letchworth Town Council before and this
		was dissolved and merged into NHDC not sure we
		need another layer of local government, especially if
		Hertfordshire might become a unitary authority,
		elected Mayor or split into West / Eastern Herts, if
		NHDC doesn't exist.
<sup>1494</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth once had a Town Council. It served no
		purpose for the residents. It provided no services that
		were not already available and was a total waste of
		money. It was abandoned after a public vote in which
		75% of the Letchworth residents supported its
		abandonment. So what has changed - nothing. There
		are enough financial pressures on residents without
<sup>1495</sup> Resident	No	inflicting another wasteful organisation. The direct benefits of Letchworth becoming a parish
Resident	NO	
		are currently unclear to me, while it is certain there would be an additional cost to council tax bills.
<sup>1497</sup> Resident	No	would be all additional cost to council tax bills.
<sup>1498</sup> Resident	No	Results in extra charges to residents
1500 Resident	No	We do not need further layers of costly governance

1504 Dog!-!	Na	There is no need to posther layer of reversees and
<sup>1504</sup> Resident	No	There is no need to another layer of governance and
		bureaucracy in Letchworth. The city works extremely
		well and I cannot foresee that adding additional
		bureaucracy will add any value to that which residents
		enjoy now. The city is a beautiful place to live; what
		value would a new town council add? And how would
		it justify its' additional cost to council tax payers? For
		the avoidance of doubt - any argument that additional
		cost is justified for "democratic dividend" is not valid.
		The city works well.
		In addition, the city had a brief foray into a town
		council some 10 or so years ago? It was an
		unmitigated disaster. The new council started its
		tenure with unjustifiable and wasteful spending on
		vanity. They achieved nothing (literally nothing). All
		was predicted before its inception and thankfully, the
		thing was disbanded, hopefully never to rise again.
		It seems to me that responsible organisations (public
		and private) should be mindful to learn lessons. This is
		one such example. I am surprised that,
		notwithstanding best practice to learn lessons, this
		dreadful idea is being reheated.
		Please. Learn. It is unwelcome. Adds no value to
		existing arrangements and adds costs for nothing in
		return other than addressing a political agenda for its
		own dogmatic sake.
<sup>1506</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town Council in the past which cost money,
		did little of use and took several years to get rid of. I
		see attempting to reinstate it as a retrograde step.
<sup>1511</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1512</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council recently. It cost a very large
		amount of money on the Council Tax with no obvious
		benefit. It did not consult with the people of the town
		and the only service it provided was cheap coach trips
		for the elderly. It did not get involved with either of the
		local councils in providing any service. I cannot see
		what benefit a town council would bring to
		Letchworth, and certainly nothing commensurate with
		the cost

<sup>1513</sup> Resident	No	A Town Council is completely unnecessary - we
		already have 3 levels of governance, with County,
		District and the Heritage Foundation. A previous TC
		was irrelevant - it was largely inactive and very
		expensive. Any possible activities were already
		undertaken by the aforementioned organisations and
		the many voluntary organisations which exist in the
		district
<sup>1514</sup> Resident	No	I see no benefit. NGHD serves the community well and
		Letchworth also benefits from the Letchworth Garden
		City Heritage Foundation. There is no obvious benefit,
		and is more likely to increase confusion regarding
		which council is responsibel for each service. The
		previous attempt to have a local council in Letchworth
		proved unproductive.
<sup>1520</sup> Resident	No	Already have enough layers of local government
<sup>1523</sup> Resident	No	I can see no benefit for this. This seems a pointless
		exercise and a waste of money. There is already a
		Heritage Authority and the Local / District council.
		Why do you need another layer here? Even the the
		proposal is pointless.
<sup>1525</sup> Resident	No	If this means the Heritage Foundation are abolished
		then I agree. Otherwise this would mean yet another
		layer of bureaucracy in a town already swimming in it.
<sup>1527</sup> Resident	No	Not willing to pay any more council tax. Establishing a
		Town Council for Letchworth is a waste of money.
		NHDC should be looking to reduce costs for residents
		and not increase them by establishing another
		quango.
		It's bad enough trying to get planning permission for
		changes to properties with NHBC and LGC Heritage
		Foundation without adding a Town Council into the
		mix.
		I'd prefer that NHDC spend some time and money
		trimming the powers of The Heritage Foundation who
		are accountable to be one
<sup>1529</sup> Resident	No	I'm totally opposed to a new layer of bureaucracy
		especially one with financial implications for individual
		residents. A few years back there WAS just such an
		organisation but after it progressively (inevitably!?)
		began to increase the amount residents were required
		to pay, residents decided to get rid of it. Do not go
		down this road again. The many organisations that
		currently operate in and on behalf of Letchworth are

<sup>1531</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town Council for Letchworth some years
Resident	140	ago, which cost extra money, and seemed to provide
		little in return. We had to fight to get rid of it, in which
		we were successful. I can NOT see the point of
		another layer of governance over what we already
1525 5 11 .		have.
<sup>1535</sup> Resident	No	I am not in agreement to this recommendation
<sup>1541</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1545</sup> Resident	No	I do not see the point in having another layer of
		government funded by residents, particularly in these
		difficult times financially. We already have three layers
		of government, Westminster, county and local. This is
		sufficient if not excessive.
<sup>1546</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council before. It was a waste of
		money and took quite a while to get rid of it. Residents
		did not want it and overwhelmingly voted for it to be
		abolished.
<sup>1547</sup> Resident	No	I do not think we need another layer of government to
		be paid for by residents.
<sup>1548</sup> Resident	No	l object to any decision which increases the amount l
		have to pay in council tax. It's already far too high;
		you should be taking all steps necessary to reduce this
		burden, NOT INCREASING IT!
<sup>1552</sup> Resident	No	No issues with current arrangements so why change.
		Will create another layer of bureaucracy
		Extra costs on residents
		What a waste of money, this is typical of local
		authority not spending money wisely.
<sup>1553</sup> Resident	No	I don't understand the benefits to me as a resident -
		the flyer I received said that I would likely pay more
		council tax as a result of a town council being formed,
		but as the benefits have not been explained, I don't
		feel I can support it as a proposal until I understand
		the rationale and benefits
<sup>1554</sup> Resident	No	I do not understand the need for further governance
		in Letchworth. I don't believe that yet another layer of
		governance will add any value, particularly in
		Letchworth where we already have the Heritage
		,
		Foundation in addition to the District Council, and I
		don't think residents should be asked to pay yet more
1555 Resident	No	don't think residents should be asked to pay yet more monev with dubious benefit.
<sup>1555</sup> Resident	No	don't think residents should be asked to pay yet more

<sup>1556</sup> Resident	No	We have the Heritage Foundation and N H District
		Council looking after our interests an£ do not require
		an additional layer of bureaucracy.
<sup>1558</sup> Resident	No	We have had a council in the past and it was a
		catastrophe, creating a lot of polemics and adding to
		the council tax. People voted to get rid of the council.
<sup>1559</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1562</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1563</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1564</sup> Resident	No	We have enough representation now I feel this will
		only complicate things , and make it harder to get
		things done more than it is now,plus the fact we pay
		enough now, and servic3s being cut back
<sup>1566</sup> Resident	No	Needless cost. Extra bureaucracy. Letchworth already
		has the needless heritage society. This will not help
		anyone.
<sup>1567</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth does not need an expensive parish council
		when we already have the Heritage Foundation. The
		North Herts Council is perfectly capable of running the
		town and surrounding area in this digital age without
		reverting back to a system that failed spectacularly
		just a few years ago. In this time of hardship for many
		the extra expenditure is unwelcome.
<sup>1568</sup> Resident	No	Just another expense residents!!
<sup>1569</sup> Resident	No	More spending by the council needlessly
<sup>1570</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth Garden City has already done this, realised
		it is of little use and expensive to run, and
		extinguished its parish council. Why are you asking
		again?
		We are already represented by NHDC councillors,
		County councillors, and also have the Heritage
		Foundation performing its own distinctly different role,
		and I feel that those bodies already represent us fully.
		In my opinion as a local resident, we do not need an
		expensive Parish Council
1572 Resident	No	

<sup>1573</sup> Resident	No	We have already had a Town Council in Letchworth
		and my late husband, Peter Groves, stood as a
		councillor in order to abolish the town council, which
		was granted in January 2013. Since we already have
		two governing layers , the NHDC and the Heritage
		foundation, the town council was a complete waste of
		time and money. The mayor's medallion, costing
		hundreds of Fs. is in the Letchworth Museum !!
<sup>1576</sup> Resident	No	No requirement for extra Bureaucracy
<sup>1577</sup> Resident	No	We had a town council once before but was abolished
		in 2013 as it served no useful purpose. I can't
		understand why we would repeat this mistake at the
		cost of council tax payers.
<sup>1580</sup> Resident	No	There is no need to increase the number of people in
		local government. There is enough if not to much
		representation. We need to focus on core activities
		and reduce unnecessary expenditure
<sup>1581</sup> Resident	No	l do not want to pay more council tax.
<sup>1582</sup> Resident	No	l do not want a rise in my council tax.
<sup>1585</sup> Resident	No	I'm not aware of any benefits and do not want an
		increase in council tax
<sup>1588</sup> Resident	No	We already have MPs and Councillors to address our
		needs/concerns. Do not need more especially not at
		the extra cost for the tax payer.
<sup>1589</sup> Resident	No	This is a totally unnecessary addition of a non-
		productive administrative layer of governance at a
		time of clearly and probably permanently declining
		national prosperity generated by both internal and
		external factors.
		[I should add the judicial curiosity that I am currently
		in limbo, as probate of my wife, who owns/ed property
		in the catchment has not been completed and so I
		write as a second home owner-to-be but payer of
		Council Tayl
<sup>1593</sup> Resident	No	Too much bureaucracy and I believe the town council
		previously got disbanded?

<sup>1594</sup> Resident	No	With the devolution white paper looking to proceed
		the creation of a previously dissolved town council
		appears to be wasteful of time and resources.
		If however the devolution is looking for town councils
		to be retained to allow smaller localities to retain
		some individual character that I would support. Our
		towns and villages all have unique characters across
		the county and what may work for larger towns,
		Watford for example is unlikely to work here due to
		location and town history
<sup>1596</sup> Resident	No	We already have the district council and the heritage .
		We don't need another expensive layer of bureaucracy
<sup>1599</sup> Resident	No	There's enough bureaucracy already in NHDC - why
		add yet another layer, with more councillors on
		generous expenses billed to taxpayers
<sup>1600</sup> Resident	No	Honestly I don't understand what a Parish Council or
		Town Council does, and the leaflet I received and the
		website information does not help me understand
		either. Perhaps some explanation around this first
		would educate me first before having to cast a vote.
		Also with the proposed merge to mayoral councils, is
		this level needed. And anything that might increase
		my already high council tax, especially if I don't
1601		understand the nurnose is not welcome
<sup>1601</sup> Resident	No	What purpose does this serve other than adding in
		another layer of bureaucracy and costing more money.
		Need to look at getting rid of Heritage Foundation,
		what value do they add?
<sup>1603</sup> Resident	No	With the Heritage foundation messing all updo we
		need another
<sup>1608</sup> Resident	No	When the economy is in a mess and council tax is
		rising, to add another layer of bureaucracy and cost
		on the residents is nonsensical.
<sup>1611</sup> Resident	No	I struggle to see what affect a town council can have in
		Letchworth with the stranglehold the Heritage
		Foundation has on so many aspects that would
		usually be the purview of publicly elected bodies
<sup>1614</sup> Resident	No	Looks like another unneeded level of beaurocracy
<sup>1615</sup> Resident	No	Do not need another level - a waste of money
<sup>1621</sup> Resident	No	

<sup>1624</sup> Resident	No	We are already well represented and I can't see the
		point of yet another body of people which is going to
		cost yet more money to us residents most of which
		will not be able to afford! With the rise in cost of living
		I think it's very insensitive to even propose something
		that will cost more and probably be as ineffective as
		other bodies that are supposed to represent residents.
<sup>1626</sup> Resident	No	Not needed
<sup>1628</sup> Resident	No	Our council taxes are already high, unwilling to pay
		more for a restructure which shows no clear benefit to
		me as a resident.
<sup>1630</sup> Resident	No	Reviewing the work undertaken by Town & Parish
		Councils, these local councils do valuable work, and l
		applaud the efforts of the unpaid councillors to make
		such a difference to their communities. I have
		answered "no" above because it isn't clear (to me, at
		least) how the proposed unitary authorities will affect
		Town & Parish Councils. When District / Borough
		Councils are abolished, their functions will be taken up
		by the unitary authority (or authorities) - but perhaps
		also by the Town & Parish Councils - I don't know. Is it
		correct that council tax under Shire versus Unitary
		administrations is broadly the same (research on
		Band D tax in England) - so NHDC residents' council
		tax will not benefit from the change to a unitary
		authority? And yet there is a precept payable for Town
		and Parish Councils. So, under a unitary authority,
		Letchworth residents will experience a reduced local
		service (since NHDC will no longer exist) unless they
		pay extra for a Letchworth Town Council instead.
		Perhaps I'm wrong about that - I'm just asking for
		clarification. To summarise, it doesn't seem sensible to
		be asking views on a proposed Letchworth Town
		Council without spelling out how the proposed unitary
		authority may affect residents.
		Perhaps if this issue was more clearly explained to me,
		I might very well have answered "yes".
		Thank you for asking for our views. Will there be a

<sup>1631</sup> Resident	No	The last thing residents need during the cost of living
		crisis is additional cost ontop of the 5% increase to
		council tax already. Given the upcoming cuts to local
		government funding it comes across as naive and
		counter intuitive to be adding additional layers and
		complexity to local government. Things work perfectly
		well as they stand.
<sup>1632</sup> Resident	No	This just increases the bureaucracy of the council,
		increasing complication, paperwork and cost
<sup>1634</sup> Resident	No	You have not provided any guidance or clarity on what
		this new town council will do
<sup>1636</sup> Resident	No	I can't see the sense in this 1) its a small area so NHDC
		councillors are fine 2) LGCHF covers a lot of stuff
		relevant to the town 3) there was a town council and it
		was abolished very recently
<sup>1637</sup> Resident	No	We didn't need another level of government
<sup>1638</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1639</sup> Resident	No	The cost of council tax would rise, and would services
		improve?
<sup>1640</sup> Resident	No	I feel it would be of no benefit to the residents.
		The cost of setting this up and maintaining its running
		would be prohibitively expensive.
		It's just an additional layer of bureaucracy. What
		would it achieve.
		As there is no upper limit as what could be charged by
		the town council it's just another council tax.
		The residents should be allowed to vote on such a far
		reaching change in local government
<sup>1641</sup> Resident	No	Current system works fine, no need to add extra
		layers and costs
<sup>1642</sup> Resident	No	Town council is the worst thing that can happen to
		Letchworth.
<sup>1643</sup> Resident	No	We just disbanded one bunch of idiots from the
		letchworth town council in what mad world do you
		think we require another bunch. Stop wasting our
		money on idiotic ideas.
<sup>1644</sup> Resident	No	We already have Herts County Council, North herts
		District Council and Letchworth Garden City Heritage
		Foundation. We don't need another layer of
		bureaucracy. Letchworth had a town council for a few
		years that was voted out of existence by the residents
		of Letchworth. It was not needed then, it is not needed
		now.

<sup>1645</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth used to have a town council and it was
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	110	
		abolished just over 10 years ago and everything has
		been fine. Why do we need to bring it back again
		now? It was a waste of money before and there is no
1617		reason to assume it will not be again
<sup>1647</sup> Resident	No	Don't need another layer of bureaucracy
<sup>1649</sup> Resident	No	Totally unnecessary. We have the Heritage
		Foundation. We do not want another layer of
		governance.
		This was reviewed previously and thought to be of the
		same view.
<sup>1650</sup> Resident	No	ABSOLUTELY NOT. NO FURTHER FORM OF
		GOVERNANCE IS REQUIRED.
		I HAVE BEEN A RESIDENT OF LETCHWORTH OF
		NEARLY 50 YEARS. THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION HAS
		SERVED ALL RESIDENTS VERY WELL INDEED.
<sup>1651</sup> Resident	No	We had a Town Council before and it was abolished as
		it was just a waste of money
<sup>1652</sup> Resident	No	Will likely increase already increasing council tax.
		Already pay enough and probably won't have real
		term benefits for residents, who are the ones affected.
<sup>1667</sup> Resident	No	The Letchworth town council was abolished in 2013. I
riesident		don't see any benefit to ourselves as residents. We
		don't need a town council or the extra cost.
1669 Resident	No	We cannot support yet more increases to our council
Resident	110	
<sup>1673</sup> Resident	No	tax It's been tried before and failed, it only succeeded in
Resident	INO	
1676 D:-I	NI-	wasting money.
<sup>1676</sup> Resident	No	I do not support an additional (and more expensive)
		layer of bureaucracy. One or two unitary authorities
1677		for Hertfordshire will be more than sufficient.
<sup>1677</sup> Resident	No	Anything that entails more cost to the residents forget
		it Letcheorth has been dictated too long by the
		heritage foundation who have destroyed veneer
		Howard's vision for our garden city and have sold off
		and gained profit from their selling of properties and
		farmland
<sup>1678</sup> Resident	No	The extra money needed would put too large a
		burden on my finances and it remains to be seen what
		if any extra benefit there will actually be.
<sup>1680</sup> Resident	No	We don't need another layer of bureaucracy.
		Letchworth got rid of the town council previously
		Ectenworth got no or the town council previously

1685 Resident	No	I am generally in favour of devolving local democracy
		to the lowest feasible level but not if it involves an
		additional layer of bureaucracy with no obvious
		benefit. The leaflet indicates an increased cost per
		household of between £22 and £121 per year, which is
		a staggering variation. but nowhere does it indicate
		what powers a town council would have and what it
		would actually do. I recall that, a few years ago, a
		Letchworth Town Council was set up and later
		abolished. As far as I can remember, all it achieved
		was purchasing a chain of office for the mayor! An
		additional issue concerns the proposed Council's
		relationship with Letchworth Garden City Heritage
		Foundation and any duplication of planning
1686 Resident	No	Any proposal that seeks to increase council tax does
		not serve as a benefit for any resident. We're currently
		living through a time of adversity, where people are
		struggling to make salaries last a month.
<sup>1688</sup> Resident	No	Didn't work last time and had a detrimental impact on
		Letchworth.
1690 Resident	No	There is no need for this. I do not want to pay more
		council tax
<sup>1691</sup> Resident	No	Too much Government already. No need for more
		administrators.
<sup>692</sup> Resident	No	If North Herts Council continues, we have wards and
		councillors already for local admin. We also have the
		Heritage Foundation which carries out some functions.
		Much more remotely, there is the County Council,
		which can be arrogant at times. If N Herts Council is to
		remain, and this is not clear from the documents I
		have seen, we do not need another layer of politicians,
		amateur or professional, paid or unpaid in local
		government. A parish(town) council is the weakest
		form of representation

