

OFFICIAL



Appendix B

Community Governance Review Consultation Responses (Phase 2) January 2024

Onehouse and Stowmarket

We are committed to the principles of fairness and respect at Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils

Document Owner: Directorate of Law & Governance
Community Governance
Version: 1
Date: 22 January 2024

Contents

1. Summary.....	3
2. Responses.....	6
2.1. Recommendation View	6
2.2. Explanations – Option 1 No Change	7
2.3. Explanations – Option 2 Move Areas into Stowmarket.....	8
2.4. Explanations – Option 3 Some Other Option	9
2.5. Explanations – Option 4 Unsure/ Don't Know.....	10
2.6. Recommendations by Postcode	11
2.7. Recommendations from Residents in Areas A, B, C and Union Road.....	13
3. Consultation Comments Lists.....	15
3.1. Agree Comments	15
3.2. Disagree Comments.....	48
3.3. Other Comments	62
3.4. Unsure Comments.....	65
3.5. Photo Responses	68
4. Representations from Community Organisations and Other Respondents	69
5. Equalities Monitoring.....	70

1. Summary

1.1. The Community Governance Review phase 2 consultation commenced on 10th November 2023 and initially was to run for 6 weeks until 22nd December 2023. An extension was granted by the Community Governance Working Group to extend the consultation period until 10th January, providing additional consultation due to delays experienced by the printing service. All households within the areas of the community governance review received a letter, survey, and map to participate in the consultation.

A Total of **848** responses were received during this period, 18 of which from the extended period. A summary of the responses precedes a detailed breakdown.

1.2. Which of the above options is your preferred option?

Agree - No Change	619	73.00%
Disagree - Areas Move to Stowmarket Town	147	17.33%
Some Other Option	10	1.18%
Blank	12	1.42%
Unsure	60	7.08%
Total	848	100.00%

1.3. Why you chose option 1 – Agree (With the Draft Recommendations for NO CHANGE)

	Of those that Agree	
Stowmarket Growth/Encroachment	150	24.23%
Identity of Area/ Residents	145	23.42%
Favour towards the Status Quo	120	19.39%
No Justification for Change	84	13.57%
Infrastructure	67	10.82%
Development Concerns	57	9.21%
ABCU Area Representation	51	8.24%
Perceived Financial Motivations	50	8.08%
Agreement to Draft Recommendations	46	7.43%
Stowmarket Management	36	5.82%
Funding	24	3.88%
Onehouse Management	17	2.75%
Lack of Information	13	2.10%
Green Spaces	11	1.78%
Expense/Waste	11	1.78%
Questionnaire Complexity	7	1.13%
No Preference	5	0.81%
Proximity	3	0.48%
Map Unclear	3	0.48%
Doesn't understand it	1	0.16%
Business Opportunity	1	0.16%
Split Area B	1	0.16%
Planning	1	0.16%

1.4. Why you chose option 2 – Disagree (Would prefer areas to move to Stowmarket Town)

Of those that Disagree

Infrastructure	58	39.46%
Proximity	48	32.65%
Funding	29	19.73%
Favour Towards Change	16	10.88%
ABCU Area Representation	14	9.52%
Favour Merger	13	8.84%
Stowmarket Management	12	8.16%
Identity of Area/ Residents	11	7.48%
Stowmarket Growth	9	6.12%
Onehouse Management	8	5.44%
Justification Not Enough	8	5.44%
Questionnaire Complexity	6	4.08%
Lack of Information	5	3.40%
Development Concerns	4	2.72%
Perceived Financial Motivations	4	2.72%
Expense/Waste	4	2.72%
Business Opportunity	4	2.72%
Map Unclear	3	2.04%
Planning	3	2.04%
Starhouse Lane	3	2.04%
Green Spaces	2	1.36%
No Preference	2	1.36%
Natural Border	2	1.36%
No Justification for Change	1	0.68%
Agreement to Draft Recommendations	1	0.68%
Split Area B	1	0.68%
STC Recommendations	1	0.68%
Not impartial	1	0.68%
Progress & Development	1	0.68%