1696 Resident	No	Can't see what additional value another layer of
		government would bring to local residents. I work in
		local government and don't see the benefit that town
		and parish councils bring. In most instances ward
		councillors are town councillors.
		Appreciate the district council may wish to pass on
		some of the services provided to a more local point of
		delivery but does that achieve best value across the
		district?
		How will a Letchworth Town Council work with the
		Heritage Foundation?
<sup>1698</sup> Resident	No	New town council why is this needed when the
		present system is just as worse as crime has risen in
		our area 3 weekly bin collections and high council tax
		and increases so to have another town council council
		who will end making further increases with less
1500		services.
<sup>1699</sup> Resident	No	We have enough bureaucracy already - another layer
		is unlikely to be useful and will just cost residents
		more on the council tax.
		When you write to councillors you're lucky if you get a
		reply. I don't even know what they achieve so why
704		have more of the same?!
<sup>1701</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1702</sup> Resident	No	More layers of administration are not needed and
		would add to costs.
<sup>1707</sup> Resident	No	The town already has the Foundation to look after
		some local interests. Having a town council would
		cause more confusion than already exists
<sup>1708</sup> Resident	No	Don't see a need for 3 town councillors for the grange.
		Our council tax is expensive now we do need any
		further increase.
		I moved from a village where I had to pay council tax
		at a higher rate for the parish council. In my opinion
		this is just another way of increasing council tax.
<sup>1709</sup> Resident	No	I don't think enough has been done to explain why we
Resident		need another tier of local government. Is this to
		replace North Herts when it is combined with
		something else? I can't be in favour of something you
		something else? I can't be in favour of something you have not explained. The only information online is
		something else? I can't be in favour of something you have not explained. The only information online is about this survey. Your proposal in the point above

<sup>1718</sup> Resident	No	we tried this and veted to abolish the last town council
1710 Resident	No	we tried this and voted to abolish the last town council
		in 2012 ,
		it was a disaster and a total waste of money .
		we dont need another quango.i am not prepared to
4722 5 11 .		pay for this
<sup>1722</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see the point of adding another layer of
		bureaucracy to the already existing one especially at
		the cost of increased Council Tax . Surely the best
		avenue would be to improve the efficiency of the
		existing system and not burden the rate payer with
		further cost at a difficult time for us all
<sup>1723</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1724</sup> Resident	No	I'd rather you spent money on better services, such as
		making sure pathways are walkable rather than
		overgrown by weeds & leaves.
<sup>1725</sup> Resident	No	I haven't understood exactly what this means other
		than an increase in council tax!
<sup>1729</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1732</sup> Resident	No	We tried it before no good
<sup>1736</sup> Resident	No	I have not seen any rationale behind increasing the
		number of councillors, and do not want my council tax
		to go up because of this.
<sup>1739</sup> Resident	No	We are adequately served at present, with the County
		Council, District Council and Heritage Foundation
		actively influencing the area. Previous attempts to
		establish a town council were unpopular and
		disastrous. Also, now is not the time to introduce any
		additional expense to burden local residents.
<sup>1740</sup> Resident	No	duditional experise to but deli residentes.
<sup>1748</sup> Resident	No	l am already subject to Central Government,
		Hertfordshire County Council, North Herts District
		Council & the Letchworth Heritage Foundation and as
		such don't need a further administrative body.
		Furthermore, it has been tried before and cost a large
		sum of money to hold a local referendum that voted
		against it. What did happen to the Mayoral Chain?
<sup>1749</sup> Resident	No	There existed a town council previously and was
		disastrous and thank goodness was ousted and only
		lasted for some months. What with the added
		expense to residents and no benefit, why do we not
		learn from our experience, and I am absolutely against
		it. NHDC and The Heritage are sufficient to serve the
		residents of Letchworth Garden City.

<sup>1750</sup> Resident	No	The area of Letchworth was to have a town council
		and that folded very quickly and turned out to be a
		total waste of money and an additional cost to
		residents without any discernable benefit, the one
		thing we do not need is another layer of bureaucracy.
<sup>1751</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth has already had a Town Council and it was
		a disaster and complete waste of money. The town
		does not need another layer of bureaucracy to add to
		NHDC and the Heritage Foundation.
<sup>1756</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1757</sup> Resident	No	Last time Letchworth had a town council the residents
		of Letchworth voted for it to be abolished. I am not
		prepared to pay extra for the limited services that the
		Town Council will provide when the District Council
		already provides those services already.
<sup>1763</sup> Resident	No	I don't see the need for this, and the fact that it will
		increase the cost to residents is absurd at this time
		of Council Tax rising to unprecedented heights, and
		benefit cuts. I have no wish whatsoever to pay more
		for town councillors and i see no way in which they
		would improve my lifestyle in Letchworth that would
		iustify this additional expense. No. no and no!
<sup>1770</sup> Resident	No	We voted to get rid of the previous Letchworth town
		council. No need to create it again.
1779 Resident	No	Another example of wasting money with no control
		over future increases when there is an ongoing cost of
		living crisis.
<sup>1780</sup> Resident	No	more expense, dont see the need for another layer of
		local council
<sup>1783</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1784</sup> Resident	No	Because it'll raise the Council Tax bill.
<sup>1786</sup> Resident	No	There are enough governing bodies to run the town. I
		don`t want to pay more council tax to subsidise more
		layers of bureaucracy.
<sup>1793</sup> Resident	No	I don't want to pay extra council tax for an
		organisation that will be of nobenefit
<sup>1794</sup> Resident	No	I'm not sure what adding an additional layer of
Kesiderit		
Resident		bureaucracy will achieve apart from higher costs for
Resident		bureaucracy will achieve apart from higher costs for residents at a time when many are already struggling
Resident		bureaucracy will achieve apart from higher costs for residents at a time when many are already struggling with bills
	No	residents at a time when many are already struggling
1804 Resident	No	residents at a time when many are already struggling with bills I do not believe that the creation of this necessary and
	No	residents at a time when many are already struggling with bills I do not believe that the creation of this necessary and is just another cost at a time of great hardship. Please
	No	residents at a time when many are already struggling with bills I do not believe that the creation of this necessary and

<sup>1814</sup> Resident	No	Parish councils are wildly inconsistent in quality with
		too many stories of scandal and infighting. They are
		not worth the additional funding cost to the council
		tax payer, and most of their responsibilities should be
		picked up by the local district council (and future
		unitaries).
<sup>1818</sup> Resident	No	Council tax is expensive enough without paying for
		something else. Also, we are served by the heritage
		foundation and local NHDC. Having a third entity
		doesn't feel as if it is needed. It would be good for the
		public to know exactly what the town council will do.
		What the members will be like and will there be
		enough diversity? Not just race but also enough
		relatable people for those who are working class and
		to those who are more affluent. Good representation
		is needed for a diverse town such as Letchworth.
		People are having to tighten their budgets and paying
		for something like this right now, is not well timed and
4040		possibly not people
<sup>1819</sup> Resident	No	It is not within my interest to have a district council
		when we already have the heritage foundation and I
		am against anything that may increase council tax
1000 5 11		even if that rise is only potentially a possibility.
<sup>1820</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1825</sup> Resident	No	Between North Herts and the Heritage foundation
		we're already well served. I do not wish to pay for this
		needless additional admin.

<sup>1830</sup> Resident	No	In 2012, a majority of Letchworth residents voted to
Resident	110	abolish the Letchworth Town Council which had
		existed for some years though many residents were
		, , ,
		left uninformed as to its purpose and achievements
		except that they had to fund it by increased Council
		Tax. Letchworth already has excessive layers of
		administration including elected Councillors at County
		and District levels, and the unelected Heritage
		Foundation. Too many layers risk duplication and
		confusion, and increase costs. Despite regular
		Council Tax rises, residents receive poor or
		deteriorating services (e.g. the infrequent town bus
		service which causes increased private car use), and
		Councillor-approved budgetary cuts (e.g. fewer refuse
		collections, and withdrawal of popular reference
		material from public libraries). A case for the
		proposed new Town Council has not been
		satisfactorily and succinctly explained. Unless the
		proposal entails removal of administrative layers
		elsewhere, real benefits as yet unexplained, all at no
		extra and preferably lower costs to residents, the two
<sup>1831</sup> Resident	No	I am concerned about rises in council tax and would
		like to know if levels are regulated, as they are with
		local authorities.
<sup>1833</sup> Resident	No	I belive the Letchworth Heritage Foundation is better
		placed to provide the roles and function of the
		proposed parish Council, if empowered to do so.
		Suitable forums between the proposed councillors
		and the Foundations could resolve and manage the
		risks, issues and opportunities such a parish council
		would consider. I believe this approach would work
		better for Letchworth and would be more effective
		and more cost effective than establishing a new parish
		council
<sup>1835</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1836</sup> Resident	No	As a Council Tax payer I cannot support something
		that is going to cause me additional expense for no
		benefit. Our council tax already rises and services are
		being reduced (bin collection)!
		ur vil till till till till till till till
<sup>1838</sup> Resident	No	We went through this several years ago and it was

No	A simple yes or no option is not sufficient here. The
	proposal for a new town council for Letchworth seems
	to be a response to the possibility North Herts District
	Council will be wound up in the coming local
	government reorganisation, and Letchworth will need
	a new tier of local government below Hertfordshire
	County Council. (The minutes of the Community
	Governance Review section of the minutes of the
	NHDC meeting of 27 Feb. 2025 contain this comment:
	"Due to the uncertainty in the future of the Council
	following the English Devolution White Paper it was
	important to ensure that Letchworth was not left
	without a town council.") If NHDC remains and the
	new town council is also created, we will end up with
	an unnecessary tier of local government which will
	cost local council tax payers, for no real benefit. My
	view is that it is fine to make contingency plans for the
	creation of a new town council, but any such plans
	should not be progressed past a point where they can
	be easily reversed unless and until it is certain that
No	
No	These are not the times to be increasing taxes on
110	households.
No	There is no clear justification for a town council in
	Letchworth on top of the other representatives
	already in place.
No	More layers of management and control are proven to
	be problematic and delay any suitable solutions. In
	addition, the costs to residents cannot be justified.
No	We already have Herts council, North Herts council
	and the Heritage dealing with the arrangements for
	our town. I really cannot see the point in spending
	more money on yet another council in addition to the
	ones we already have. It is already confusing to know
	which council deals with which activity one wants to
	enquire about. Having a further one makes it even
	more complicated to understand who is responsible
	for what and increases the difficulty for liaising on
	matters important to a resident.
No	<u> </u>
No	The local council should be dealing already with any issues & matters. Another layer of authority is not
1	No No No

<sup>1857</sup> Resident	No	Thank you for seeking the views of residents on the
		proposal to establish a new town council for
		Letchworth Garden City.
		We strongly oppose this proposal for the following
		reasons:
		1.Letchworth residents already have to navigate
		three layers of governance: the Heritage Foundation,
		North Herts Council and the County Council. Another
		level in the form of a town council would be excessive,
		expensive and unnecessary.
		2.Residents' Council Tax would increase to fund any
		new Council. Those who pay Council Tax (and not all
		residents pay in full) are already paying large amounts
		for little return.
		3.Perhaps the most compelling reason not to
		establish a town council is the fact that it has been
		done before and failed. A town council was set up
		around 2005. It soon became clear that it was an
		expensive exercise in futility, had no proper function,
		the councillors had no job to do and, thanks to
		concerned local residents, was abolished in 2013. It is
		very discouraging that, less than 15 years after its well-
		deserved abolition, the notion of a town council is
		being revived.
		Please, therefore, do not proceed with proposals for a
		town council for Letchworth Garden City.
<sup>58</sup> Resident	No	We need less bureaucracy, not more. This is
30 Resident	No	particularly true when the media is full of complaints
		about cost of living pressures and the fact that council
		tax is already increasing more than inflation. The
		proposal is to make both these issues worse through
		the establishment of a Town Council.
<sup>61</sup> Resident	No	1. COST of another layer in a tough economic
		environment.
		2. Our District councillors are doing a good job.
		3. Role overlap.
		4. I would like to see a different proposal such as
		direct citizen assemblies without an extra layer of
		councillors.

<sup>1862</sup> Resident	No	This has been tried before and failed. In the current
		financial climate to look to increase council tax on a
		new level of governance is irresponsible and totally
		unnecessary.
<sup>1865</sup> Resident	No	We will end up paying more council taxes.even if not
		straight away we will in the future.
		It always happened.
<sup>1869</sup> Resident	No	The increase in council tax will be difficult to bear. It is
		unclear if the benefits will outweigh the cost. It feels
		like an unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy.
		Will the town councillors have any new powers to
		actually do anything to improve Letchworth? Will they
		increase delays in the consultation and decision
		making process for Letchworth? It seems unlikely.
<sup>1871</sup> Resident	No	No need, wasteful. Town Council was disbanded some
		years ago after extensive campaign. Its wrong now to
		reinstate it in this way.
<sup>1873</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another layer of government to pay
		for, this has been tried before and rejected.
		Extra costs for ratepayers isn't needed
<sup>1874</sup> Resident	No	We already have district and county councils, plus a
		heritage foundation, we don't need another layer of
		bureaucracy (particularly if it will cost more in council
		tax bills)
<sup>1881</sup> Resident	No	I think it is a waster of money and everything works
		well as it is
<sup>1884</sup> Resident	No	l do not see the benefit that a new Town Council
		would bring. The Wards are represented already by
		District Councillors. I do not see anywhere on your
		website a case for the new Town Council. On top of
		that it is going to increase the Council Tax. This idea
		was tried some years ago and it was eventually
		disbanded.
<sup>1889</sup> Resident	No	I thought the idea of the reorganisation was to slim
		down the councils
<sup>1891</sup> Resident	No	A town council is not appropriate for Letchworth
		because the duties usually undertaken by such a body
		are mostly carried out by the Letchworth heritage
		foundation owing to Letchworth being a conversation
		area. Not many years ago, at great effort, Letchworth
		finally got rid of an expensive town council in a proper
		full vote to all residents so this has already been
		shown to be a majority view. I am not in favour of
		increased council tax to support a body where its role
		is already undertaken by others. Local representation
		should continue as present without increase to my
		council tay

<sup>1894</sup> Resident	No	Total waste of money on more talking heads, Given
		the financial climate, REDUCING COST should be the
		priority not increasing the size of government
		bureaucracy
<sup>1896</sup> Resident	No	absolutely against this- I remember the last time we
		had a mayor of Letchworth, it took ages to get rid of
		him! Council tax is quite high enough anyway.
<sup>1905</sup> Resident	No	At this moment in time we have the Hub, the Bid, the
		Heritage and local council. Why do we need to pay
		more for some one to sit in an office talking about
		things they want to do, and not giving the people the
		things they need. If the people in the council are not
		up to the job, replace them with someone who is. We
		do not need to pay more for less.
<sup>1910</sup> Resident	No	There was a Letchworth town council several years
		ago and it was a disaster with self serving people
		arguing about such things as whether they could use
		the old LUDC chain of office. Fortunately there was a
		'referendum' and residents voted to disband that
		council. In addition I object to paying extra for a
		council which I believe shouldn't exist, particularly
		when the government is reviewing the existence of
1012 D 11 /		hoth District and County Councils
<sup>1912</sup> Resident	No	We have enough with Heritage Foundation, District
		Council another layer just increases loops people need
		to jump through to get anything done and the cost to
<sup>1916</sup> Resident	No	residents  Simply no need to give complicate givetoms increase
rate Resident	No	Simply no need to over complicate systems, increase
		spending on additional councillors that will over
		complicate any decisions to be made. One council for
		North Hertfordshire and review of current systems
		and working practises would be more beneficial
		exercise to complete.
		Adding 13 councillors and increasing council tax on its
		residents during a period in which the country is
		struggling economically is a strange proposal. Money
		would be better spent on staff servicing North
<sup>1920</sup> Resident	No	Hartfordshire I cannot afford to pay even more council tax!
<sup>1921</sup> Resident	No	Cost and this is unnecessary. It has failed once before.
<sup>1922</sup> Resident	No	I'm worried about transparency, that if will be
Nesidelle	140	expensive for the residents and also no one will be
		able to question them.
		able to question them.

1036 D:	NI -	
<sup>1926</sup> Resident	No	Having spent most of my working life working for a
		local Council, I know from bitter experience that the
		more layers there are, the more it costs and the less
		gets done. What is so wrong about the present
		system? It doesn't need even more local Councillors, it
		needs dedicated Councillors who are prepared to do a
		good job for their constituents. It smacks to me of
		'jobs for the boys' and I am totally against any changes
		being made. We pay quite enough Council tax as it is.
		I would hate to have to pay more for yet another layer.
<sup>1929</sup> Resident	No	Extra cost to residents. Unnecessary governance. Too
		many councils/heritage foundations etc!! We need
		stream lining not the opposite!
<sup>1931</sup> Resident	No	I feel it's unnecessary and won't give value for money
		for all residents
<sup>1938</sup> Resident	No	l don't expect that an additional council for
		Letchworth would provide value for money. It's
		responsibilities would overlap with the Letchworth
		Heritage Foundation. Adding one would also seem to
		ignore the fact that Letchworth previously had a
		parish council that was abolished after a process that
		demonstrated that it was not generally perceived as
		useful
<sup>1946</sup> Resident	No	We do not need another layer of local government.
		The costs incurred in another level of bureaucracy will
		be another financial burden on households already
		struggling to cope with current community charge
1051		increases and high energy bills.
<sup>1951</sup> Resident	No	It appears that the initial plan under CGR was to
		establish separate Town Councils for Royston and
		Hitchin, with Letchworth not originally considered by
		NHDC.
		This omission seems rather unusual, but given that
		NHDC is based in Letchworth, perhaps residents of
		Royston and Hitchin feel underrepresented at the
		local level and therefore seek a council dedicated to
		their communities.
		If they strongly wish to have their own Town Council, it
		should not affect the situation in Letchworth, as we
		have already made our stance clear at the ballot box
		regarding such a body.
		Togethan goods a body.

<sup>1954</sup> Resident	No	We don't need an additional layer of governance, on
		top of the Heritage foundation. I'm not prepared to
		cover the additional cost required.
<sup>1958</sup> Resident	No	I am fundamentally against any new proposal which
		will increase my council tax bill. This is a time in which
		household budgets are already stretched. I cannot
		understand what possible benefit this proposal would
		bring, it will not make a positive difference in day to
		day life yet I will be made to foot the bill. We do not
		need more councils, we need the councils we already
		have established to be effective
<sup>1959</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth already has adequate if not excessive
		governance from Council bodies specifically North
		Herts Council, Letchworth Heritage Foundation and
		Hertfordshire County Council. There are no reasons
		that these bodies should not be capable of
		collaborating and managing the needs of the local
		area, listening and responding to views of residents.
		I consider regulations applied and costs of Council
		bodies are already excessive and further costs, bodies
		to consult, needs to collaborate are unnecessary and
1000 B : L .		uawalcoma
<sup>1960</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>1975</sup> Resident	No	Having had a town council previously that was
		abolished I don't believe there is a benefit for
		reinstating one at the residents (our) expense.
<sup>1982</sup> Resident	No	It would be ridiculous to have another body in
		Letchworth Garden City given that there is already the
		Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation and
		North Herts Council.
<sup>1983</sup> Resident	No	Why would we want to pay for yet another layer of
		unwanted bureauracy.
<sup>2001</sup> Resident	No	A rise in council tax is unacceptable.
<sup>2009</sup> Resident	No	Too many candidate, wasting our tax and more
		outcome from us is not relevant. Find more volunteer
		base candidate from area to improve our community.
<sup>2017</sup> Resident	No	We already have enough representation another layer
		adds more cost and unnecessary duplication
<sup>2033</sup> Resident	No	Adding an extra level of democratic structure will cost
		more money, will need more people to become local
		politicians whilst not having more budget to do more
		politicians whilst not having more budget to do more
		things locally. I'm not sure what the case is for really

<sup>2034</sup> Resident	No	Council Tax is already significantly higher than I would
		anticipate, increasing it to add more bureaucracy is
		counterintuitive to good management
<sup>2043</sup> Resident	No	Don't understand what a parish would do that is
		different to what the existing local goverment does.
		Certainly doesn't feel like an appropriate time to be
		introducing something that would increase cost of
		living for residents either.
<sup>2047</sup> Resident	No	There is no need for an additional, costly layer of
		government in Letchworth. We are already
		represented well by councillors and an MP. Local
		people, my friends and neighbours, already feel they
		pay too much council tax. A whole new parish is
		wasteful.
<sup>2070</sup> Resident	No	l was a member of Letchworth Town Council in 2009,
		and was proud to be part of the HELP organisation
		which eradicated the existing Town Council. It was a
		costly waste of money It is vital that we do not
		become inward in our thinking in this area, and,
		unfortunately, a Town Council would return us to this
		state.
<sup>2074</sup> Resident	No	A Town Council for Letchworth has already been tried.
		It resulted in extra expense for residents, with no
		benefits whatsoever. The previous Town Council was
		swiftly abolished. Please do not revisit an experiment
		which results in effectively a second council tax for
		residents and which has already been found to be a
		failure.
<sup>2088</sup> Resident	No	The Foundation seems to be managing Letchworth
		pretty well and this would add a layer or extra
		dimension
<sup>2090</sup> Resident	No	We have enough bureaucracy without adding more
		layers to it.
<sup>2091</sup> Resident	No	Letchworth is a well-managed town, and does not
		need any more layers of bureaucracy.
<sup>2093</sup> Resident	No	I think Letchworth is well governed and there is no
0407		need for a further bureaucratic body.
<sup>2107</sup> Resident	No	In this time of a cost of living crisis, with additional
		financial burdens on individuals and the council, I can
		see no additional value stemming from this proposal.

2111 D 1 L .		
<sup>2111</sup> Resident	No	I strongly object to the proposed establishment of a
		new town council for Letchworth.
		Our community is already facing significant financial
		pressures with the current council tax rates being
		increasingly difficult to manage for many households.
		Adding another layer of local government would
		inevitably increase our council tax bills at a time when
2112 D		living costs continue to rise
<sup>2112</sup> Resident	No	Another layer of bureaucracy and additional cost with
		no tangible benefit to residents as evidenced by the
2117 5 11 .		last Letchworth Town Council.
<sup>2117</sup> Resident	No	We are currently in the midst of a cost of living crisis.
		We have just been hit with yet another increase in our
		Council Tax. The last thing we need is a demand for
		more money to fund another layer of (unnecessary)
2110 5 11 .		bureaucracy.
<sup>2118</sup> Resident	No	The previous Letchworth Town Council was a waste of
		money. They proved before that nothing good comes
		out of it.
		Do not want to pay more council tax when every one
<sup>2120</sup> Resident	NI-	is struggling.
2120 Resident	No	The residents of Letchworth Garden City tried having a
		Town Council not very long ago, and they
		overwhelmingly rejected it in repeated public polls
		over a period of several years, and eventually their
		voice was listened to and it was abolished. It is very
		quick and easy to set up a parish and its council, but
		the odds are stacked heavily against removing it. It
		would do a great disservice to the people of
		Letchworth to go against their clear rejection of a
		Town council and all the hard work they did getting rid
		of the last one, only to have one foisted on them again
		at this time. Frankly, it beggers belief that a current
		NHDC councillor would propose setting one up at this
<sup>2130</sup> Resident	No	There is no indication of what the Town Council would
		do apart from an increase in council tax (see leaflet
		V0869_6 LETCHWORTH). Something similar was
		TOOOS_O ELECTITIONITY, SOMECHING SIMMIC TICS
		introduced a few years ago and was rejected by
		introduced a few years ago and was rejected by democratic vote.

<sup>2141</sup> Resident	No	I have not been given any reason whatsoever as to
		why or how a town council will benefit myself nor my
		family. I therefore feel that as families are already
		struggling to pay council tax bills that an additional fee
		for a town council would be an unnecessary extra
		burden. I also note that you only give an estimated
		increase for Band D. I dread to think what the increase
		would be for higher bands. We already have local
		councillors who do a good job for NHDC plus HCC and
		also the Heritage Foundation, we do not need more.
		Also given that the last Town Council was ill received
		and disbanded after the people of Letchworth voted
		unanimously that they didn't want it, why would good
		money be wasted now in trying to set up a new one!
<sup>2142</sup> Resident	No	I don't think another layer of administration costing
		more money is needed.
<sup>2169</sup> Resident	No	The last Town Council provided a very good reason for
		not embarking on another. There was considerable
		opposition to the previous Town Council and a vote
		took place to have it annulled. The money spent on
		the establishment of the Town Council would have
		been better spent on providing better conditions for
		many disadvantaged residents of Letchworth and not
		say, on providing chains of office for parading officials
		who seemed to achieve very little for the residents of
		Letchworth. I do not want to see this repeated.
		I have no wish to pay more council tax unnecessarily
		and remain strongly against the formation of another
		Town Council.
<sup>2175</sup> Resident	No	I do not want my Council Tax bill to go up even more
		than it has in the past few years. It is becoming
		unsustainable - and I do not feel I get adequate
		benefits from it in the first place (particularly the
		disgraceful state of the roads, particularly the
		dangerous potholes on the roundabout on Baldock Rd
		that links to the A1M road.

<sup>2181</sup> Resident	No	We already tried this, with [Letchworth Garden City
		Council] in 2005, that proved a complete failure and
		costed LGC residents far too much, for zero benefits
		(we have Hertfordshire County Council and North
		Hertfordshire District Council to provide All of the
		services that LGC residents need.
		Please see http://www.helpletchworth.co.uk/ for
		details of the successful petition in 2008 to "dissolve
		the town council" - this was eventually formally closed-
		down in 2013.
		PLEASE DO NOT REPEAT THE SAME MISTAKES AGAIN -
		LGC RESIDENTS DO NOT NEED A TOWN COUNCIL -
		NOTHING HAS SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGED IN LOCAL
		NOTHING HAS SIGNIFICANTET CHANGED IN LOCAL
<sup>2182</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree with this. I dont see the benefit of a
		town council and can't afford to pay out any more
		council tax.
<sup>2194</sup> Resident	No	Never want a town council again let alone pay for one
		since the last time we managed to get rid of them
<sup>2195</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>2204</sup> Resident	No	Not an effective representative process to control or
		plan the future of the area.      An unnecessary addition
		to existing representation.
<sup>2210</sup> Resident	No	No because it would mean more money going out and
		more levels of people to go through for a
		communication. It would be better to go directly.
<sup>2216</sup> Resident	No	We have a county council and a district council.
		Opinions vary about the value for money we receive
		from these councils but there is no escaping that ever
		year our council tax rises whilst services get cut. A
		parish council would be funded through YET
		ANOTHER increase in our council tax. After Aprils
		increases in energy costs, landline / broadband costs,
		mobile phone costs, etc. people are struggling to meet
		their current outgoings as it is. We do not need yet
		another council to offer very little (if any) value for
		money to add to the two we have to tolerate at the
		manat
<sup>2230</sup> Resident	No	paying too much tax already. we do not need a town
2222 5 11 .		council
<sup>2232</sup> Resident	No	
<sup>2241</sup> Resident	No	It has not been clearly communicated how this is
		beneficial to create. This is the first I have heard about
		this. I would have appreciated a summary of why the
		council felt this was important or beneficial before this

<sup>2103</sup> Resident	Yes	Support creation of a parish of Letchworth if it is
		certain that creation of unitary authorities is going
		ahead. Would not want Letchworth to be left only
		represented by a larger unitary authority in the event
		that North Herts is abolished. If a parish of Letchworth
		is created, the outgoing district council should also use
		its representation on and influence with the Heritage
		Foundation and new town council to encourage them
		to work together towards the best interests of the
		town. Unfortunately, the previous incarnation of the
		town council here was too much a product of its
		origins as a protest against the Heritage Foundation.
		However, the Heritage Foundation's scheme of
		management does not cover the whole town (the
		sizeable Grange and Jackmans estates being excluded
		along with a few other pockets) and there would be
		value in having a body democratically representing the
		whole town. The Heritage Foundation shouldn't be
		expected to double up as a de facto voice for the
		community when it has its statutorily defined
		functions requiring to look after particular interests
		only.
		Also, please make the name for the new parish just
		"Letchworth" rather than the cumbersome
		"Letchworth Garden City". The former is elegantly
		simple and historic, the latter doesn't even fit on some
		forms with automated character limits. We can rightly
		celebrate the town's important contribution to the
		history of the garden city movement and town
		planning more generally without saddling it with such
		an unwieldy name. Unlike Welwyn / Welwyn Garden
		City. the old village of Letchworth was completely
<sup>791</sup> Resident	Yes	With local government reorganisation set to merge
		existing district councils (Hertfordshire has no unitary
		authorities at present), Letchworth Town Council
		needs to be restored, as do Hitchin and Baldock Town
		Councils in effect (they have remained unparished
		since their respective Urban District Councils were
		abolished in 1974), especially given Letchworth's
		special garden city status and the need for decision-
		making to be at the grassroots level in order to
		adequately protect its heritage

<sup>2066</sup> Another	Yes	I think all areas should be parished in England
organisation		especially with the reformes proposed in the next few
(I'm		years, Not giving Letchworth a successor parish in
representing		1974 and abolishing the parish in 2013 was a big
myself as part		mistake.
of a proposal		
to parish all		
non		
metropolitan		
area in		
Fngland) *	.,	
<sup>997</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>2218</sup> District	Yes	With the proposed reorganization of local government
Councillor		wit the formation of a unitary government there will
		be a need for a town council for Letchworth to ensure
		that local concerns are heard and enacted upon.
		Town and parish councils play an important role in our
		local government structure and without one one in
		Letchworth there is already a noticeable democratic
		deficit which is raised by many local residents. Town
		councils feel very much. In touch with local residents
		and ensure that they have a say on important local
		matters. Even a District Council is too remote and
		does not meet frequently enough . The actual remit of
		town and parish councils will need to be looked at in
		the light of the local government restructuring but
		Letchworth as with the other towns and parishes in
		North Herts needs one . It helps to foster a pride in
		the place we live and a sense of community. I was for
		7 years a parish and town councillor in North Devon -
		and Mayor of Northam during the COVID pandemic
		when the town council was most in contact with local
		people.
<sup>6</sup> Resident	Yes	Seek a long term aim to abolish the Hertage
		foundation and pass its role to an elected body
<sup>18</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>42</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>43</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>56</sup> Resident	Yes	I would like the town council to take over running the
		Scheme of Management from the Heritage
		Foundation. This Scheme should be managed by a
		democratically elected body and democracy has
		slowly been eroded from the Heritage Foundation.
58 Resident	Yes	

focused on many high profile issues and overlooked the loss of effective representation.  The Heritage Foundation's governance fails to deliver to me accountable, engaged, democratically-elected representation. I find its representatives for too aligned with the Executives policy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common responses address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to distince information, the identities of Community prepresentatives on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to featessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as bifstrict Councillors do. Blections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.			
the loss of effective representation.  The Heritage Foundation's governance fails to deliver to me accountable, engaged, demoratically-elected representation. If find its representatives far too algned with the Executive Spoilcy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minuse for public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AcM minuses. The common response address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community prepresentatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.	<sup>69</sup> Resident	Yes	
The Heritage Foundation's governance fails to deliver to me accountable, engaged, democratically-elected representation. I find its representatives far too aligned with the Executive's policy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are courrently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of 'community representatives' on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do, Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  P. Resident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and sixt democracic.			focussed on many high profile issues and overlooked
to me accountable, engaged, democratically-elected representation. I find its representation. I find its representation is find its representation of aligned with the Executive's policy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are currently May 204.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do, Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish councils hould, and insit democratic.			the loss of effective representation.
representation. I find its representatives far too aligned with the Executive's policy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common responseg address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Persident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			The Heritage Foundation's governance fails to deliver
aligned with the Executive's policy and observing complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			to me accountable, engaged, democratically-elected
complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			representation. I find its representatives far too
public release are currently May 2024.  In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			aligned with the Executive's policy and observing
In my experience, very few governors make an effort to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are biacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			complete confidentiality. The latest Board Minutes for
to engage with the community. I am not sure what governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common responsee address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			public release are currently May 2024.
governors actually do, because the public do not even see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			In my experience, very few governors make an effort
see AGM minutes. The common response@ address makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.			to engage with the community. I am not sure what
makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.  There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  P Resident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			governors actually do, because the public do not even
There is no public register of trustee or governor interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.			see AGM minutes. The common response@ address
interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident Yes There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			makes it very difficult to contact a governor or trustee.
a private organisation. As an example of the Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			There is no public register of trustee or governor
Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  Pesident  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			interests, because the Foundation says it sees itself as
identities of "community representatives" on one committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			a private organisation. As an example of the
committee are blacked out and when they visit they do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			Foundation's reluctance to disclose information, the
do not give any names.  So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  President			identities of "community representatives" on one
So a Town Council would meet the need for representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  Yes  There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			committee are blacked out and when they visit they
representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  President			do not give any names.
report back to residents, much as District Councillors do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President  Presiden			So a Town Council would meet the need for
do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a good for democracy and engagement.  President Yes There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			representatives to fearlessly raise local issues, and
good for democracy and engagement.  Resident Yes There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			report back to residents, much as District Councillors
Resident Yes There needs to be more joined up thinking with the Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			do. Elections, rather than private appointments, are a
Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.			good for democracy and engagement.
Heritage Foundation which makes decisions that a parish council should, and isn't democratic.	<sup>70</sup> Resident	Yes	There needs to be more joined up thinking with the
parish council should, and isn't democratic.	. coldelle	103	
			·
	<sup>110</sup> Resident	Yes	p

<sup>111</sup> Resident	Yes	My yes answer is consequent upon any new
		Letchworth Town Council actually providing services to
		the residents of the town. The ill-fated previous
		Letchworth Town Council failed to do this - they
		precepted residents, gave out grants, but did not take
		on the provision of any services (even taking over
		some from the District Council). There is already a
		Royston Town Council (which I believe provides some
		services to the residents of Royston), and so that
		should be used as the blueprint for the establishment
		of a Town Council in Letchworth, as well as for Hitchin
		and Baldock. I do not wish to be paying a an
		additional annual precept on my Council Tax for a
		body that actually does nothing (which is effectively
		what happened during the previous short-lived
<sup>127</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>176</sup> Resident	Yes	I agree people should have more representation, but I
		am not clear about the purpose of this new council
		and the powers it would have, and how it would relate
		to LGCHF and Letchworth BID. LGCHF has too much
		power and not enough representation, and risks
		turning Letchworth into an undesirable area with its
		current approach to solar panels, external insulation
<sup>182</sup> Resident	Yes	etc. I presume this will cut costs
<sup>185</sup> Resident	Yes	Seems sensible, but I could not see it would affect me
resident	162	personally. Therefore uncertain why I was being
<sup>260</sup> Resident	Yes	surveyed?  Democracy is best served by local representatives
<sup>386</sup> Resident	Yes	More local democracy is a good thing! If the
		government ever decide to merge District and County
		Councils too, it will be good to keep more local
<sup>397</sup> Resident	Yes	representation in place.
430 Resident	Yes	
<sup>462</sup> Resident	Yes	I remember the last time there was a revival of the
		town council idea. I hope this scheme lasts a bit
		longer than last time, without the dissension of that
		period. Dividing the North Herts area into areas
		where decisions are made more locally seems a
537 Resident	Yes	sensible idea.
553 Resident	Yes	

571 Resident	Yes	
<sup>599</sup> Resident	Yes	I would like to know what the terms of reference are
		for the Town Council, what responsibilities the Town
		Councillor's will have and what the costs to residents
622		will be.
<sup>632</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>653</sup> Resident	Yes	I think this is a good idea. However I am not sure how
		Letchworth Heritage foundation will view this as they
		took steps to shut down the "Parish Council
		organisation " that was voted for some years ago. If
		we are going to have rethink on the way local
		government is organised in Letchworth then I would
		suggest that Letchworth Heritage Foundation should
		be wound down and assets transferred to the
		proposed new Town Council along with the Planning
		Department so that we have one "ELECTED" Planning
		department rather than the current situation of
		having to submit plans to two different organisations
		in Letchworth. Im not so sure that the "heritage "
676 Resident	Yes	The Labour government are bent on removing local
riesiae.ie	. 03	democracy by turning Hertfordshire into a unitary
		authority. A town council will be our last hope of local
		democracy.
<sup>680</sup> Resident	Yes	I am in favour in local democracy, ie. giving
		responsibility for the governance of an area down to
		the lowest reasonable level where people most
		affected are in charge of their own affairs. The
		problems facing Letchworth are very different from
		those facing, say, Royston or Hitchin, and the idea of
		lumping these three towns together under district
		governance, as at present, for the sake of convenience
		is wrong. Therefore the idea of a Letchworth Town
		Council, with its own statutory responsibilities and
		budget setting seems sound. HOWEVER, the obvious
		complication is the existence of the Letchworth
		Garden City Heritage Foundation, which already has
		town-wide interests and powers in terms of
		environmental responsibilities (including control over
		design and build of private dwellings), education,
		leisure, etc. There is an obvious potential clash of
		responsibilities and interests between this (largely
		unelected, as most people understand the term) body
		and a new Town Council; and this potential clash must

<sup>691</sup> Resident	Yes	I am but only if the preposed devolution of District
		and County Council goes ahead by the government.
<sup>722</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>792</sup> Resident	Yes	With the likelihood of NHC being abolished and a
		Unitary Council covering a much wider area, this will
		be the only way to retain genuinely local government
<sup>807</sup> Resident	Yes	
829 Resident	Yes	I've said yes because we need changes, but don't see
		the point because you will always do what you want
<sup>836</sup> Resident	Yes	
842 Resident	Yes	
866 Resident	Yes	Letchworth needs to be controlled democratically not
		by an unelected foundation
<sup>868</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>951</sup> Resident	Yes	Sadly this is only returning to what we had a while ago
		when the wealthiest in the town decided that it was
		too expensive and was abolished. This was partly
		because factions within the town council that made it
		less then democratic. Prior to that it was doing
		considerable good for those in Letchworth who were
		unable to visit attractions etc due to the expense.
		Whilst I would like it to come back I very much doubt if
		the powers that be in Central Government will be
		prepared to let it happen
		ргерагеа со тести паррет
<sup>975</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>985</sup> Resident	Yes	Need more info: what will the council members do?
		Will they be aligned to political parties?
		Will they be paid and if so, how much?
<sup>989</sup> Resident	Yes	Hopefully the proposed council could hold the
		Heritage Foundation in check.
<sup>1005</sup> Resident	Yes	I have already completed one survey form with a 'no"
		answer and now I have just read the draft proposals
		for the review of Hertfordshire councils. I guess
		there will be more of a need for a Letchworth town
		council on the 'demise' of North Herts Council. So I
		council on the 'demise' of North Herts Council. So I have changed my decision to a 'YES' hoping it will not