1.5. Why you chose option 3 - Some Other Option

For those that chose Some Other option

Split Area B	5	50.00%
Identity of Area/ Residents	3	30.00%
Infrastructure	3	30.00%
ABCU Area Representation	2	20.00%
Funding	2	20.00%
Stowmarket Management	2	20.00%
Expense/Waste	2	20.00%
Proximity	1	10.00%
Favour Towards Change	1	10.00%
Favour Merger	1	10.00%
No Preference	1	10.00%
Justification Not Enough	1	10.00%
Planning	1	10.00%

1.6. Why you chose option 4 – Unsure/ I Don't Know

	Of those that are Unsure	
Not Enough Info	17	28.3%
Without Specification	9	15.0%
Ambivalent	7	11.7%
Recent Move	7	11.7%
Not Our Decision	5	8.3%
Infrastructure	4	6.7%
Matter Complexity	3	5.0%
Council Tax Transparency	2	3.3%
Map Not Clear	2	3.3%
Unfamiliar to Area	2	3.3%
Traffic Concerns	1	1.7%
Stowmarket Growth	1	1.7%

1.7. Please State which of the following best describes you?

I live in the Onehouse or Stowmarket	98.82%
I work in Onehouse or Stowmarket	0.00%
I own a Business in Onehouse or Stowmarket	0.00%
I am a representative of a community organisation in Onehouse or Stowmarket	0.71%
Other	0.47%

1.8. Contact details

A total of **381** respondents have provided their contact details to be kept informed on the Community Governance Review.

1.9. Disability

A total of **127** respondents indicated that they have a disability representing **14.98%** of those who submitted a response.

1.10. Correspondence

Post	837	98.70%
Email	11	1.30%

1.11. Demographics

16 - 19	0	40 - 49	76	70 - 79	219
20 - 29	20	50 - 59	136	80+	86
30 - 39	49	60 - 69	198	Prefer Not to Say	64


1.12. Clarity of Materials

Respondents self-reporting difficulties within their comments were captured.

	Questionnaire Complexity	Doesn't understand	Lack of Information	Map Unclear
Agree	8	2	14	4
Disagree	6	0	5	3
Other	0	0	0	0
Blank	0	0	0	0
Unsure	0	3	17	2
TOTAL	14	5	36	9
PERCENT	1.13%	0.59%	4.25%	1.06%

1.13. Confusion

A total of **14** respondents answers did not match their explanations provided, representing **1.65%** of those who submitted a response. **7.08%** of respondents' answers could not be matched as they did not submit their responses with explanatory comments. Overall, a confirmed **91.27%** of respondents understood the consultation exercise.




2. Responses

2.1. Recommendation View

The majority of responses with **73.00%** prefer option 1 for no change to the Onehouse and Stowmarket boundary. **17.33%** of responses indicated a preference for option 2 to move the areas into Stowmarket.

Community Governance Review for Onehouse and Stowmarket - Second Phase Consultation 2023-34



2.2. Explanations – Option 1 No Change


Out of the 619 respondents that ticked option 1 – no change. A total of 582 comments were received. A summary of those comments by theme can be found below and the entirety of the comments by option can be found in the subsequent sections.

A note on themes: Themes are commonly reoccurring words that have been grouped on the similarity of meaning to provide meaningful quantitative statistics from the qualitative data received.

The top 3 reasons why respondents stated option 1 was chosen:

1. Belief that Stowmarket Town is big enough/ Sprawling/ Encroaching on Onehouse.
2. Belief that the Areas/ Residents have a strong community identity linked to Onehouse.
3. Preference to towards the status quo.

Onehouse and Stowmarket Consultation Commonality of Themes - Option 1 No Change




2.3. Explanations – Option 2 Move Areas into Stowmarket

Out of the **147** respondents that ticked option 2 – to move the areas into Stowmarket. A total of **137** comments were received. A summary of those comments by theme can be found below.