<sup>1059</sup> Another	Yes	If the town council can provide more joined up dealing
organisation		of issues that are currently split between different
(Syed Ali		groups such NHC, the Heritage Foundation, the
Lettings Ltd) *		County Council, and the BID then it could add value.
		I would be concerned though as that it doesn't
		increase the council tax needlessly which would put
		people off living here due to already very high living
		costs due to a lack of available accommodation.
<sup>1060</sup> Resident	Yes	Letchworth requires coordination at a town level.
<sup>1062</sup> Resident	Yes	A town council would allow greater focus on issues
		specific to Letchworth especially around investment in
		the local economy and supporting the vulnerable.
<sup>1063</sup> Resident	Yes	Governance of Letchworth isn't democratic enough.
		There needs to be more democratic accountability
		and control of local concerns specific to the town.
<sup>1078</sup> Resident	Yes	I feel Letchworth has suffered since the Urban District
		Council was dissolved, services have suffered and I
		think that the special circumstances due to the Fiscal
		advantages of the Heritage Foundation have had a
		detrimental effect on the level of funding applied by
		NHDC when compared to over local towns.
<sup>1117</sup> Resident	Yes	Local people
		Deciding On local
		Issues is what will get Letchcworth moving re
		Focussed on what will make it a better place to live,
		work and prosper
<sup>1121</sup> Resident	Yes	It will need to work better than the previous Town
		Council, which concentrated its efforts to opposing
		existence of LGCHF. Opposition to LGCHF is needed in
		respect of how they operate Scheme of Management,
		but must be done in cooperation with other local
		bodies, such as Decarbonise Letchworth. There are
		many other concerns with which Town Council needs
		to engage, particularly if Hertfordshire becomes a
		number of Unitary authorities
1160 Resident	Yes	Seems reasonable
<sup>1180</sup> Resident	Yes	To gather the grass root thoughts and concerns of the
		residents interested and affected by local issues.
<sup>1184</sup> Resident	Yes	I'm not sure that we need quite that many but a town
		council YES
<sup>1239</sup> Resident	Yes	I have answered 'yes' with the proviso lived in
		Letchworth otherwise! would not be in favour

<sup>1247</sup> Resident	Yes	As an urban area/town Letchworth's voice can be lost
		at a district and county level. Having a town council
		would give Letchworth its own voice on subjects that
		affect it.
<sup>1276</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1315</sup> Resident	Yes	Anything that displaces the Heritage foundations
		woeful attempts at rejuvenation is welcome.
		Letchworth needs a clear sighted policy to focus on -
		i.e. homes for working people and a better retail and
		leisure offer in the centre. The Heritage foundation is
		drifting too far from the cultural aspect - a town
		council might rein them in.
<sup>1366</sup> Resident	Yes	I think having smaller wards would be better, instead
		of say 3 councillors per ward have 1 per ward
<sup>1407</sup> Resident	Yes	With the move to a nationwide unitary model, there is
		a clear risk that local democracy and accountability
		will be lost. Reviving this tier of government will offset
		what are likely to be much larger wards in a new
		unitary and a larger and more remote local authority
1410 D : 1 4		than we currently have in NHDC.
<sup>1410</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1411</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1423</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1440</sup> Resident	Yes	With the new government's proposed Local Authority
		reforms, I think it is imperative that the residents of
		Letchworth Garden City are represented by a Town
		Council to ensure that local matters/issues and
		consultations are dealt with and reviewed by the local
		community and elected Councillors who work on
		behalf of the residents.
<sup>1441</sup> Resident	Yes	With the new government's proposed Local Authority
		reforms, I think it is imperative that the residents of
		Letchworth Garden City are represented by a Town
		Council to ensure that local matters/issues and
		consultations are dealt with and reviewed by the local
		community and elected Councillors who work on
1457 Danislani	\/	behalf of the residents.
<sup>1457</sup> Resident	Yes	Would this be removing authority from the heritage
		foundation for approval or rejection of planning
<sup>1462</sup> Resident	Yes	applications around house styling etc?
<sup>1463</sup> Resident	Yes	New Town Council would benefit Letchworth.

<sup>1476</sup> Resident	Yes	I think the current heritage council need someone else
		to be overseeing their business activities, business
		dealings regarding heritage buildings and green belt
		planning.
<sup>1478</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1490</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1492</sup> Resident	Yes	A Letchworth town council and civil parish was
		previously created in 2005. The arrangement was not
		successful and for the following 3 years no activities
		were carried out by the town councillors. The
		councillors could find no role to fill in Letchworth. 6
		councillors resigned through the futility of the whole
		thing. 6 new councillors were appointed by the Town
		Council without elections. It took many years of
		campaigning and consultations to abolish the town
		council, which was eventually achieved in March 2013.
		I do not understand why NHC would wish to repeat
		the failures of the past, where 75% of Letchworth
		voters supported the abolition of the then town
		council in 2012. I strongly disagree that a Letchworth
		Town council is required today, as further layers of
		bureaucratic governance, with their associated costs,
1560 Resident	Yes	
<sup>1578</sup> Resident	Yes	Make it a fairer system
633 Resident	Yes	Central Government plan on making HCC a unitary
		authority which means that NHDC will go - there must
		be a Body representing LGC which is not the current
		property management company masquerading as a
		protector of 'heritage' The voice of the people of the
		tow needs representation
<sup>635</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>703</sup> Resident	Yes	A great number of locals will make overly simplistic
		comments shooting down this proposal due to the
		increase in costs to their council tax, which is a
		disappointing response to an opportunity to increase
		democratic representation, and when a merged local
		authority is highly likely in the coming years. I'd be
		happy to pay an additional pound or so a week for the
		opportunity for greater accountability, the opportunity
		to enhance local services and to increase the
		community representation for our area.
		I hope the folks that respond no provide additional
		justification other than an increase in costs - we need

<sup>1720</sup> Resident	Yes	I am saying yes with the proviso that the Counsellors
		live in Letchworth
<sup>1745</sup> Resident	Yes	I am new to the area and would like to be informed
		about local affairs.
<sup>1761</sup> Resident	Yes	It sounds like a good plan
<sup>1775</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>1837</sup> Resident	Yes	I want guarantees that decisions are made specifically
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	163	for Letchworth and the immediate area, not subject to
		decisions made for example regarding Stevenage or
		Hatfield which have quite different demographics,
1077 D ' L .		needs and issues.
<sup>1877</sup> Resident	Yes	I think it would be good to get decisions made locally
1000		closed to the area they effect
<sup>1968</sup> Resident	Yes	With local towns all getting Parish Councils I feel it
		would be detrimental to Letchworth not to follow suit.
<sup>2166</sup> Resident	Yes	The number of representatives reflects the growing
		population and is necessary due to the abolition of the
		District Council and the move to a larger unitary
		authority. I fear local accountability will be more
		remote and less able to understand and respond to
		the needs of the town without a Town Council.
<sup>2227</sup> Resident	Yes	A Town Council would be good for the people of
		Letchworth, but it would need for the Heritage
		Foundation to be brought into the 21st. century and
		be wholly democratically elected, as with only 20% the
		governors elected by Letchworth residents it is
		basically a quango. History has shown that a Town
		Council would be short lived when up against a body
		with superior power and finances, especially
		concerning some issues where there is an overlap of
		governance
E/002 Resident	No	In Letchworth GC we have national government, Herts
		County Council, North Herts Council and of course the
		Heritage Foundation which is enough. Indeed the
		Heritage foundation seems to me to be at odds with
		the elected authorities.
		However, to add another tier of elected councillors
		and further increase the rates appears to exacerbate
		the rising costs of living. To evaluate the proposal
		properly we should be appraised of the services these
		new "councils" will provide to justify the proposed
		increase in rates, and give details of the amount of
		rayanua that this will accrua to the NUDC

E/003	Danisland	NI-	Very house policy of the angent party of the second	
E/003	Resident	No	You have asked for comments on whether or not	
			residents would like to have a new Town Council in	
			Letchworth. My response is that any proposal that	
			increases the Council Tax at the present time is not a	
			good idea. The leaflet I have mentions 13 Town	
			Councillors. Even if these are volunteers presumably,	
			they would be entitled to claim expenses – times 13.	
			I also recall that we did have a Town Council for a	
			short period within the last 20 years. Certain parties	
			felt so strongly about the cost of it to the tax payers	
			that they mounted a successful campaign to abolish it.	
			So why do we need to go down that road again?	
			From the above you will conclude that I am personally	
5,004				
E/004	Resident	No	Regarding the suggested Town Council for Letchworth	
			I can only say that I consider it a totally lunatic idea.	
			We live in increasingly straitened circumstances, and I	
			doubt whether things will ever improve in view of both	
			local and global considerations; to suggest an extra	
			layer of non-productive governance would be	
			plausible in times of milk and honey, but now???	
E/005	Resident	No	No new Town Council for Letchworth	
			1) We had Letchworth Town Council that was	
			disbanded	
			2) The Council Tax is increasing year by year	
			3) Currently we are paying over £2800 per year on	
			Band E	
			4) Electricity bill up	
			5) gas x electricity gone up	
			6) Car Tax Up	
			7) Income Tay up	_

LILLEY							
			Election dates		N Cllr	5	
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason		

<sup>167</sup> Resident	No	We don't need any more cost! The cost of the leaflets,	Yes	Numbers of councillors are too high anyway.
		the completion of the review, (and I KNOW how long it		We never see ours either! PS question 15 has
		takes to craft questions - and surveys such as this),		been repeated further above in the survey, at
		and then the cost of implementing subsequent		least twice. That must have taken ages to
		changes, should they go through are completely		create.
		unnecessary. Current councillors need to concentrate		
277		on their task in hand.		
<sup>277</sup> Resident	No	This exercise is costing money when other areas are	No	
		experiencing cuts - believe us when we said no 10 or		
3CE D : 1		so years ago.		
<sup>365</sup> Resident	No	NO.	Yes	I would be in favour or doing away with all the
				other councils (parish and town) apart from the
				main council. Then there is one place for
414 Resident	NI-	1	V	customer to get everything resolved.
414 Resident	No	I don't see why things need to change in this area it	Yes	Songs it's an odd number so they can make a
		just seems to be changed for change sake it's just		decision I don't care they students seem to be
		gonna cost money.		making decisions about things are that great I
				don't know who makes a decisions to remove
<sup>503</sup> Resident	No		No	bins for example.
<sup>914</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>915</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>968</sup> Resident	No	The additional costs will provide no additional service	Yes	
<sup>1006</sup> Resident	No	l want the right to reelect or change every 4 years	No	Local views should be encouraged
<sup>1223</sup> Resident	No	Again, I have seen no projection on how this will affect	No	Again, I have seen no projection on how this will
		local services or their funding.		affect local services or their funding.
<sup>1631</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>1691</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>822</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
826 Resident	Yes	I feel that recent developments in the ethics of	No	More people, more diversity of opinion. More
		modern politicians, or lack thereof, have highlighted		councillors gives the people more chances to
		the total lack of accountability in british politics.		overcome a dishonest or biased council.
		Having but one vote every 5 years to send a message		
		to elected officials is pointless. One vote every four		
		years is equally pointless, but it's a step in the right		
		direction.		
<sup>894</sup> Resident	Yes	not bothered either way	Yes	
<sup>962</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1150</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1362</sup> Resident	Yes	Have less elections, making it simpler and more cost	Yes	To reduce costs
4627		effective		
<sup>1637</sup> Resident	Yes		No	

<sup>1732</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>553</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>1059</sup> Another	Yes	Having the electoral cycle fall in line with NH District	Yes	It would reduce overheads and improve focus.	
organisation		elections would encourage greater participation since			
(Syed Ali		people would be voting already.			
Lettings Ltd)	*				
<sup>1060</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>1703</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes		
<sup>E/006</sup> Resident	Yes	1. To change election dates to be in line with NHC	No	1. To change election dates to be in line with	
		elections – agree		NHC elections – agree	
		2. To reduce the number of parish councillors to 5 -		2. To reduce the number of parish councillors	
		disagree for the reasons below:		to 5 – disagree for the reasons below:	
		The Parish Council should remain with 7 Councillors to		The Parish Council should remain with 7	
		prevent the higher risk of inquorate meetings should		Councillors to prevent the higher risk of	
		the number be reduced to 5 and also to prevent more		inquorate meetings should the number be	
		pressure being put on fewer Councillors in respect of		reduced to 5 and also to prevent more pressure	
		projects they may carry out.		being put on fewer Councillors in respect of	
				projects they may carry out	

# **NUTHAMPSTEAD**

D Capacity	Response	Reason
<sup>2104</sup> Resident	No	Nuthampstead presently only has a parish meeting,
		not a parish council. If we are moving to unitary
		authorities, parish meetings may not be an effective
		way for the voice of the community to be heard at the
		larger unitary authority level. I would suggest either
		creating a grouped parish council for Barkway and
		Nuthampstead, or formally merging Nuthampstead
		back into Barkway parish. Barkway Parish Council and
		Nuthampstead Parish Meeting have worked together
		for some time, notably on the creation of the Barkway
		and Nuthampstead Neighbourhood Plan.
		Nuthampstead was also historically part of the parish
		of Barkway, and remains so for ecclesiastical
		purposes. It only became a civil parish in 1866
		because it was a hamlet which had its own overseer of
		the poor - the legal definition of civil parish was
		changed in 1866 to be the areas used for the

FLEY				
		Election dates		N Clirs
Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>13</sup> Parish/Town	No	Reduction would hamper good representation in the	No	As above
Councillor		PC, there appears to be no fiscal reason for reduction		
(Offley Parish)		as Parish Councillors are not paid		
<sup>17</sup> Resident	No	Parish councils are very important to us residents they	No	
		are critical to the local infrastructure and indeed they		
		could do with having more powers over affairs that		
		affect their local residents as I feel county councillors		
		do not do much a bit like central government.		
<sup>83</sup> Parish/Town	No	We have a healthy PC all are volunteers there is no	No	The current number of councillors allows a
Councillor		financial gain in reducing the number of councillors.		spread of the workload.
(Offley Parish		-		
Council)				
<sup>87</sup> Parish/Town	No	Whilst I understand cost cutting measures, this idea	No	See above
Councillor		has no relevance as we are all volunteers! Wether		
(Offley Parish		there are 7 or 9 makes no difference at all, just a		
Council)		stronger team looking after our parish.		
<sup>94</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1906</sup> Resident	No	I think5 years is too long, even if it only happens once	Yes	If they cannot fight for their constituents like
				ours was regarding an issue that will devastate
				the area forever. was he could not speak on our
				behalf. So is there any point
<sup>11</sup> Parish or Towr	n Yes	It all makes sense	No	All councillors are volunteers and unpaid.
council (Offley				Cannot see what the changes will gain for a
Parish Council				Parish Council
<sup>20</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>72</sup> Resident	Yes		No	It would be helpful to understand the rationale
				for this
<sup>116</sup> Parish/Town	Yes		No	We function very well as a Parish Council, we
Councillor				are all volunteers so it costs nothing to have the
(Offley Parish				number we currently have and we are one of
Council)				the few PCs which are always Quorate and do
				not have a problem recruiting. Why break
				something which does not need fixing? Also
				please note that as volunteers many of us are
				employed full time so having the number of
				Parish Councillors we have means we can
				always have somebody available for committee
				meetings, projects, and liaising with the local
				racidants

North Herts District elections in 2032?	reducing the number from 9 to 7. Those
	representing the Parish do it on a voluntary
	unpaid basis. Spend their own time dealing with
	queries, plans, etc. etc.

PIR	PIRTON					
			Election dates		N Clirs	
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
	83 Parish/Town Councillor (Offley Parish Council) 122 District	No	It's not necessary, we are a busy PC and have a lot of work with the Developers, around Cockernhoe.	No		
	Councillor	163		163		
	<sup>59</sup> Resident	Yes		No		
	155 Parish/Town Councillor (Pirton Parish Council)	Yes		No	We currently have 7 councillors and really need more to cover all the areas of work we are responsible for. We are very active and want to recruit new councillors, especially younger residents from the new estates and reducing the number of councillors to 7 would prevent this. Current councillors all have many areas of responsibility. For example, I am a councillor, a trustee of the Bury Trust and a representative on the Pirton Village Hall committee. We need more councillors, not less, and we do all this work voluntarily for the village at no cost. It makes no sense what so ever to reduce the	
	<sup>1466</sup> Resident	Yes	This could encourage people to vote in Parish Councill Elections if it is couple with the district elections. Currently it is difficult to get people to vote in parish council elections.	No	I can't see any need for this. In reality a number of councils operate at below the 'required' level and I fear if that if it is reduced it will end up with less people coming forward. In addition there are increasing duties and responsibilities for Parish Councils so more councilors helps spread the considerable workload.	

<sup>1716</sup> Parish/Town	Yes		No	We are a very active Parish and as such have
Councillor				many things/tasks which we Councillors do. As
(Pirton Parish				volunteers we don't all have time to do
Council)				everything and so reducing the number of
				Parish Councillors from 9 to 7 will squeeze
				those tasks and mean that we can't provide the
				same level of service as our Parishioners have
				come to expect. As the council is not paying for
				our services, it seems illogical as to why you
				would wish to reduce our numbers - even
				though we only currently have filled 7 or our
				places in the past we have had a full quota
<sup>1796</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1888</sup> Resident	Yes	It seems sensible to align the elections.	Yes	Pirton PC has struggled to find councillors for a
				number of years, resulting in uncontested
				elections, which are not ideal.

1969 Parish or Town Yes	No	Pirton Parish Council indicated in the first
council (The		consultation on NHDC's Community
Pirton Parish		Governance Review that we wished to retain 9
Council) *		Council seats that we have now. The NHDC has
		responded with proposals to reduce the
		number of elected Councillors to 7.
		We wish nonetheless to retain 9 places, for the
		reasons we give below.
		We have considered the paper that constitutes
		the consultation paper, particularly paragraphs
		7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, and 8.10. So, we will address
		the approach to be taken under the Local
		Government and Public Health Involvement Act
		2007, and the government guideline/ advice on
		these matters.
		First of all, we note that there should be regard
		"to the need to secure that community
		governance within the area under review
		reflects the identities and interests of the
		community in that area, and is effective and
		convenient." (LG Act 2007).
		The Government Guidence notes that the
		identities and interests of communities should
		be identified before the governance
		arrangements are considered. We will
		endeavour to assist NHDC on this.
		Finally, the aim of a Community Governance
		Review is to ensure that communities'
		governance arrangements are appropriate at a
		local level, recognising the different situations
		within each area and then assess the
		appropriate number of councillors, ensuring
		comparability between areas, though not

PRESTON				
		Election dates		N Clirs
<sup>ID</sup> Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>2176</sup> Resident	No	Fine as is	Yes	5 should be Sufficient for a small area like this

<sup>2045</sup> Resident	Yes		No	As the village population increases so does the
				need to fully represent the diversity of
				community - as well as divide the increased
				work load on councillors. 7 councillors mean
				meeting quorates are easier to obtain which
				reduce rescheduling meetings.
<sup>2149</sup> Resident	Yes		No	For a small committee of 5 this would mean if
				anyone is on holiday/ill, it would be a struggle
				to be chorate and important decisions would
				need to be deferred
<sup>2150</sup> Resident	Yes		No	5 does not give enough people to share out
				roles to and it also means that if people have to
				give apologies and not be able to make a
				meeting then due to not sufficient meeting
				numbers meetings / decisions may then be
				delayed. 5 councillors does not allow for
				enought flexibilty or contingency or sufficient
				cross section of views
<sup>2151</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>2152</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The roles of Parish Councillor is a demand on
		I am supporting of reverting to a 4 yearly term		the time of those who kindly volunteer to
				perform this role for and on behalf of their
				communities. With only 5 Councillors, that is a
				significant increase in workload from 7 to 5
				hands to help. It will also challenge the ability to
				ensure quorum for meetings - things come up! I
				don't understand the rationale for a reduction
				in a non-paid position and am not supportive of
				this proposed change
<sup>2153</sup> Resident	Yes	l am supportive of this proposal	No	The roles of Parish Councillor is a demand on
				the time of those who kindly volunteer to
				perform this role for their communities. With
				only 5 Councillors, that is a significant increase
				in workload from 7 to 5 hands to help. It will
				also challenge the ability for Quorum meetings -
				things come up! I am not supportive of this
				proposed change

<sup>2154</sup> Resident	Yes	No objections as a 'one-off'.	No	It is more likely that meetings won't be quorate
				if some Parish Councillors send their apologies.
				This could result in delays in key decisions.
				Seven Parish Councillors mean that individual
				tasks can be shared more widely and equitably
				to balance the workload. Seven Parish
				Councillors enables a wider representation
				from our growing, diverse community, allowing
				a broader range of views, backgrounds and
				experiences to be aired and heard. The PHC
				development will increase the number of
				residents in the parish.
2156 D				<u> </u>
<sup>2156</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>2158</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Every councillor may not be able to attend
				every meeting so limiting the number to 5 only
				could jeopardise a quorum.
<sup>2159</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Prefer breadth of representation
<sup>2167</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>2168</sup> Resident	Yes		No	The work of the parish councillors can be
				shared among more people and gives greater
				diversity.
<sup>2171</sup> Resident	Yes	Simplify admin.	Yes	Given the number of residents 5 councillors
				seems sufficient.
<sup>2172</sup> Resident	Yes		No	More Councillors help spread the workload and
				easy to form a quorum
<sup>2174</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	Reducing the number of parish Councillors will
				make the running, governance and decision
				making of the Council more efficient and less of
				a talking shop. The quality of each Parish
				Councillor is vitally important to deliver
				successful outcomes.
<sup>2183</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
<sup>2191</sup> Resident	Yes		No	A greater number of Councillors will avoid
				delayed meetings, spread the workload more
				efficiently, and maintain a diverse
				representation. I have not seen any argument
				in favour of a reduction in the number of
				Councillors.
<sup>2200</sup> Resident	Yes	Logical	No	Better representation with seven and less
				chance of a low turnout
<sup>2205</sup> Resident	Yes		No	

<sup>2233</sup> Parish or Town Yes		No	It is more likely that meetings won't be quorate
council			if some Parish Councillors send their apologies.
(Preston			This could result in delays in key
Parish Council)			decisions on Parish Council business.
*			
			Seven Parish Councillors mean that individual
			tasks can be shared more widely and equitably
			to balance the workload.
			Seven Parish Councillors enables a wider
			representation from our growing, diverse
			community, allowing a broader range of views,
			backgrounds and experiences to be aired and
			heard.
			The PHC development will increase the number
<sup>2237</sup> Resident Yes		No	•It is more likely that meetings won't be quorate
			if some Parish Councillors send their apologies.
			This could result in delays in key decisions on
			Parish Council business.
			•Seven Parish Councillors mean that individual
			tasks can be shared more widely and equitably
			to balance the workload.
			•A new development of 69 dwellings in Preston
			will increase the number of residents in the
			parish, therefore there is likely to be more work
			for Parish Councillors
ADWELL			
ID Capacity Respons	e Reason		
734 Resident No	Theres is a lot of fly-tipping in Radwell. He believes it		
- Vezinelli IVO	will encourage further fly -tipping.		
	will encourage further my -upping.		
EED			
	Election dates		
ID Capacity Respons	e Reason		
<sup>99</sup> Resident Yes			

<sup>1394</sup> Resident	Yes	It makes sense to move things in line with NHDC	
		elections and is less confusing for residents.	

Warding N Cllrs Election dates							
Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>100</sup> Resident	No		No		No		
<sup>993</sup> Resident	No	To have one ward as opposed to several, would mean matters would not be addressed quickly enough. Two years waiting until 2026 and 2028 and thereafter is denying the public of their democratic vote. Urgent matters could be missed and bureaucracy could occur.		Adequate numbers of councillors need to be available to cover the work adequately.	No	No I am not in favour of elections being moved as residents are not being given their democratic right to vote every year.	
Parish/Town Councillor (Royston town council) *	No	Being a town councillor for 3 years I believe this should stay the same.  15 councilors are needed as sometimes they can't make it and you need 5 to go ahead with a meeting \$\infty\$	No	As above these have worked for many years why change and confuse locals?	Yes	This makes sense to go inline with the general elections but again could get confusing for the older generation!	
1088 Parish/Town Councillor (Town Council	No	Our Royston Town is growing with more residential developments so we needs more councillors to voice out the concerns about the town .	No	Councillor will find it easier to reach to the people.	No		
<sup>1137</sup> Resident	No	We need representatives that understand the local area, in keeping with the scales and demographics of that area.	No	We need diversity of representation, reducing the number of councillors is a barrier to that diversity.	Yes		
<sup>1465</sup> Resident	No		No	,	Yes		
<sup>1613</sup> Resident	No	As a Royston resident this change really could affect the councillor decision 15 is needed I believe.	No	Going short on councillors, 15 better number for decisions.	Yes	This makes sense!	
<sup>4</sup> Parish/Town Councillor (Royston Town Council)	Yes	Yes. Currently Heath ward has been split at town level but there seems to have been little benefit from this. There had been a proposal to change the boundaries and have some one member wards which seemed inappropriate.	Yes	Whilst the council largely seems to manage to fill 15 seats the level of engagement of those councillors varies significantly. I don't believe having several councillors who turn up to meetings every few months benefits the community. Also for the 2022 elections Meridian ward was uncontested. Other wards had no more than 2 candidates who weren't elected. For 15 seats there were only 21 candidates. Furthermore in recent months there have been a number of meetings which have been inquorate. Reducing the number to	Yes	Elections are expensive to hold and residents often have less awareness of when local elections take place. Aligning the election cycles would mitigate both of these points somewhat. If unitary authorities are introduced this should be reviewed.	

<sup>7</sup> Resident	Yes	This makes sense and provides some continuity to the		It's not clear why this recommendation is	Yes	This feels like a sensible 'bridging' proposal to get to
		varying levels of local government.		necessary. If it is a result of the ward		the desired full alignment between town and district
				realignment and a desire to make the number		council election cycles.
				of town councillors in wards aligned with ward		
				population, then I am in favour of this.		
<sup>23</sup> Parish/Town	Yes	This is simpler for residents to understand and makes	Yes	For the last 2 years there have been 2	Yes	More cost effective and likely to lead to a better
Councillor		elections more straightforward to organise. In practice		Councillors that attend one meeting every 6		turnout if Town & District elections are held at the
(Royston Town		Town Councillors represent the whole town rather		months and several more that attend only 3-4		same time.
Council)		than a particular area.		times per year. In practice most of the work is		
				undertaken by 6-8 Councillors. All parties have		
				difficulty attracting candidates and in 2022 the		
				Meridian Ward was uncontested. There have		
				also been several committee meetings in the		
				last 2 years which have been inquorate.		
				Reducing the numbers to fewer Councillors who		
				are committed to undertake the role would		
				lead to better attendance. Too many		
				Councillors leads to a democratic deficit and I		
				think in practice Royston Town Council would		
<sup>26</sup> Resident	Yes	Fewer the better	Yes	Few the better	Yes	Fewer the better
<sup>33</sup> Resident	Yes	It seems like a logical change	Yes		Yes	
<sup>62</sup> Resident	Yes	Cuts out more council needless spend.	Yes		Yes	
<sup>82</sup> Resident	Yes	\	Yes		Yes	
<sup>07</sup> Parish/Town	Yes	Too many wards with names the electorate don't	Yes	All parties struggle to find 15 candidates at	Yes	This would result in huge savings in manpower and
Councillor		identify with. Using same wards as district makes		election time and we end up with people		resources. More likely to be a higher turnout of
(Royston Town		more sense.		elected who don't really want to be councillors,		electors.
Council)				resulting in all the work being done by a small		
00				number of dedicated members.		
<sup>08</sup> Resident	Yes	\	Yes		Yes	
<sup>18</sup> Resident	Yes	The recommendation avoids future confusion	Yes	Ideally I would suggest reducing the number of	Yes	
				town councillors further from 15 to 10		
				Heath 3		
				Meridian 4		
10				Palace 3		
<sup>19</sup> Resident	Yes	\\	Yes		Yes	
<sup>001</sup> Resident	Yes	The current situation is confusing to everyone	No	As an ex town cllr - sadly many of those elected	Yes	Simpler and cheaper all round. Town Council election
				to this position do not actually do very much. Its		turnout is low anyway.
				very hard to communicate this with the public -		
				it's not really a political issue just a people one.		
				We need more people elected who are able and		
				willing to do things. Reducing numbers of cllrs		
				will not aid in this.		
<sup>051</sup> Resident	Yes	<b>\</b>	Yes		Yes	

<sup>165</sup> Resident	Yes	Easier for people to understand if same as District	Yes	Thirteen should be maximum, 10-12 better for	Yes	Saves money and more people might actually vote
		Council wards		a town size of Royston. (Hitchin much bigger		
				and proposal is 13). Two councillors in Royston		
				turn up once every six months, most of the		
				work is done by a minority of councillors and a		
				number of meetings have been inquorate		
				because RTP members don't turn up. Let's		
				have a smaller number of councillors who		
<sup>248</sup> Resident	Yes	Cush an arrangement would many that the	Vas	actually want to serve on the Town Council	Vos	Two reasons:
240 Resident	res	Such an arrangement would mean that there was an	Yes	There are too many councillors on the town	Yes	Two reasons:
		elected team focussed on a particular section of the		council. Also, it is possible for the people		Economy-elections can be expensive and it would be
		town and therefore responsible. In the current system,		elected not to grasp their responsibilities. Fewer		more efficient to run them alongside each other.
		residents are confused about who to approach.		members would mean fewer chances to hide		Democracy- residents are in danger of election fatigue
				and just parade the badge, because with		and so it is more democratic to encourage as many
				election comes duty.		people to vote as possible to ensure true
						representation by having fewer, more meaningful
898 Resident	Yes		Yes		Yes	elections
155 District	Yes	It is sensible to align the boundaries with district	Yes	13 councillors is plenty to run an effective	Yes	It is important to get this done for 2026 so that the
Councillor		boundaries. It is simpler for residents and easier to		council for a town of this size, and the 4/5/4		election can be held on the new boundaries rather
		administrate. The previously proposed single member		division across wards is the most even on a per		than the old ones. 2028 should be reviewed once the
		wards would create a situation where less than 2% of		voter basis. Fewer vacancies also increases the		timelines for local government reorganisation are
		the town elected 15% of its councillors.		chance of competitive elections in each ward		known (e.g. if a shadow unitary election is held in
				which (within reason) is better for local		2027, there may not be an NHDC election in 2028)
				democracy and accountability		

RUSHDEN AND WALLINGTON							
				Boundaries	Election dates		
ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason		

<sup>1671</sup> Resident	No	We have lived in Redhill for nearly 30 years and are	Yes	
Resident	NO	fully integrated into Sandon Parish and feel they	165	
		represent our interests fully in all appropriate matters		
		Wallington has not shown any interest in Redhill,	•	
		including those already in their Parish. (Eg exclusion		
		from the Wallington Plan)The current arrangement		
		works well. Sandon PC has openly welcomed Redhill		
		residents to events such as Golden Jubilee, Coronation		
		and the upcoming VE celebrations.	•	
		and the apcoming ve celebrations.		
		Concerns we have are:		
		Whose idea was this? Residents were never consulted		
		and are happy with the status quo and enjoy the		
		quirkiness of a small hamlet being in 3 different		
		Parishes.		
		How will we be represented on the Wallington PC, as		
		there will continue to be only 2 Councillors for		
		Wallington? Redhill residents have been Councillors or	1	
		Sandon PC, none have sat on Rushden & Wallington		
		PC. Sandon has always protected the interest of our		
		hamlet and ensured inappropriate developments		
		don't happen, what are Wallington's plan to continue		
		to protect Redhill?		
		If there has to be change, and I don't believe there		
		does, why is Redhill not moving into Sandon parish,		
		where the majority of the village already sit? Was this		
		option ever considered? If not why not? And if so, why		
		was it rejected?		
		What are the financial implications for Redhill		
		residents re different precept/ council tax charges?		
<sup>51</sup> Resident	No	Not to move the boundary.	Yes	Request electronic email elections.
		No splitting up.		Paperless

<sup>1711</sup> Resident	No	Up until this survey there has been no consultancy No
· · · resident	INU	
		about the proposed changes with any Redhill
		residents. The change seems completely
		unnecessary, and there are no obvious benefits to
		residents of Redhill. At the very least the council
		needs to provide a detailed review of the benefits and
		the negatives. Redhill is currently very well supported
		by Sandon council, and it does not seem to make
		sense to move to Wallington when the parish council
		is smaller, thus reducing the time that can be spent
		supporting Redhill residents. There are a number of
		questions that need to be addressed including: 1)
		How will this impact council tax levels and the parish
		council precepts? 2) Will Redhill be added to the
		Wallington Plan? 3) What are the benefits to residents
		of Redhill? 4) Why is this being proposed when the
		current split between Sandon and Wallington works
		perfectly well? 5) How much will this change cost the
		parish council eg printing of the draft
<sup>1728</sup> Resident	No	It works as it is and makes us unique. The boundary is Yes
		down the middle of the road.
<sup>659</sup> Resident	Yes	it makes sense but i do not know the rationale for it. Yes providing only this once
		what do RW and SW refer to and the map does not
		appear to represent the whole of redhill, possibly
		inaccurate. there should be more representatives as
		more people to represent.
<sup>995</sup> Resident	Yes	We are on the side of the road that is in Wallington Yes
		parish already. I relate to Wallington closely not
		Sandon

SANDON						
		Boundaries		N Clirs		Election dates
ID Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>247</sup> Resident	No	at present there are only a few houses in the Wallington Parish from Redhill and far more within Sandon Parish, why move them to Wallington instead of Sandon?	No	Although it is a small community, having the availability for 6 councillors, allows the opportunity for future parishioners to stand rather than be limited. It may not be well manned at present but I am hopeful for the future	Yes	
<sup>1758</sup> Parish/Town Councillor (Sandon Paris Council)		A vote by Redhill residents was made and they wanted to remain with Sandon	No	We are happy to retain the current 6 available places	Yes	Makes sense for elections to mirror NHDC elections

<sup>762</sup> Resident	No		No		Yes	It works well at the moment
<sup>1927</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see any reason for the change. Surely this would create work and unnecessary costs.	No	I cannot see any reason for the change. I could understand if there was a financial saving, however, Sandon Parish Councillors do not get paid.	Yes	It make sense to align the elections.
<sup>2122</sup> Resident	No	I live in Redhill and our house is currently in the Sandon parish. We have lived here over 25 years and from the very start were warmly welcomed by Sandon and its parishioners. I have also served on Sandon Parish Council and again was welcomed into that position and for the duration of my tenure I felt I represented the whole of Redhill in part because those in Walliington parish (on the other side of the road) had little / no communication from that parish and I think that situation still persists today. Given this , I do not wish to 'move' into Wallington Parish but remain where we are. Sandon parishioners invite us to all parish celebrations and events and consult with us on all planning issues especially those pertaining to the old 'chicken farm' - we have never felt forgotten. Personally I like the quirkiness and history of this situation and do not believe it adds any extra expense to anyone. I would be very disappointed if we moved to Wallington and see no reason to change the current		I would like it to stay at 6 and give an opportunity for Redhill to be represented as is currently the case.	Yes	

ST IPPO	LYTS				
			Boundaries		N Clirs
ID Ca	apacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason
<sup>1446</sup> Re	esident	No	St. Ippolyts parish council has served us well and I choose to let that continue	No	Keep the number of parish councillors at 8 with St. Ippolyts North and South represented by an equal number.
1782 Re	esident	No	Our parish council is effective as it stands. Being on the edge of Hitchin, we are semi rural and enjoy the link to St Ippolyts. It may that if NHDC are determined to adjust the boundary then property to the north of Blackhorse Lane and Newlands Lane should become part of Hitchin but not south thereof.	Yes	
<sup>1984</sup> Re	esident	No	not needed	No	keep the balance

<sup>1987</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts North is already in Hitchin Priory Ward and No	
		has been for many years. North ward would no	willing elected volunteers. Not good for the
		longer be part of the St Ippolyts community and	community.
		residents would not have any voice on local matters,	
		concerns with school places etc. Parish Council owns	
		2 small open spaces in North ward.	
		If Hitchin Town Council formed North ward residents	
		would pay precept to that. South ward precept would	
		have to be increased to cover the loss of North ward.	
<sup>2147</sup> Resident	No	The parish should be kent intact These proposals would have an adverse impact on the No	There is no benefit in cost savings or efficiency
Resident	INO	residents of St Ippolyts South ward, who would have	in either of these proposals.
		to bear the whole cost of the leisure and green space	in entrer of these proposals.
			Davish Counsillers are unneid Dureduring the
		facilities owned and operated by the Parish Council.	Parish Councillors are unpaid. By reducing the
		The state of the bloom of the state of	numbers availbale to serve, the workload on
		The residents of St Ippolyts North Ward do not identify	members can only increase as fewer to share
		as Hitchin residents, but consider themselves to be an	the burden. It is unnecessary and will not
		integral part of the Gosmore and St Ippolyts	enhance competition for a seat
		community and Parish.	
		There is no effective democratic cost saving in the	
		proposals as Parish Councillors are unpaid and	
		volunteer their services to the community	
<sup>31</sup> Resident	No	Yes	
<sup>112</sup> Resident	No	I am not sure why we are being asked about this No	There is not enough information about why this
		boundary before the consultation on Hitchin Town	change is being made, the detail of the
		Council is resolved. Which boundary line is being	boundary line, the number of households
		Council is resolved . Which boundary line is being used , is the New Pound Farm development included	boundary line, the number of households involved and the benefits for residents , if l
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included	involved and the benefits for residents , if I
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view ,
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council .	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St
		used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St
<sup>166</sup> Parish/Town	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change
<sup>166</sup> Parish/Town Councillor (St.	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change
	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided  I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council .  Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so how many households are in each ward ?  The residents in North ward are proud to be part of St. No	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change
Councillor (St.	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so how many bouseholds are in each ward ? The residents in North ward are proud to be part of St. No Ippolyts. For some, it also gives them the opportunity	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change  This makes no sense at all. Nearly half the ward but reduce to 7 councillors, or keep it the same
Councillor (St.	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so how many bouseholds are in each word? The residents in North ward are proud to be part of St. No Ippolyts. For some, it also gives them the opportunity for them, or their children to move further into the	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change  This makes no sense at all. Nearly half the ward but reduce to 7 councillors, or keep it the same but do the same. It works very well with 8
Councillor (St.	No	used , is the New Pound Farm development included in the move , it is not at all clear on the small map provided I don't see what benefit is derived from reducing the number of volunteer spaces available on the current St Ippolyts Parish Council . Can you please provide the logic for numbers of Parish Councillors , is this based on Household and so how many bouseholds are in each word? The residents in North ward are proud to be part of St. No Ippolyts. For some, it also gives them the opportunity for them, or their children to move further into the	involved and the benefits for residents , if I understood the detail I might have a different view , the proposed change has been very poorly communicated with no presentations to the St Ippolyts residents of the logic for the change  This makes no sense at all. Nearly half the ward but reduce to 7 councillors, or keep it the same but do the same. It works very well with 8 councillors and allows each if us to be able to