The top 3 reasons why respondents stated option 2 was chosen:

1. Belief that residents within the areas will utilise Stowmarket facilities/ Onehouse cannot provide the facilities.
2. Regard the areas as closer to Stowmarket/ adjoined to Stowmarket.
3. Belief that any financial resources should be allocated to Stowmarket.

Onehouse and Stowmarket Consultation Commonality of Themes - Option 2 Move areas into Stowmarket




2.4. Explanations – Option 3 Some Other Option

Out of the **10** respondents that ticked option 3 – Some Other Option. All **10** provided explanatory comments. A summary of those comments by theme can be found below.

The top 3 reasons why respondents stated option 3 was chosen:

1. Preference to Split Area B from the other areas and move Area B into Stowmarket
2. Belief that Stowmarket Infrastructure will be used by the Areas.
3. Preferences for existing dwellings to remain in Onehouse and for new developments to be allocated to Stowmarket.

Onehouse and Stowmarket Consultation Commonality of Themes - Option 3 Some Other Option




2.5. Explanations – Option 4 Unsure/ Don't Know

Out of the 60 respondents that ticked option 4 – Unsure/ Don't Know 53 provided explanatory comments. A summary of those comments by theme can be found below.

The top 3 reasons why respondents stated option 4 was chosen:

1. Not enough information – Town/Parish narrative on the political elements (e.g. Council Tax)
2. No specification provided.
3. Have no preference either way.

Onehouse and Stowmarket Consultation Commonality of Themes
- Option 4 Unsure/ Don't Know




2.6. Recommendations by Postcode

The majority of response received came from IP14 1 constituting 51.89% of the responses.

Parish	Areas	Total	Agree	Disagree	Other	Blank	Unsure
Stowmarket	IP14 1	440	304	89	5	6	37
	IP14 2	140	106	22	1	1	10
	IP14 4	2	2	0	0	0	0
	IP14 5	87	50	24	3	0	10
IP14	Not Stated	18	8	3	0	5	2
Onehouse	IP14 3	108	97	9	1	0	1
	Residents in Areas ABC and Union Road	52	52	0	0	0	0
Total		847	619	147	10	12	60

Map of the Onehouse – Stowmarket in relation to post code areas




The yellow circle marks out the approximate postcode area relating to the ABCU residents.

Note: only households within the parish of Onehouse or the Town of Stowmarket were consulted.

The majority of each post code support the Community Governance Review Working Group’s draft recommendation with a range from **100.00% to 44.44%**.


Community Governance Review for Onehouse and Stowmarket Second Phase Consultation Responses by Postcode



2.7. Recommendations from Residents in Areas A, B, C and Union Road


All 52 residents of the affected areas who have returned responses agree to stay within Onehouse.

Community Governance Review for Onehouse and Stowmarket Second Phase Consultation Affected Residents' Responses by Area



The percentage breakdown of each post code showcases the internal breakdown for the area. All areas show a preference towards No Change.

Community Governance Review for Onehouse and Stowmarket
 Second Phase Consultation
 Responses by Postcode in %