<sup>241</sup> Resident				
	No	Ignore the answer above. I am neither for nor against.	No	??????
		How do you expect anyone to make an informed		
		choice when the only consequence you mention is		
		reducing councilors from 8-7 in BOTH cases, which is		
		completely irrelevant to me anyway. What are the real		
		implications??? I only wanted to complete this survey		
		to express my frustration at the useless info provided!		
<sup>248</sup> Resident	No	I'm happy with the support & services from St Ippolyts	Yes	Reduce the number of Parish Councillors if the
		parish council & the community feel it engenders.		move to Hitchin does NOT go ahead.
<sup>261</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>263</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>348</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>349</sup> Resident	No	The St Ippolyts ward in its current form operates	No	What is the rationale for reducing parish
		perfectly well, so why change it?		Councillors?
<sup>534</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is not Hitchin. I know we are close	No	A yes / no answer here isn't really sufficient - l
		geographically, but the needs and wants of the village		don't know what's driving the requirement to
		are its own, and shouldn't be lumped in with the		reduce the number of parish councillors
		closest Town.		(especially since they're voluntary and not
				paid?).
				However, since less people would mean less
				representation of the village's interests, then no
				- I'd rather there were more and the number
				staved at 8
<sup>547</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts North ward has been part of St Ippolyts as	No	I believe that 8 councillors gives a greater
		long as I have lived here (over 30 years), like many		opportunity for a range of ideas to be
		local residents I regard myself as a village person and		expressed. If this was reduced the burden on
		have chosen to live as part of a village and not part of		each councillor would be greater and the
		a town. I value the chance to have my voice heard in		chances of meetings not being quorate would
		all matters that pertain to my village, if I was		increase.
		represented by a town council (or just the county) I do		
		not feel that my voice would have such impact I would		
		be a much smaller piece in a very much larger entity.		
		I also feel that to remove the north ward from St		
		ippolyts Parish would be a disaster for St ippolyts, by		
		Ippolyts Parish would be a disaster for St Ippolyts, by reducing it's size, and therefore it's precept it would be		
		reducing it's size, and therefore it's precept it would be		
569 Pacidant	No	reducing it's size, and therefore it's precept it would be next to impossible for the Parish Council to achieve anything other than bin emptying and grass cutting.		Would like to maintain the number of
<sup>569</sup> Resident	No	reducing it's size, and therefore it's precept it would be next to impossible for the Parish Council to achieve	No	Would like to maintain the number of councillors as is.

<sup>781</sup> Resident	No	I don't think this would be the best way to allow the	No	Unless there is a struggle to fill the roles, I think
<sup>783</sup> Resident	No	views of the local community to be represented.	No	the more people we have the better
<sup>1054</sup> Resident	No	Don't reduce the number of councillors if you don't	No	Don't reduce the number of councillors if you
		move the area to another ward. Simply, don't reduce		don't move the area to another ward. Simply,
		the number of councillors since there are more		don't reduce the number of councillors since
		houses built in the area and the number of residents		there are more houses built in the area and the
		taken away from St Ippolyts North will be replaced by		number of residents taken away from St
		the new ones anyway.		Ippolyts North will be replaced by the new ones
1005				anvwav.
<sup>1096</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1135</sup> Resident	No	Having lived in the area for over 30 years, I do not	No	I do not support these changes as I have not
		wish this proposal to go ahead. I prefer to be aligned		seen sufficient evidence to justify the change.
		with St Ippolytt's parish council and feel that they have		
		more vested interest in the area and are able to		
		respond more quickly to issues local to this area.		
<sup>1235</sup> Resident	No	We require a more localised approach	No	We require a more localised approach
<sup>1427</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree with having a town council - just	No	
		another layer of bureaucracy and cost. I live in St		
		Ippolyts and do not wish to be moved to Hitchin just		
		so that a pointless town council can be established		
<sup>1470</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>1530</sup> Resident	No	I feel very much part of the St Ippolyts village	No	Why change what isn't broken? Our parish
		community and I'm happy with the status quo. I want		councillors work hard for our village and
		to remain being part of a lovely village that I have lived		represent all of us well
		in for 30 years, I'm a Governor at St Ippolyts School		
		and want to remain within the village politically. I don't		
		want our Community to be subsumed within Hitchin		
		and can see no benefit to the village from the change.		
<sup>1561</sup> Resident	No	It's a question primarily of identity: people in the area	Vos	This does seem to follow logically from the
Resident	INU	south of Blackhorse Lane/Newlands Lane, including	162	proposed change, though as noted above, I
		the Broadmeadow estate, identify strongly with St		would be very sad to see the change go ahead.
		Ippolyts, participate in and support village activities,		would be very sad to see the change go allead.
		and often moved to this area precisely because it is		
		part of St Ippolyts, rather than Hitchin. There would		
		also probably be some practical losses, such as reduced rates for using the village hall, etc. We are		
		proud to be part of the historic village of St Ippolyts		
<sup>1607</sup> Resident	No	It's a village and parish and not part of Hitchin. This	Yes	
		will also negatively affect the catchment of st Ippolyts		
		school		
<sup>1654</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts should remain as an independent parish	Yes	N/A
		and not be swallowed into Hitchin		

with profe in and care for the small community of thichin would be detrimental for the reading with the larger community of thichin would be detrimental for the reading of thichin would be detrimental for the reading of our shapes. With the smaller matters setting for in a much larger sound.  **Resident** **Pacified** **Pacified					
purpose of the merging with the larger community of histinh would be destinanted for the residents of our villages. With the smaller matters seemed to residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages. With the smaller matters are residents of our villages are not only villages are not villages are not villages. With the smaller matters are representation in a much little representation. Souss will be substanted frience in communities.  We resident No. 1 persident of St. loppolys should remain intext and not No spill community together with the Parish of St. loppolys which is not better to keeping community together with the Parish of St. loppolys which is not better to keeping community together with the Parish of St. loppolys which is not better to keeping community together with the Parish of St. loppolys should remain intext and not No much better for stay as whole Parish of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is not chivided to the mark of St. loppolys which is the start of the parish of St. loppolys which is the start of the parish of	<sup>1659</sup> Resident	No	The parish council here is independently run and done	· No	Why do we need to reduce the number of
community of hischin would be detrimental for the sections of our linguisters our linguisters of our linguisters our linguiste			with pride in and care for the small community of st		councillors? I don't understand the need to
residents of our villages. With the smaller matters residents of our villages. With the smaller matters resident place in a ministration for the small face whose special by the partial count of the			ipps and Gosmore. I feel merging with the larger		change this.
Settine lost in a much larger 'Soace'  Resident			community of hitchin would be detrimental for the		
We are a separate village with very different needs to so in a part of the control of the part of the control of the part of			residents of our villages. With the smaller matters		
a large town like Hitchin. We are a rural area whose parish councillors have served us were yet lover the parish councillor have served us were yet lover the parish councillor have served us were yet lover the parish councillor have made good decisions for their local village area.  54 Resident No Local rural community media rural based regressmentation. Sussessi wills esubassimation at lown hased community, important to recognise differences in communities.  55 Resident No Perfer to stay as whole Parish of St Ippolyts Should remain intact and not No polyte should be a priority for a Town council, Local government review will most likely should half their my ability to get the small things done and id on on believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council, Local government review will most likely should half their my ability to get the small things done and id not not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority of a Town council, Local government review will most likely should half their move that			getting lost in a much larger 'space'		
parsh councillors have served to sery well over the years and who have made good decisions for their council local values area.  Est Resident No Carl ural community needs rural based representation. Issues will be subsumed into a from have community, important to recognise differences in communities.  The parsh of St ippolys Should remain intact and not No The parsh of St ippolys Should remain intact and not No Spilt.  The Resident No Prefer of stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No Prefer of Stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolys which is No I think it important to keep St. Ippolys Willage Yes More likely to reach decisions  The Resident No Resident No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which was number of views  The Resident No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which is No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys who which was number of views  The Resident No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys who who was number of views  The Resident No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys which was number of views  The Resident No Reep the parish of St. Ippolys was a rural parish of No Reep the parish out of N	<sup>1792</sup> Resident	No	We are a separate village with very different needs to	No	We need diversity in representation and parish
Section   Sect			a large town like Hitchin. We are a rural area whose		councillors give us that
Coal fursion community needs rural based   Yes   Coal fursion community needs rural based   Yes   Coal fursion community   Important to recognise differences   Coal fursion community   Coal fursion coal			parish councillors have served us very well over the		
Resident   No   Continuation media transfer and based   Perspecia training to represent attain in stack and in the standard or the part of \$1 (paptyrs Should remain intact and not split   paptyrs is not divided   paptyrs is			years and who have made good decisions for their		
representation. Issues will be subsamed into a Town based community. Important to recognise differences in communities.  Fig. Resident No The parish of St ippolys should remain intact and not spilt. It is not divided plon to spilt the parish of St. Ippolys which is spilt with the parish of St. Ippolys which is spilt. Important to keep St ippolys which is community together within the Parish.  Fig. Resident No It in thick it important to keep St ippolys willage community together within the Parish.  Fig. Resident No R			local village area		
based community, important to recognise differences in communities.  Fig. Resident No The parish of 5t ippolyts Should remain intact and not split in communities.  Fig. Resident No Prefer to stay as whole Parish of St. ippolyts which is much better for keeping community together  Fig. Resident No I think it important to keep 5t ippolyts Williage community together within the Parish.  Fig. Resident No I think it important to keep 5t ippolyts Williage community together within the Parish.  Fig. Resident No Keep the parish of 5t ippolyts williage community together within the Parish.  Fig. Resident No Keep the parish of 5t ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin house in Hitchin No Council, I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will fullute my ability toget the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nonedicated with this more takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not suppolys  Fig. Resident No This would split the parish in two and leave 5t lippolyts No Why? It is an outrageous waste of public money to launch these consultations for proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!	<sup>1854</sup> Resident	No	Local rural community needs rural based	Yes	
In communities.   In communities.   In communities.			representation. Issues will be subsumed into a Town		
Page			based community. Important to recognise differences		
Spile   Spil			in communities.		
Prefect to stay as whole Parish of St. ippolyts which is much better for keeping community together   No	<sup>1859</sup> Resident	No	The parish of St Ippolyts Should remain intact and not	No	There should be no reduction in Councillors if St
here in much better for keeping community together within the parish.  No I think it important to keep St Ippolyts Village communicating together within the Parish.  No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin  1 Feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council, I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be no intless, and a waste of fresources.  Parished No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents.  No Resident No This would split the parish in two and leaves St Ippolyts out the services and a waste of presource whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!  No Why? It is an outrageous waste of public money to launch these consultations for proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!			split		Ippolyts is not divided
Resident No I think it important to keep St Ippolyts Village communicating together within the Parish.  No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  Resident No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  Place or needs are well catered for by the Parish council would be a priority for a Town council. I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. I council file with the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. I council file with the services will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources. If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  Place of the parish council would be a priority for a Town exclase place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No Why? It is an outrageous waste of public money to launch these consultations for proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!	<sup>1866</sup> Resident	No	Prefer to stay as whole Parish of St. Ippolyts which is	No	There would seem to be plenty of work for all of
Resident No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  No Resident No If feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council yolunteers the same as before  No If selive becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources would be nointless and a waste of public would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts No worment  No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts No worment would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts work would be an outrageous waste of public work work of the proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!  No Why? It is an outrageous waste of public work on these consultations for proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!  No Why It is an outrageous waste of public work even bother to explain the rationale for!			much better for keeping community together		them and it is good to have a number of views
Resident No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin before  No Resident No If feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council yolunteers the same as before  No If selive becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources would be nointless and a waste of public would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts No worment  No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts No worment would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts work would be an outrageous waste of public work work of the proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!  No Why? It is an outrageous waste of public work on these consultations for proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!  No Why It is an outrageous waste of public work even bother to explain the rationale for!					
Resident No   Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin   No   Keep the parish council volunteers the same as before	<sup>1867</sup> Resident	No	I think it important to keep St Ippolyts Village	Yes	More likely to reach decisions
Resident No Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not take half and include it in Hitchin  No Ifeel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council would be parish council functions perfectly well as it is  The Parish council functions perfectly			communicating together within the Parish.		
Take half and include it in Hitchin  Resident  No  I feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council, I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town councils o any move would be nointless and a waste of resources.  Por Resident  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  Resident  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts whether these consultations for explain the rationale for!  Proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!	<sup>1892</sup> Resident	No		No	
Take half and include it in Hitchin  Resident  No  I feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish council, I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town councils o any move would be nointless and a waste of resources.  Por Resident  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  Resident  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts what soever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No  No  No  No  This would split the parish in two and leave \$t\$ tippolyts whether these consultations for explain the rationale for!  Proposals which you don't even bother to explain the rationale for!	<sup>1895</sup> Resident	No	Keep the parish of St Ippolyts as a rural parish do not	No	Keep the parish council volunteers the same as
council, I believe becoming part of a larger organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  704 Resident No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  No					before .
organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident  No  If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident  No  This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts  South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N	<sup>1901</sup> Resident	No	I feel our needs are well catered for by the Parish	No	The Parish council functions perfectly well as it is
organisation will dilute my ability to get the small things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be nointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident  No  If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident  No  This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts  South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N			council, I believe becoming part of a larger		
things done and I do not believe that the services that we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be pointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident No					
we receive from the parish council would be a priority for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be pointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident No					
for a Town council. Local government review will most likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be pointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident  No  If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident  No  This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts  South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N			5		
likely abolish a Hitchin Town council so any move would be pointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident No					
would be pointless and a waste of resources.  903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  907 Resident South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident No No No  909 Resident No No  909 Resident No No					
903 Resident No If this move takes place the only benefits will be to people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts 907 Resident South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this. 908 Resident No			3		
people living in hitchin not st, ippolyts  Pool Resident No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  Pool Resident No No No  Pool Resident No	<sup>1903</sup> Resident	No		No	No comment
Posident No This would split the parish in two and leave St Ippolyts South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  Posident No					
South financially unsustainable. It makes no sense money to launch these consultations for whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N	<sup>1907</sup> Resident	No		No	Why? It is an outrageous waste of public
whatsoever and is fundamentally undemocratic as no residents want this.  908 Resident  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
residents want this.  explain the rationale for!  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  No  N					•
908 ResidentNoNo914 ResidentNoNo			,		
	<sup>1908</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>915</sup> Resident No No	<sup>1914</sup> Resident	No		No	
NOTICE TO THE STATE OF THE STAT	1915 Resident	No		No	
	- Nesidelit	INU		INO	