3. Consultation Comments Lists

3.1. Agree Comments

Comments	Additional Comments
No more new houses please	No more new houses please
Why? It just changing the history of the area, waste of time and possible our money	
We have both lived in Suffolk for many years. I think there is too much building work going on (too badly in some cases) without the infrastructure they require. The recent cladding proves this. Stowmarket, the very name, hill with market is nearly anathema. The whole of G Anglia would be one big housing estate if all these constructors get their way and where are the doctors surgeries ere? All promised.	
No need to change	
There will be too much pressure on Stowmarket services, health centre, etc	
Onehouse should not lose any of their land!	
Due to reasons stated in your letter	
I believe Stowmarket + Onehouse boundaries should remain the same to reflect their individual identities and interests	
Stowmarket does not need it's borders extended any further, as the Town Council don't have enough funding to keep up with the needs of what we already have. The Town and surrounding areas are looking tired and neglected why would we want more of the same?	
i) the area historically have been part of Onehouse ii) I feel Onehouse Parish Council will better consider the valuable biodiversity of Area C than Stowmarket Town Council	
No reason to change boundaries	
Prevention of further sprawl of developments which are replicated nationwide with no appreciation of the nature of Suffolk architecture and the idea of the county being scattered with smaller communities	Provide for your residents who are paying council tax now, not just invest for the future when a lot of us will not be here. Look after parks/green spaces, lesser vandalism and allow retail spaces to thrive out of town.
I have read the reasons given by the working-group of councillors and agree with them. Its important that Onehouse retains its own identity, I feel Stowmarket is gradually losing its as it sprawls in each direction, creeping closer to Haughley, Stowupland and Onehouse.	
I disagree with villages being expanded and drawn into the bigger areas of Towns, thus losing the identity of this village. I was Born + bred in Stowmarket. You only have to look what the Council has done to the Town centre over the years. There was a lot of old buildings in the town, now these all gone. the character of this Town has diminished, all we have now is a white elephant. Villages should hold on to their identity + character.	We don't need other options. Keep villages as villages. Bottom line is this is all about Council Tax + Rates, Councils getting greedy. Councils are like the politicians, they don't listen to the electorate.
For the reasons set out in this letter	
Stowmarket already growing too fast	
I don't want the boundaries of Stow to encroach further on the Onehouse boundaries and for any more housing development to be filling up the gaps!	

We want to keep Onehouse as separate from Stowmarket as possible. We want to be a separate village, not swallowed up by Stowmarket	
No need to change the boundaries, can't see a reasonable justification to move these areas into Stowmarket. Seems like the proposal is influenced by money as opposed to what is best for the community.	
Onehouse is very much a Village community and the residents that I know are very keen to keep their identity separate from Stowmarket	
Maintains Onehouse identity especially inclusion of Paupers Grave and the former Workhouse in the Village	
I have close links to Paupers Graves having been given permission by Onehouse Parish Council to plant Rowan trees in memory of my husband and daughter. It is somewhere I regularly visit finding much peace and I'm aware the newbuilds were chosen as being in Onehouse as are the established properties. The area is also attributed to Stow Lodge occupants of the Workhouse were buried in Paupers Grave.	
Leave things as they are no need for change	
Stowmarket area is large enough as it is and struggles to provide services, like doctors & dentist for the inhabitants	
I live in Stowmarket, Combs end but do use the roads up to the proposed site and to be honest I cannot see how they managed to get so many houses in such a small space with no gardens.	Please try to keep Stowmarket + Onehouse a community not an overgrown estate!
I am happy with the way things are, I like to be part of a village community. I'm aware that personally I would remain in Onehouse but I would be closely surrounded by Stowmarket. I feel there is a clear delineator currently	
Residents currently living within Onehouse have expressed a wish to remain in Onehouse. Onehouse Parish Council should continue to benefit from funding provided for the areas covered by new/proposed developments within the boundaries	
I feel Stowmarket & Onehouse should retain their own identities. Stowmarket is a town, Onehouse is a village (No amenities).	
History of Paupers' Graves - owned by the Parish Council. Existing residents of newer developments thought they were being in the Parish of Onehouse	
1) The cross party working group recommended no change 2) Stowmarket should remain the present size	
The existing boundaries are no doubt historical in origin. No real reason is given for this change although I expect the parish share of the Council Tax and all the new building has a part to play	
Stowmarket Town Council just trying to grab more council tax at expense of villages	
Why reinvent the wheel? Can't see how it would be council tax "well spent"	
Keep us separate, let Onehouse stay as it is	
1) Cannot see any material advantages in the change 2) Concerned that Onehouse PC may become non-viable if it's population/electorate roll is shrunk so dramatically	
Since 1970, as the area of Stowmarket housing has increased the over-heads of Stowmarket Council has rocketed and their service has declined	Stop wasting our money on empire building and concentrating on providing an efficient service

Used to reside on Chiltern Hall, have seen building development escalate around Stowmarket but this should not be at the detriment of the outlying villages losing their identity! Also as Stowmarket has expanded so our services have declined. It surely is more important to concentrate on what is going on within the existing boundary and not stretch resources further.	
Stowmarket is too Large already. The boundary should stay the same	
Stowmarket's infrastructure, roads, schools, doctors, shops, carparks, and water supplies are already over subscribed	
I believe the villages surrounding Stowmarket have their own identities and benefit from their own sense of community	
Stowmarket have trouble looking after their area as it is! Leave well alone.	
There are already many issues to be addressed without more housing i.e. Combs Lane flooding, Edgecombe Road is in desperate need of resurfacing, also Edgecombe Park my address is still top dressed after 5+ years? "Why"	
Don't know of advantage or disadvantage	
Community togetherness between all boundaries is integral to keep community togetherness	Important that small villages have their own say matters concerning them. Togetherness in the village mates each individual feel part of the community
We moved out of Stowmarket to Onehouse to become part of a smaller and tighter community. We love Onehouse and don't want it changing.	Our 2 small children also like Onehouse, we fell that they are a lot safer on the roads here, on bikes, scooters, etc
Happy with the way things are	
I don't want Stowmarket to "Swallow" Onehouse	This form is overly complex and not returning it would wrongly indicate a change to the Status Quo. The default position should be to keep areas define as is
This attempt at a land grab is clearly aimed at the Tax revenue which would disadvantage the population of Onehouse and would hold back infrastructure improvements in the Parish	
The other areas are not in Stowmarket	
For the reasons stated in your letter	
Because I consider Onehouse should retain it's identity, and know that is what parishioners of Onehouse want	
As a Stowmarket resident for 53 years (with just a short period of married life in the Ipswich area) I am of the opinion that historical value, especially the Paupers Graves, should prevail. I am of the opinion that charge for change sake is unnecessary. I am not against change but on this occasion, this seems pointless	
No need to change Unnecessary cost. Important that Onehouse retains its identity	
There is no need for change	Crucially important that no more land is fed to building developers
I see no reason why Stowmarket should be expanded	
Because A (in particular) B and C have always been in Onehouse and identify as such. There is no need for "Stowmarket" to expand and lose it's own identity. Any regard to funding for services (GPs, schools, roads, etc) should be done at county level	I am grateful for the opportunity to see what the "elected" or otherwise officials who represent the citizens of this area are up to in our names

<p>It seems sensible to maintain the status quo</p>	<p>I don't see any other options really other than to follow old Parish boundaries. The new housing estate in section B can hardly be split so its best it remains in Onehouse.</p>
<p>Cannot see any reason why the boundaries should now be moved just because there is a new housing development</p>	
<p>No need for change</p>	
<p>Town Council cannot cope with work load at the moment</p>	
<p>Stowmarket is large enough. It's a market town so would like it to stay that way</p>	
<p>Having grown up in Onehouse and now living in Stowmarket, Onehouse Parish Council are better equipped to look after the interests of this suburb and it's occupants. Stowmarket Town Council could not manage a p*** up in a brewery! The state of the town is testament to this statement.</p>	
<p>I have lived in Onehouse virtually all my life. I have been provided with no evidence of how moving this boundary will benefit myself or my neighbours. In contrast I expect in the least it would impact me financially in a negative manner. Maybe instead of spending money on such matters the Councils involved should properly fund services. Others gave the go ahead for the new developments against local wishes</p>	<p>We regularly receive this type of correspondence but with no details of the pro's and con's or how much the review or carrying out each proposal would cost. I also object to Stowmarket residents having a say as where I am registered as living.</p>
<p>Not all change is for the best its been ok for hundreds of years leave things alone</p>	
<p>Pressure on Stowmarket services, such as doctor's surgeries, schools and general infrastructure. Stowmarket has already had many new housing estates without additional provisions. I would have no issue with the development if these were in the plans. Why should residents of Stowmarket suffer? and have to pay for the pleasure!</p>	
<p>The land and development was sold as Onehouse. Stowmarket Council can't use the money for new Doctors etc so let Onehouse Parish have their money</p>	
<p>There is too much building in Stowmarket. No more new estates that can't sell the properties</p>	
<p>No change to boundaries. Stowmarket is expanding rapidly. Roads and amenities and drainage cannot cope.</p>	
<p>Local Facilities would bear more strain on services without the financial support being increased</p>	
<p>Would prefer to remain in Onehouse</p>	
<p>I think that if the working group considers that the existing boundaries meet the statutory tests of reflecting the interests/identity of the community, then why change them? If I'd bought a house in Onehouse, I'd likely want to stay in Onehouse. And if residents in Onehouse are against the proposal, stick with the status quo is my view</p>	<p>I think the working of the options is no as clear as it might be "Agree to decline" v "disagree to decline". Avoid double negatives if you can! However, the agreeing to "No change" is clear</p>
<p>I can see no reason for change</p>	
<p>I agree with Mid Suffolk's points + Is the plan an expense we can do without. + History & Custom is important</p>	
<p>I see it as a way to fairly divide revenue from council taxes to support each area</p>	
<p>Because I agree with the reasons given in the letter</p>	