1932 Resident   No   This Selba is lated divisive for the more rural parts of St. No   Project St. Processing Parts of St. Project St. Project St. Project Parts of Pa					
From a joined up approach with Hitchin, and that's less likely to cour if the readmining area is less apart of the residential Hitchin community.    1984   Resident   No   As residents who have a particle council committed to readmining area is less apart of the residential Hitchin community.   1985   Resident   No   As residents who have a particle council committed to long a particle with less than the level of entering the intervence part of the residential than the level of entering particle sear unrule appears of this particle with the many sometimes quite small but important issues that would part the routine manner level of a for all intervence down and the level of entering the town the particle for the readmining and a long that make intervence that would appear the routine manner level of a steretion that our local particle routine work will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our backget more manner level of a steretion that our local particle routine work will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our backget more manner level of a steretion that our local particle routine work will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our backget more manner level of a steretion that our local particle routine work will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our backget more manner level of the routine work will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our local particles.    1946   Resident   No   Supplys is a very distinct community with separate or concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would represent the particle that will be particle the level of the particle that will not more manners.    1946   Resident   No   Supplys is a very significant to representation will add extra costs and additione on improvements. The additionable work will not immore properantain will add extra costs and additione on improvements. The addi	<sup>1928</sup> Resident	No	This feels a little divisive for the more rural parts of St	No	This feels a little divisive for the more rural
Resident			Ippolyts. The concern being that St Ippolyts benefits		parts of St Ippolyts. The concern being that St
Parameter   Para			from a joined up approach with Hitchin, and that's less		Ippolyts benefits from a joined up approach
Hitchin community.   Hitchin			likely to occur if the remaining area is less a part of the		with Hitchin, and that's less likely to occur if the
Para Resident   Para Residen			residential Hitchin community.		remaining area is less a part of the residential
high maintenance and communication for all aspects of this points in can see no reason to change same. This will result in loss of councillors who work a not cost and loss of councillors who work at no cost and loss of the budget that could mean the level of service goes down budget that could mean the level of service goes down and the level of service goes goes goes goes goes goes goes goe					Hitchin community.
Community facilities and rural aspects of this parabh   Cana see nor reaching sume. This will result in loss of councillors who work at no cost and loss of budget that could mean the level of service goes down in the level of service goes down and maintain all our local facilities.    1947   Resident   No   St jopphys is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin or liberates this services, dumps, lighting ecq adding level will not improve ments. The administration controlled by well making the process can not currently run or libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting ecq adding level goes will not improve ments. The administration controlled by well maintain the process cannot currently run or libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting ecq adding level goes will not improve ments. The addinistrative process cannot currently run or libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting ecq adding level goes will not improve ments. The addinistrative process cannot currently run or libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting ecq adding level goes will not improve ments. The addinistrative process cannot currently run or level goes to be parabh the community the better managed at a local goes will not improve ments. The addinistrative p	<sup>1934</sup> Resident	No	As residents who have a parish council committed to	No	l don't want to be effected by a Hitchin council
Can see no reason to change same. This will result in loss of councillors who work at no cost and loss of budget that could man the level of service goes down in the council or show that could man the level of service goes down in the property of the p			high maintenance and communication for all aspects		that will have little interest or time to address
Second part			of community facilities and rural aspects of this parish		the many sometimes quite small but important
A lose lose for ral			I can see no reason to change same . This will result in		issues that our parish council deal with . The
1935 Resident   No   Ne will not gat any where near the same level of attention that our local parish council provide potentially the loss of budget from the north ward will be have serous effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our local facilities   No   This proposal has not been properly thought through the councillors give their time with no constanting all through the councillors give their time with no constanti			loss of councillors who work at no cost and loss of		councillors are not paid and give their time to
1945 Resident   No   We will not get any where near the same level of attention that our local parish council growed in the parish in good order and maintaining all name and maintain all our local facilities   No   The local Parish Council do sterling work in protecting the interests of local residents.   No   St Ippolyts is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin   No   Extra layer of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc adding lavers will not improve material level   No   I would like to keep stuppolys together   No   I think St Ippolyts parish should remained in intact as one civil parish.   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N			budget that could mean the level of service goes down		help the community there is no justification to
through the councillors give their time with no cost because they are committed to keeping the potentially the loss of budget from the north ward will have serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our local facilities  1941 Resident 1942 Resident 1942 Resident 1943 Resident 1944 Resident 1944 Resident 1945 Resident 1945 Resident 1945 Resident 1945 Resident 1946 Resident 1946 Resident 1946 Resident 1940 Resident 1946 Resident 1940 Resident 1950 R					
cost because they are committed to keeping the parks in good order and maintaining all use serious effects on the ability of our council to run and maintain all our local facilities and maintain all our local facilities the interests of local residents.   No	<sup>1935</sup> Resident	No	9	No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1941 Resident   No   The local Parish Council do sterling work in protecting to interests of local residents.   No   The local Parish Council do sterling work in protecting to interests of local residents.   No   St Ippolyts is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin   No   Extra layer of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.   No   Iwould like to keep st.jppolyts together   No   Ithink St.jppolyts will be better managed at a local level   No   St.jppolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   St.jppolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N			·		
1941 Resident   No   The local Parish Council do sterling work in protecting the interests of local residents.   No   St Ippolyts is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin   No   Extra layer of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding level   No   I would like to keep st. liprolyts will be better managed at a local level   No   I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil   Polyto Resident   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil   Polyto Resident   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil   Polyto Resident   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N					cost because they are committed to keeping
1942 Resident   No   The local Parish Council do sterling work in protecting the interests of local residents.   No   Stippolyts is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin lobe subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin lobe will representation will add extra costs and achieve and provements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.   No   I would like to keep st.ippolyts together   No   I would like to keep st.ippolyts will be better managed at a local level level   Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   St.ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish councillors are volunteers, surely the more we have that are willing to give their time and opinions to help shape the community the better, I don't understand why you would remain at 8.			have serious effects on the ability of our council to run		the parish in good order and maintaining all
the interests of local residents.  1942 Resident 1942 Resident 1948 Resident 1958 Resident 1956 Resident 1959 Resident 1950 Resi	1011				rural aspects of same
1942 Resident   No   St ippolyts is a very distinct community with separate concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin   Start alper of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.    1966 Resident   No   I would like to keep st.ippolyts together   No   I would like to keep st.ippolyts together   No   I would like to keep st.ippolyts will be better managed at a local level   Poppor Resident   No   St.ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N	1941 Resident	No	9 , 9	No	
concerns from Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin be subservient to those of Hitchin and its needs and voice would be subservient to those of Hitchin and instration controlled by well well and instration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I would like to keep st-ippolyts together No  1979 Resident No St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level level  1980 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1980 Resident No No No  1990 Resident No	1012 5 11 1				
1948 Resident   No   Extra   ayer of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra   wearing but amateur representation will add extra   costs and achieve no improvements. The   administrative process can not currently run our   libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding   adding lavers will not improve matters.	1942 Resident	No		No	·
Extra layer of administration controlled by well meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding layers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1990 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil Parish Resident No I vould Ive to keep st-pholyts organish No					·
meaning but amateur representation will add extra costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run or libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I would like to keep st.ippolyts together No  1979 Resident No St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1990 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No No  1990 Resident No No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No No  1990 Resident No No No No  1990 Resident No No No No No  1990 Resident No	1049 5				
costs and achieve no improvements. The administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1979 Resident No St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1980 Resident No St Ippolyts parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No N	1946 Resident	No		No	·
administrative process can not currently run our libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I would like to keep st.ippolyts together No  1979 Resident No I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level level level No St. Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level No St. Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1980 Resident No St. Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1994 Resident No			•		
libraries, bin services, dumps, lighting etc; adding lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I would like to keep st.ippolyts together No  1979 Resident No I think St ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1970 Resident No St ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1980 Resident No No St ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish Resident No No No  1995 Resident No			·		·
lavers will not improve matters.  1966 Resident No I would like to keep st.ippolyts together No I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1979 Resident No St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  1980 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1990 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No					
1966 Resident       No       I would like to keep st.ippolyts together       No         1979 Resident       No       I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level       No       All parish councillors are volunteers, surely the more we have that are willing to give their time and opinions to help shape the community the better. I don't understand why you would reduce the number reduce the number reduce the number of parish.         1990 Resident       No       St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.       No       The number of parish councillors should remain at 8.         1994 Resident       No       No       No         1995 Resident       No       No       No					
Resident No I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local level  No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No No No No  No No No  No No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No  No No No  No No No  No No No  No No No  No No No  No No No No  No No No No No No No No No No No No No N	1966 Dasidant	No		No	adding lavers will not improve matters.
level more we have that are willing to give their time and opinions to help shape the community the better. I don't understand why you would reduce the number  1990 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  No N	resident	INO	I would like to keep st.ippolyts together	NO	
and opinions to help shape the community the better. I don't understand why you would reduce the number    1990   Resident   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N	<sup>1979</sup> Resident	No	I think St Ippolyts will be better managed at a local	No	All parish councillors are volunteers, surely the
better. I don't understand why you would reduce the number    1990   Resident   No   St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.   No   No   The number of parish councillors should remain at 8.    1994   Resident   No   No   No   No   No   No   No   N			level		more we have that are willing to give their time
reduce the number  1990 Resident No St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.  1994 Resident No					and opinions to help shape the community the
1990 ResidentNoSt Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil parish.NoThe number of parish councillors should remain at 8.1994 ResidentNoNo1995 ResidentNoNo1996 ResidentNoNo					better. I don't understand why you would
parish. remain at 8.  1994 Resident No No No  1995 Resident No No No  1996 Resident No					reduce the number
1994 ResidentNoNo1995 ResidentNoNo1996 ResidentNoNo	<sup>1990</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts Parish should remain in intact as one civil	No	The number of parish councillors should
1995 ResidentNoNo1996 ResidentNoNo			parish.		remain at 8.
1996 Resident No No	<sup>1994</sup> Resident	No		No	
	<sup>1995</sup> Resident	No		No	
1997 Resident No Please don't split this rural community. No	<sup>1996</sup> Resident	No		No	
	<sup>1997</sup> Resident	No	Please don't split this rural community.	No	

<sup>1998</sup> Resident	No	As a resident, our natural focus is towards the village	No	With the development at Pound Farm, a
		& the facilities that it offers. There is a distinct		reduction in the number of councillors at this
		difference in the character of this area which is		time does not make sense.
		represented by our Parish Councillors & if the		
		proposal was to go ahead, that accountability and		
		recognition will be lost. The current boundaries of		
		Blackhorse Lane and Newlands Lane are clear, whilst		
		the proposed boundaries appear rather more		
1000 5 11		convoluted		
<sup>1999</sup> Resident	No	no coment	No	no coment
<sup>2000</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2002</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree that the village should be separated	No	
		into different wards		
<sup>2003</sup> Parish or Town	No	Parish Council object to north ward moving into a	No	Parish Council object to a reduction in unpaid
council (St		proposed Hitchin Town Council. North Ward residents		volunteers. There is no benefit in a reduction.
Ippolyts Parish		want a voice within the Parish, rural problems would		
Council) *		not be met, there are no advantages and huge		
		disadvantages, it will result to a short fall of funding		
		for the Parish.		
<sup>2004</sup> Resident	No	The parish should stay united! Together us better!	No	More people better views and options
<sup>2005</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2006</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2007</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2008</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2010</sup> Resident	No	I feel this will negatively affect the village of St.	Yes	Reduction in the number of councillors appears
		Ippolyts. It will mean there is less financial support		appropriate if the move of the north does not
		available to maintain parish projects such as the		happen. I do not support this move.
		football and bowls Pavillion. I also think this is being		
		done to allow further building to take place in St.		
		Ippolyts as the broadmeadow estate would no longer		
		count as housing built in St. Ippolyts. There are		
		already two huge sites of building in St. Ipps including		
		London Road and Waterdell lane and there just isn't		
		the infrastructure to support further building of new		
		homes. It will destroy the green space of the area and		
<sup>2012</sup> Resident	No	We as a parish like a say and part control of relevant	No	The councillors are needed.
	-	village issues.	-	

<sup>2013</sup> Resident	No	There is a strong bond between people on the	No	Same as previous answer!
		broadmeadow estate to the st Ippolyts and Gosmore		This is a repeat question?
		locality.		
		Church - we were married there and children		
		christened there		
		School - children attended the primary school		
		Recreation ground - football and bowls facilities used		
		across all times of life.		
		Bird in hand pub- a social space		
		Village hall - events held.		
		By staying in the st Ippolyts parish area those bonds		
		are maintained and strengthened.		
<sup>2015</sup> Resident	No	We want to stay as part of St. Ippolyts parsh	Yes	
<sup>2016</sup> Resident	No	We are part of the St Ippolyts community and will lose	No	
		representation if we become part of Hitchin Priory		
<sup>2018</sup> Resident	No	My family wishes to remain in St Ippolyts as it is now	No	My family wishes to remain in St Ippolyts as it is
				now
<sup>2019</sup> Resident	No	We bought in a village location and want to remain in	No	
		a village.		
<sup>2020</sup> Resident	No	It would be a disaster to separate the church, it does	No	
		do much for the community and children and school,		
<sup>2021</sup> Resident	No	We want to stay united, and keep our parish as one.	No	Leave St ippolyts as it is.
2022 5 11		We do not want to be split.		
<sup>2022</sup> Resident	No			Keep the same number of councillors
<sup>2024</sup> Resident	No	No	Yes	
<sup>2026</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2027</sup> Resident	No	l am not in favour of this proposal. It's not at all clear	Yes	
		what the reason is for doing it?? Apart maybe from		
		looking a bit neater on a map! Who is it benefitting? If		
		it was to be taken further I'd like to see North Herts		
		set out the pros and cons for each of a) the residents		
		living in that area b) St Ippolyts PC and c) a future		
		Hitchin council. If I understand the proposal correctly,		
		people living in that ward would still live in St Ippolyts		
		but they would no longer have a say on local matters		
		and facilities		
<sup>2028</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is a lively community and splitting the	No	
2020 D:	NI-	parish is Rome	NI-	
<sup>2029</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2030</sup> Resident	No	It splits our community	Yes	Reduced overhead
<sup>2031</sup> Resident	No	Not in favour	No	

<sup>2032</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2035</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2036</sup> Resident	No	It will be detrimental to the community amenities.	No	
<sup>2037</sup> Resident	No	Do not want to change my address from St Ippolyts to	No	
		Hitchin. St Ippolyts' Parish Council seems to do a good		
		job for this area.		
<sup>2038</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2039</sup> Resident	No	This is a separate community with its own identity and	No	As above - don't believe change is necessary
		our voice would be reduced by the proposal plus		especially given the I create in population due
		south ward becomes poorer		to new developments
<sup>2040</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2041</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2042</sup> Resident	No	Leave St. Ippolyts alone as a complete parish. Do not	No	I wish to stay in the St. Ippolyts parish rather
		split it up		than in the Hitchin area
<sup>2044</sup> Resident	No	I do not want the power of the parish to be diluted.	No	
<sup>2046</sup> Resident	No	This Parish council operates well in its current	No	
		boundaries. No need for change		
<sup>2048</sup> Resident	No	I relate to St Ippolyts village, NOT Hitchin. I cannot see	No	I relate to St Ippolyts village, NOT Hitchin. I
		any advantages to splitting the Parish. The local parish		cannot see any advantages to splitting the
		council is more in touch with needs of the community.		Parish. The local parish council is more in touch
				with needs of the community.
<sup>2049</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2050</sup> Resident	No	I am worried that I would lose my voice on local	No	As above
		matters		
<sup>2051</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts North parish ward has been part of St	No	You have not provided any arguments in favour
		Ippolyts for many hundreds of years. Indeed the		of changing the status quo.
		parish records were kept in the Black Horse Inn in St		
		Ippolyts North parish ward. I was myself responsible		
		for proposing that the St Ippolyts sign was placed on		
		London Road close to the Blackhorse Lane / Newlands		
		Lane crossroads. This was accepted by the Parish		
		Council, who agreed that this would help the residents		
		of the then new estate comprising of Broadmeadow		
		Ride and the roads off it to feel very much part of St		
		Ippolyts Parish. The Highways department happily		
		placed the St Ippolyts sign at this position.		
<sup>2052</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2053</sup> Resident	No	I moved here with my family thirty three years ago,	No	The current number of Parish Councillors
Residerit	INU	, , , , , ,	INU	seems fine to me.
		partly because I wished to live in the village of St		Seems time to the.
		Ippolyts, having moved from the village of Kimpton. I		
		very much wish to continue to do so.		

<sup>2054</sup> Resident	No	l do not agree with splitting St Ippolyts Parish Council	No	
<sup>2055</sup> Resident	No		No	There are no advantages that I can see in
				moving St Ippolyts North to Hitchin.
<sup>2057</sup> Resident	No		No	<b>□</b> '' <i>j</i>
<sup>2059</sup> Resident	No	I have been a resident for over 40 years and the	No	Once again there is no valid reason to change
		system has worked and there is no reason to change		for the sake of of it.
		for the sake of change-we will our voice in matters		
		that touch and concern local matters.		
<sup>2060</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2061</sup> Resident	No	I strongly disapprove of the proposal to split of St	No	
		Ippolyts North from St Ippolyts south to incorporate St		
		Ippolyts north into Hitchin.		
		I see no reason why it should be divided. I have lived		
		in the parish for many years and do not wish to be		
		part of Hitchin: my identity and connections are with		
		St Ippolyts including the church, school and activities		
		in the parish hall. Current funding levels and services		
		and the sense of community would be diminished.		
		These would be huge disadvantages for those living in		
2062 D 11 /		St Innolyts, both north and south		
<sup>2063</sup> Resident	No			
<sup>2064</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2065</sup> Resident	No	I do not want to see South ward isolated and	No	
		financially at risk due to the separation. The facilities in		
		the area are already under resourced.		
<sup>2067</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2068</sup> Resident	No	Detrimental affect to the area.	No	
<sup>2069</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>2071</sup> Resident	No	Please keep north ward with St.Ippolyts	No	Please keep arrangements as at present
<sup>2072</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>2073</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
<sup>2076</sup> Resident	No	I do not want our local community and the funding of		
		it to be split. I feel it will damage our sense of place		
		and identity if we are merged into Hitchin which is a		
		very different urbanised area.		

2079 Danidani	NI-	the second by th	NI-	The appearance and appearance in the second
<sup>2078</sup> Resident	No	I am actually neutral but the questionnaire did not	No	The proposal and question appears to be
		allow such a response.		identical to 6. I am against any part of St
				Ippolyts Parish Council being absorbed by the
				Town Council rural matters often differ from
				urban issues.
				In my opinion this survey failed to solicit a
2070 p : 1 .				meaningful response and was poorly drafted.
<sup>2079</sup> Resident	No			
<sup>2080</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2081</sup> Resident	No	I moved to St Ippolyts as I wanted to be part of a small	No	Leave St Ippolyts alone
		village and parish council. Becoming part of HITCHIN		
		council will not improve my life but will potentially		
		make things worse and cost more		
<sup>2082</sup> Resident	No	I cannot see what it would improve but it would make	No	Leave St Ippolyts alone
		things worse for the village I live in.		
<sup>2083</sup> Resident	No	I have, on occasion, attended the Parish Council	No	I believe these people are volunteers
		meetings to voice my concerns about various topics		
		and as these people are my neighbours, they listen! I		
		feel very strongly that this would NOT happen should		
		this split of the parish happen. Hitchen residents		
		would have no interest in the concerns of St Ippolyts		
		parish. Also		
		St Ippolyts parish may struggle to maintain the		
		wonderful amenities such as the Football and Bowls		
		pavilion. This would be a travesty for the local people		
		who enjoy to play or watch the games in a lovely green		
<sup>2084</sup> Resident	No	It would appear that this is just a money making	No	There is no obvious advantage of reducing the
		exercise, to take money from the St Ippolyts Parish		numbers by 1. No cost saving as they are
		Council which would make it difficult to support its		volunteers anyway.
		activities such as the football team and bowls club		
		pavilion. Why would local residents want to be in a		
		larger group where its voice would be reduced as		
		opposed to a smaller local group with a more intimate		
		association?		
<sup>2087</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2089</sup> Resident	No	INH will be absorbed into the larger Hitchin area and	No	As above.
		we will have no say in the local INH area that we live.		
		Please leave the ward as it is. Thank you		
<sup>2097</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2098</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2099</sup> Resident	No	This change will leave the South Ward too small and it	No	
		will become harder to raise and resolve issues.		
<sup>2100</sup> Resident	No		No	

<sup>2101</sup> Resident	No	It will deprive St Ippolyts of funding for recreation	Yes	
2102 5 11		grounds, public bins, dealing with fly tipping etc.		
<sup>2102</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2105</sup> Resident	No	control at a local level would be lost therefore a loss of	No	
		actioning things that are important to residents along		
		with financial budgets that will no doubt get cut, leave		
		things alone that aren't broke!		
<sup>2106</sup> Resident	No	Facilities in the parish would suffer, financing would be	No	
		reduced and parish projects would be threatened. We		
		are a rural community		
<sup>2110</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2113</sup> Resident	No	This proposal would further encourage expansion of	No	
		Hitchin into its rural surroundings, absorbing the rich		
		character of villages that surrounds it and diminishing		
		not only the quality of life in those villages but also for		
		the residents of Hitchin who will be deprived of a rural		
		setting close to the town centre.		
<sup>2115</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2116</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2119</sup> Resident	No	St Ippolyts is a very small ward and it is better for local	No	It would seem reasonable for both north and
		people to be able to be represented by someone who		south St Ippolytts to each have the same
		knows the parish and ward personally, which would		number of Councillors.
		not be so easy if the ward was incorporated into		
		Hitchin and by being made even smaller the likely		
		scenario would be the eventual demise of the St		
		scenario would be the eventual demise of the St		
<sup>2121</sup> Resident	No	scenario would be the eventual demise of the St lopolyts ward.	No	
2121 Resident 2123 Resident	No No		No No	
		Ippolyts ward.		
<sup>2123</sup> Resident	No	Ippolyts ward.	No	
2123 Resident 2124 Resident	No No	Ippolyts ward.	No No	
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident	No No No	Innolvts ward.	No No No	Why is there an imbalance of representation-
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident	No No	Innolvts ward.  It is important that there is representation of the St	No No	Why is there an imbalance of representation-
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident	No No No	Innolvts ward.	No No No	Why is there an imbalance of representation- surely they should be a balanced representation
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident	No No No	Innolvts ward.  It is important that there is representation of the St	No No No	·
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No	Inpolyts ward.  It is important that there is representation of the St lppolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.	No No No No	·
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No No	It is important that there is representation of the St Ippolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.  I wish the village of St Ippolytts to remain a settlement	No No No No	surely they should be a balanced representation
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No No	It is important that there is representation of the St Ippolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.  I wish the village of St Ippolytts to remain a settlement separate to Hitchin. This is unwelcome creeping	No No No No	surely they should be a balanced representation
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No No	It is important that there is representation of the St Ippolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.  I wish the village of St Ippolytts to remain a settlement separate to Hitchin. This is unwelcome creeping urbanisation of a rural parish. It is inappropriate for	No No No No	surely they should be a balanced representation
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No No	It is important that there is representation of the St Ippolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.  I wish the village of St Ippolytts to remain a settlement separate to Hitchin. This is unwelcome creeping urbanisation of a rural parish. It is inappropriate for residents of Hitchin to be consulted on potential	No No No No No	surely they should be a balanced representation
2123 Resident 2124 Resident 2125 Resident 2126 Resident 2127 Resident 2127 Resident	No No No No No	It is important that there is representation of the St Ippolyts parish by the residents and not diluted.  I wish the village of St Ippolytts to remain a settlement separate to Hitchin. This is unwelcome creeping urbanisation of a rural parish. It is inappropriate for	No No No No No	surely they should be a balanced representation