<p>There is too much house building, its getting out of hand. Bus service is rubbish. Schools are full. Health care can't cope. Stowmarket is a Town. Council won't stop till it is a city</p>	<p>Build more infrastructure. Stop wasting our council tax on stuff like this.</p>
<p>If they move the boundaries then build further into Onehouse they will surely ask for the boundaries to be moved again. Rather leave them as they are & either build in Stow or Onehouse but not move boundaries</p>	
<p>No Conclusive reason for changing</p>	
<p>I think the change would make Stowmarket too big an area and will change the identities and interests of the area.</p>	<p>I live in the new developments in Union Road and apart from the obvious financial benefits to Stowmarket by taking over boundaries from Onehouse, do not understand what the residents would gain. Things should be left as they are and the Council should be focusing on more important issues</p>
<p>It is important for Onehouse to continue to be a close village retaining its identity and boundaries, without an encroachment from Stowmarket</p>	<p>Keep a reasonable amount of pleasant countryside without encroaching on that divide. I have no wish and I am sure many others to see Stowmarket and Onehouse adjoined or Onehouse becoming a near attaché/satellite.</p>
<p>Think it's the best option</p>	
<p>Since we moved to Stowmarket in the 80s it has doubled in size, therefore, no longer the small market town it was. I think we are big enough now, you can see the effects already, nobody cares anymore, rubbish, rule breaking, ugly shops, this list could go on.</p>	<p>To stay as we are and smarten the town up, the council cannot make the right choices now, so would be worse if we carried on expanding</p>
<p>Distinct separate villages should be protected, + allowed to make decisions for themselves</p>	
<p>I am happy to stay part of Onehouse for personal preference as well as the reasons you have outlined here.</p>	
<p>The parish of Onehouse should remain as it is. The people of Onehouse live there because it is a small community. Why change it?</p>	
<p>There is no justification to change the boundaries between Stowmarket and Onehouse. Many Towns and villages have residential areas spanning boundaries. Approval of building in neighbouring villages to a town should not justify a land-grab expansion of a town, especially when against the wishes of the village incumbent residents.</p>	<p>To allow boundary expansions on this basis would threaten the identity and existence of rural support villages, setting a precedent which could then be used in similar situations across the county. Kesgrave Town has not been consumed by Ipswich, Onehouse should not be grabbed by Stowmarket!</p>
<p>If I wanted to live in Stowmarket I would have chosen a different address. I like the Onehouse Hamlet and wish it to remain as such.</p>	<p>I prefer to have a Onehouse community spirit so much more pleasurable than that of a Town</p>
<p>Geographical logic</p>	
<p>My wife and I were both born in Stowupland. We have researched and noted the large areas of this parish which have been taken into Stowmarket. Also my parents were Onehouse residents until their deaths. We both agree that there should be no change of the Onehouse/Stowmarket boundaries for all the reasons stated by the cross-party Working Group of Councillors. We are both horrified that the change should even be considered.</p>	
<p>Historical boundaries</p>	

Decline request until MSDC provides more schools, nurseries and health centres to Stowmarket before bringing more people into town! And Dentist.	Improve Stowmarket before making it bigger. Refuse planning permissions for additional housing until we have health centre etc is added. Improve necessary facilities in Stowmarket before adding more people/housing
I think it would be insulting to the residents of Onehouse & the history of Paupers graves & union workhouse for them to be obliterated by the creeping growth of Stowmarket. We have already lost so much of our town & countryside.	As with many other Stowmarket surrounding towns and villages we have suffered uncontrolled, unimaginative thoughtless growth of housing. We are aware that houses are required. Where are the facilities required to service them? As for the A14 Gateway. What a mockery.
Seems the most sensible option	
I agree with your arguments to keep the boundary as it is. I.e. points 1 to 5.	
We do not have enough doctors, hospitals, schools, etc to cope with anymore development in Stowmarket. As the last few weeks has shown you cannot cope with flooding. Find this can only get worse if you allow more buildings	Please keep Stowmarket history. Leave boundaries as they are
Union Road development is near to Onehouse and not Stowmarket	
1086 Earliest mention of Onehouse in Domesday Survey 1381 Poll Tax 1723 Stow Union Workhouse listed in Parish of Onehouse Precepts to pay for maintenance of Onehouse Community centre which is in urgent replacement floor to maintain paupers graveyard to estate footpath from 22 Forest Road to Chilton Ley	Unable to comment due to lack of information. However, the working group (according to Mid Suffolk District Council website) recommends no change to the boundary between Stowmarket and Onehouse. Villagers living in Onehouse see the proposals as and other attempted land grabbing by Stowmarket T.C. so that precepts from housing in the disputed areas goes to Stowmarket and not Onehouse. Also planning future decisions would be decided by Stowmarket thus the people of Onehouse have no wish to be a conurbation merging with Stowmarket.
The local infrastructure cannot support this. Roads, doctors, schools, hospitals, police, fire service, ambulance. These are already under lots of pressure.	
Because I agree with recommendations and reasoning of the cross-party working group and as a resident of Onehouse see no need for an electoral boundary change	
The historic value of Onehouse should be retained, Paupers Grave/ Stow Lodge, etc. Residents that chose to live in Onehouse should retain that separate identity and Stowmarket is growing enough with new build, don't make it even bigger.	
I have lived in Onehouse for many years and was a Parish Councillor for 28 years until 2023, A bunch of retired Onehouse residents have looked after the Paupers Grave since 2000 and it is owned by Onehouse P.C I feel it is important for the Old Workhouse to be part of the historic site.	The proposed plan would isolate the little strip of Onehouse from the village. Also Onehouse Parish are purchasing the strip of land surrounding the Paupers Grave. Do I assume that it remains in Onehouse?
We prefer the boundaries to stay as they are. We have lived here for 33 years and enjoy being part of this Parish, with its own identity.	
For the reasons stated in the letter	
We choose to live in Onehouse Village as it is small and friendly with centuries of history. My husband can trace direct ancestors	