2133 Resident	No	I live in the edge of Hitchin/St. Ippolyts (North	No	I don't think any further comments are
Resident	INO		INO	
		Ward)and was a resident in St. Ippolyts for much of		necessary (see earlier).
		my life. I'm appalled that village residents are		
		potentially being dragooned into a situation that		
		would lead to their area being submerged into a large,		
		urban area. This begs the question for what precise		
<sup>2134</sup> Resident	No	purpose is this being attempted?  I have lived in the parish of St Ippolyts (north ward) all	No	The role of a Parish Councillor is voluntary, so
Resident	NO	my life and I'm horrified at the proposal to split the	NO	I'm not sure why there needs to be a reduction
		Parish of St Ippolyts and include the north ward in		in numbers when they carry out their roles
		with Hitchin. I have not found any logical reason for		
		, ,		without costing the taxpayer any money.
		this to happen. The parish of St Ippolyts is a		
		community in itself and residents feel part of a village		
		community which is now being threatened. North		
		ward residents would no longer have a voice on parish		
		matters and we want to stay united. We do not live in		
		Hitchin, and if we had wanted to, could have bought		
		property there.		
		The proposal would reduce significantly the number of		
		households in the parish which would leave the parish		
		council short of money for the upkeep of community		
<sup>2135</sup> Resident	No	ana a an ala an ala an	No	
<sup>2137</sup> Resident	No	Our children went to St Ippolyts School and we feel	No	The parish councillors carry out their roles
		part of the village. We take part in classes and events		diligently, caring for the best interests of the
		in St Ippolyts and are more affected by St Ippolyts		village. Reducing the number of councillors will
		than by Hitchin.		increase the workload and make it harder to
		•		fulfil their roles and balance this with family life.
<sup>2138</sup> Resident	No	We have been very involved in st ippolyts parish ,	Yes	
		school events at village hall		
<sup>2143</sup> Resident	No	North ward would no longer have any say on local	No	I am not in favour of reduction of number of
		matters and South Ward would suffer from reduced		Councillors.
		funding.		
<sup>2145</sup> Resident	No	I have lived all my life in St. ippollyts and have been a	No	
		parish councillor, School Governor and my family part		
		of the village community for many ,many years, now		
		for no good reason you want to tear this apart		
<sup>2146</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2157</sup> Resident	No		No	
2163 Resident	No	l believe North and South Ward should stay as a joint	No	See above.
<sup>2163</sup> Resident	No	I believe North and South Ward should stay as a joint ward with 8 councillors and continue to look after the	No	See above.

<sup>2164</sup> Resident	No	The parish of St. Ippolyts north and south should stay	No	Why?
		together. Moving the north into Hitchin would reduce		
		the effectiveness of the remaining south due to cuts in		
		funding and services.		
		It's a village called St.Ippolyts therefore it should		
		remain as such.		
		You wouldn't move the part of Hitchin closest to Luton		
		into Bedfordshire		
<sup>2165</sup> Resident	No	I object to splitting the parish of St Ippolyts	No	I object to splitting up the parish of St Ippolyts
<sup>2173</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2178</sup> Resident	No	Concerned about lack of funding for rural areas	No	
<sup>2179</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2187</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2188</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2189</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2193</sup> Resident	No	I have lived in the Paddocks ( SG4 9EF ) for nearly 35		N/A
		years.		I am extremely anti the recommendation
		It has always felt like a semi rural parish much better		consequently am unable to consider these
		served by St. Ippolyts than the more urban Hitchin.		alternatives.
		It is has always been more closely aligned to St.		
		Ippolyts community and I can see no sensible reason		
		why it should change.		
		It would also deprive the St. Ippolyts parish of much		
		needed funding and facilities which would once again		
		5		
		effect the nature of a pleasant rural and semi rural environment.		
		I am very strongly against the recommendation and		
		would be interested to know why after all these years		
		it is even being considered and who thinks it is a good		
		idea.		
		PRESUMABLY NO ONE WHO ACTUALLY LIVES IN THE		
		PARISH PUT THIS SUGGESTION FORWARD, BUT AS		
0405		USUAL ITS PEOPLE WITH SECONDARY AGENDAS WHO		
<sup>2196</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2197</sup> Resident	No	Why fix what is broken. St lppolyts is an OLD and	No	Again why fragment something that works so
		thriving community - this will fragment the village and		well left alone. St Ippolyts has been ONE parish
		confuse funding.		and should remain so. At a time when you
				really should be strengthening community you
				are trying to divide and destroy it
<sup>2198</sup> Resident	No		No	
<sup>2201</sup> Resident	No		No	

25° Resident No This would reduce monies for upleesp of facilities No I do not suppose this move at it would leave 8 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose the move at the would leave 9 tippolys for suppose 10 tip	<sup>2209</sup> Resident	No		Yes	
1					
Parish Council in an impossible passion financially. This wank in the set this count into section mercupe facilities with these households paying in and yet a proposal will continue to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities without proposal will be set to use the facilities witho	<sup>2215</sup> Resident	No	This would reduce monies for upkeep of facilities	No	
They would not be able to maintain existing meager those residents moving into litted under the proposal will continue to use the folding without palying anything to St plopfice, in particular the maintenance of Jay and hun equipment at the recommendance of Morth word we want to have a voice of Notine Traiting.  Proposal will continue to use the folding without palying anything to St plopfice, in particular the maintenance of Jay and hun equipment at the recommendance of Notine Traiting.  Proposal will continue the Proposal will will continue the Proposal	<sup>2217</sup> Resident	No		No	
Facilities with fewer households paying and yet in proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue to use the facilities without the proposal will continue the proposal will continue the proposal will continue the proposal will continue the proposal will be proposal will continue the proposal will be prop			Parish Council in an impossible position financially.		
by Series of the			They would not be able to maintain existing meagre		
proposed will continue to use the facilities without paying anything to Stippolys. In profitable the maintenence of play and him equipment at the recreament of noted matters.  279 Reademt No Remaining south ward will be too small to generate No Remaining south war			facilities with fewer households paying in and yet		
pering mything to St loppyse. In particular the mintenence of play and hun equiment at the recommendation of the r			those residents moving into hitchin under the		
maintenance of play and nun equipment at the result of the control			proposal will continue to use the facilities without		
2191 Resident No As a resident Object was also continued concerned on local matters. 2292 Resident No Essemis imports that households on the Broad madow exatte have an input to local matters. 2298 Resident No Leave it alone! 2298 Resident No Leave matters as they are. 2398 Resident Ves Leave matters as they are. 2499 Resident Ves I am against Hitchin having a Town Council 2409 Resident Ves I have as continuous with Hitchin and we already vote in Hitchin Priory Ward without a voice. Town pairs to councils without a voice. Town pairs to councils without a voice. Town prior storain asys that the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded and decicions left with the parts houncils could be disbanded to have clicky parts houncils and parts and parts are parts and parts and parts are parts and pa			paying anything to St Ippolyts. In particular the		
219 Resident Role on local maters 220 Resident Role on Role of March sand we want to have a voice on local maters. 220 Resident Role Resident Role of March Industrial for the Ernad Role of March Industrial Role of Role of Parish Councillors altogether Councils World of Parish Councillors altogether Councils World Parish Councillors altogether Councils World of Parish Councillors altogether Councils World Parish Councillors altogether Council World Parish Councillors altogether Council World Parish Councillors Role of Parish Councillors altogether Council Role of Pa			maintenence of play and hun equipment at the rec		
Care					
Parameter   Para	<sup>2219</sup> Resident	No		No	
Management   Man					
Sesident   No   Remaining south ward will be too small to generate sufficient funds for directing into local needs   No   It's fine as it id	<sup>2220</sup> Resident	No	•	No	
Controll of Council	2220 5 11				
2238 Resident   No   Leave trained   No   It's fine as it id	<sup>2229</sup> Resident	No		No	
2239 Resident   No   Leave matters as they are.   No	2220 D				mi C - 201
122 District   Yes	2230 Resident	NO	Leave it alone!	NO	It's fine as it id
Councillor   Yes	<sup>2239</sup> Resident	No	Leave matters as they are.	No	
1733 Resident   Yes	<sup>122</sup> District	Yes		Yes	
2025 Resident Yes I am against Hitchin having a Town Council Yes  86 Resident Yes This area is continuous with Hitchin and we already yote in Hitchin Priory Ward  97 Resident Yes This area is continuous with Hitchin and we already yote in Hitchin Priory Ward  98 Resident Yes The parish councili for streply elected, as so few people come forward. Hence most are co-opted or appointed without a vote. To me, this situation says that the parish councili could be disbanded and decicions left with town or district councils.  298 Resident Yes Yes No  313 Resident Yes Yes Yes  409 Resident Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish council so ounciliors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident Yes Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether  704 Resident Yes Yes Yes  705 Resident Yes Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish Yes Get rid of Parish councillors altogether  705 Resident Yes Yes Yes  706 Resident Yes Yes Yes					
Resident Yes This area is continuous with Hitchin and we already vote in Hitchin Priory Ward  PResident Yes The parish council is rarely elected, as so few people without a vote. To me, this situation says that the parish councils could be disbanded and decicions left with town or district councils.  Per Resident Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Alfalent Yes Yes Gardent Yes Yes Yes Alfalent Yes Yes Yes Alfalent Yes Yes Yes Yes Alfalent Yes Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  Pres Yes Yes Yes Yes Alfalent Yes	<sup>1733</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
This area is continuous with Hitchin and we already vote in Hitchin Priory Ward  Provided Hitchi	<sup>2025</sup> Resident	Yes	l am against Hitchin having a Town Council	Yes	
vote in Hitchin Priory Ward  Priory Resident  Priory Resi	<sup>86</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
1 Proposition 2	<sup>90</sup> Resident	Yes	This area is continuous with Hitchin and we already	Yes	Less people to represent therefore less
come forward. Hence most are co-opted or appointed without a vote. To me, this situation says that the parish councils could be disbanded and decicions left with town or district councils.  239 Resident Yes Yes  313 Resident Yes No  325 Resident Yes Yes  449 Resident Yes Yes  441 Resident Yes  Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Get rid of Parish councillors altogether  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes			vote in Hitchin Priory Ward		councillors needed
without a vote. To me, this situation says that the parish councils could be disbanded and decicions left with town or district councils.  239 Resident Yes Yes No 325 Resident Yes Yes Yes 409 Resident Yes Yes Yes 411 Resident Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident Yes Yes Yes 754 Resident Yes Yes Yes 755 Resident Yes Yes Yes 755 Resident Yes Yes Yes 756 Resident Yes Yes Yes	<sup>97</sup> Resident	Yes	The parish council is rarely elected, as so few people	Yes	I'd rather there were 0 (zero) parish councillors.
parish councils could be disbanded and decicions left with town or district councils.  Page Resident Yes Yes No  Page Resident Yes Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  Page Resident Yes Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Yes Yes  Page Resident Yes Yes Yes			come forward. Hence most are co-opted or appointed		
239 Resident   Yes   Yes   No			without a vote. To me, this situation says that the		
239 Resident       Yes       Yes         313 Resident       Yes       No         325 Resident       Yes       Yes         409 Resident       Yes       Yes         411 Resident       Yes       Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish youncillors altogether councills who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.       Get rid of Parish councillors altogether         702 Resident       Yes       Yes			parish councils could be disbanded and decicions left		
Resident Yes Yes  409 Resident Yes Yes  441 Resident Yes  Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether  702 Resident Yes  704 Resident Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish yes Councills who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  Yes  Yes  Yes			with town or district councils.		
325 ResidentYesYes409 ResidentYesYes411 ResidentYesFar too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.Yes702 ResidentYesYes754 ResidentYesYes	<sup>239</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
409 Resident Yes Yes  441 Resident Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish Yes Get rid of Parish councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident Yes Yes  754 Resident Yes Yes	<sup>313</sup> Resident	Yes		No	
441 Resident Yes Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish Councillors altogether councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident Yes Yes  754 Resident Yes Yes	<sup>325</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident  794 Resident  Yes  Yes  Yes	<sup>409</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
councils who are far to set in their ways to be progressive.  702 Resident  703 Resident  704 Resident  Yes  Yes	<sup>441</sup> Resident	Yes	Far too selective and so outdated to have clicky Parish	Yes	Get rid of Parish councillors altogether
progressive.  702 Resident Yes Yes  754 Resident Yes Yes			councils who are far to set in their ways to be		<u> </u>
702 ResidentYesYes754 ResidentYesYes					
	<sup>702</sup> Resident	Yes	·	Yes	
990 Resident Yes No	<sup>754</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
	<sup>990</sup> Resident	Yes		No	

<sup>1375</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>1726</sup> Resident	Yes	Change makes sense	Yes	
<sup>1771</sup> Resident	Yes	As it stands, the inclusion of what is contiguous with		This does not make sense. You are basing the
		Hitchin in St Ippolyts makes no sense especially. with		survey
		the border running down the centre of Blackhorse		
		lane and Newlands Ave. However with the current		
		development next to Broadmeadow, the gap is		
		decreasing. This may need to be addressed in the		
		future as the demographics are changing.		
<sup>1974</sup> Resident	Yes		Yes	
<sup>2014</sup> Resident	Yes	This was the original setup many years ago. The idea	Yes	Not sure why such a small area needs so many
		of a town council seems sensible given the		councillors
		development of the area		
<sup>2023</sup> Resident	Yes	St Ippolyts north share closer proximity with Hitchin.	Yes	It does not make a difference.
		Thus, it would make sense to be a part of proposed		
		town council.		
<sup>2144</sup> Resident	Yes	I am in favour of this only if a new parish of Hitchin,	Yes	
		served by a new Town Council goes ahead.		
<sup>2203</sup> Resident	Yes	I've always seen Broadmeadow as Hitchin anyway; its	Yes	Seems logical
		not exactly rural and will be even less so once the		
		adjoining new estate is completed. I think there is a		
		case for excluding Millfield Lane from INH and keeping		
		that in St Ippolyts, but that's probably not on the list		
		for consideration		
<sup>E/007</sup> Resident	No	I do not agree that the St Ippolyts North parish ward		
		should become part of a new Hitchin Town council.		
		-Smaller wards give more and speedier access ,by		
		parishioners, to serving Councillors		
		-Councillors in smaller wards are more likely to be		
		identified in the area.		
		- Personal relationships are facilitated in smaller wards		
		, creating less frustration.		
		- There will be more connection on-line which can by-		
		nacs a whole community of the elderly		

# ST. PAUL'S WALDEN

ID	Capacity	Response	Reason	
200	<sup>06</sup> Resident	No		
21:	<sup>24</sup> Resident	No		

<sup>15</sup> Resident	No	"The establishment of new Town Councils in Baldock,
		Hitchin, and Letchworth - this will have implications on
		the amount of council tax paid by residents" State
		how. Be clear. You have already increased it while
		reducing our services, for example core services -
		waste disposal to 3 weeks. Disgusting.
<sup>348</sup> Resident	Yes	Fairly content with our status quo
<sup>534</sup> Resident	Yes	
<sup>235</sup> Parish or Tov	vn Yes	
council (St		
Paul's Walde	n	
Parish Counc	zil)	
*	•	

HERFIELD					
		Election dates		N Clirs	
ID Capacity	Response	Reason	Response	Reason	
<sup>1752</sup> Resident	No		No		
<sup>1760</sup> Parish/Town	No	See no reason why a Parish election needs to be	No	I believe 5 is too few for the Parish to be run	
Councillor		aligned with NHDC elections.		effectively without asking too much from the	
(Therfield				councillors who volunteer their time.	
Parish)				There can't be a financial benefit to NH as we're	
				not paid anything.	
				Having more people means you get a wider	
				range of life experience on the council with	
				more chance of constructive oninions	
<sup>1885</sup> Resident	No	I believe the elections should be kept separate to	No	Parish Councillors are volunteers, juggling	
		highlight that Parish Council elections are NOT political	!	private lives, families and work alongside their	
				PC duties. It would make it too onerous on	
				individuals to reduce their number with the	
				amount of work that they do already. More	
				volunteers equals wider experience and	
				knowledge - always good to have - and our	
				village is rapidly growing in population meaning	
				there will inevitably be more for the Councillors	
				to deal with	
<sup>61</sup> Resident	Yes		No	5 is too few councillors for Therfield. They could	
				possibly function ok with 6	
<sup>1442</sup> Resident	Yes		No		

555 Parish/Town	Yes	No comments.	Yes	No comments.
Councillor				
(Therfield				
Parish Council	)			
*				
1662 Resident	Yes		No	If we have 7 people interested we shoud make
				room for them in the interests of democracy
				and spreading the load around volunteers.
<sup>2226</sup> Resident	Yes		No	Councillors keep saying at meetings that they
				have too much to do as Parish councillors, so
				decreasing the numbers would result in more
				work for individuals. The larger number of
				councillors means there is more diverse input
				from the village.

		Election dates
D Capacity	Response	Reason
<sup>2162</sup> Parish/Town	No	Why reduce the number of councillors to below the
Councillor		current number of councillors? There is clearly a need
		for a greater allocation than being proposed and it
		makes no sense to disengage local people from being
		part of their parish council.
<sup>1870</sup> Resident	No	

1955	Parish or Town	No
	council	
	(Weston Parish	
	Council) *	

We do not agree that synchronising Parish Council elections with District Council elections is a good idea. The District Councillors mostly stand as representatives of political parties, whereas Parish Councils are, for the most part, completely non-political. Holding elections for both at the same time simply encourages the greater politicisation of Parish Council elections, which we believe would be undesirable.

If the move to a unitary authority goes ahead, synchronising elections at this time would be a pointless exercise, so better to leave it as is.

In Weston we have no difficulty in supporting a council with 9 members. Reducing this to 7 would simply impose an undesirable constraint on numbers and greater work pressure on those filling the vacancies.

#### **WYMONDLEY**

Capacity	Response	Reason
<sup>8</sup> Resident	No	Changing the electoral cycle is fine but i am not in
		favour of the reduction from 2 to 1 for Great
		Wymondley. Having served on the parish council for
		11 years we need to spread the load to more
		councillors not les
<sup>944</sup> Resident	Yes	For a small parish it is often difficult to find enough
		councillors