living here in the 17th C. The Paupers Graves and Union Workhouse are very important to Onehouses' identity.	
There is no need to alter the current boundaries. To do so would see further encroachment of Stowmarket onto Onehouse diminishing the identity of Onehouse. The proposal to extend boundaries is nothing more than a land grab by STC in an attempt to secure additional revenue from new developments.	I'm pleased the community governance review has seen sense and came to a sensible conclusion on the matter
More than adequate expansion currently being carried out	
Can't see or understand what the benefits would be to change or even to remain the same. The pro's and con's haven't been laid out so without this information human nature is to keep the status quo	Please provide more information in the future to enable a fully informed decision to be made with a map that can clearly identify roads etc.
To retain the integrity of Onehouse as a village and to maintain separation from Stowmarket	we appreciate the opportunity to add our views in the hope that the status quo prevails
Change is not always good. I don't trust that the field marked A will not be sold off if put in the domain of Stowmarket + then more bloody houses built on it.	Don't trust that it will change anything!
I agree with the Working Group	
No point	
I don't see any benefit or need for the change	
I have chosen option 1 because if the boundaries are moved then union road development and Areas A,B,C will then become Stowmarket's share of new developments, leaving more houses & development to be build in Onehouse	
In the absence of any provided pros/cons of any such change and the fact that being within Onehouse has to date added no problems 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'	This questionnaire is poor. Options A + B are written with the intention to confuse?! No provided information on which to make an informed choice.. Would impact rationale is not in favour of Onehouse residents
Stow Lodge and Paupers Graves have always been part of Onehouse and don't want it changed. Also a lot of residents moved to Union Road would face higher Council Tax bills, which would go to Stowmarket not Onehouse. For as long as I can remember Onehouse/Stowmarket boarder started at Stow Lodge	
To keep Onehouse as a village	
It seems to be the option most favourable to me and my family	
The boundary is absolute. The only reason a change has been proposed is Stowmarket is aware of a loss of income by not having the additional council tax	For all parties in future development applications to be fully aware of boundaries, prior to a development proposal being made
For the same reasons outlined by the working group of councillors	
I have chosen option1 because of the history of Stow Lodge, has always been Onehouse, the boundaries should be the same, the council will get tax from all houses regardless at location. No change. Plus I like to say I love in Onehouse!	
I do not like the thought of local parishes continuing to be 'swallowed up' by larger towns. These parishes need to be preserved rather than being lost	
I agree with the reasons of the working group	
More chance of more opinions from both areas	Maybe having more smaller areas with more amenities it would set the way for

	more opinions. From people who actually live in the areas. A move tailored service.
These are established boundaries that go back decades. Developers & Councils knew the parish boundaries when authorisation was given. Onehouse deserves the benefit of their council tax contributions for putting up with the additional clamour they bring.	
It's been good enough for years to come under the parish of Onehouse when it was just fields, why should it change just because its been developed on. Leave alone	
I believe in the independence of villages. Local communities are important & should not be muddled by changing boundaries	
Stowmarket is already increasing in size	
If it ain't broke don't fix it!	Until this arrived I was unaware that there was any practical or functional difference between the two areas
I believe that the villages and parishes surrounding Stowmarket should retain their individual identity and not be swallowed up by the town.	
I don't think that a new housing development should change the boundaries and they should remain how they have been for years.	
I see no need or valid reason to change the boundaries	
I can see no reason to change the existing boundaries	
Parish boundaries have been in place for long periods of years and should not be changed (for historical reasons)	My rates are paying for this. Why?
The boundary for Stowmarket should remain the same. The Union road development is better placed within the Onehouse boundary	
I fail to see why a 'land grab' by Stowmarket Town Council is justified. I assume key reasons are rooted somewhere in proportions of council tax allowance they would benefit from as a result of these proposals? There is no compelling need from evidence provided.	1) Same options with decision made by senior town councillors on roll of a dice (best of 5 rolls, winner takes all). 2) Merge the two & create a new combined council & town called either a) Onemarket b) Stowhouse It doesn't particularly lay out the case by Stowmarket Town Council for their land grab proposals. Likewise, it doesn't spell out any counter opinions by Onehouse Parish.
It should be the people who live in those amendment areas to decide if they want to become part of Stowmarket or stay within the Onehouse parish area. Not the people of Stowmarket	
I want my village to stay a village and not part of a town	The area around the old A14 Haughley Picnic site is a dead area and is ideal for development
I do not wish to see Onehouse swallowed up. I wish to see Paupers' Grave preside within Onehouse, its historical source	
Stowmarket Council appear like others to be struggling, why take on more responsibility	
Make more sense for communities stay the same	
Stowmarket want these high population new houses so they can gain more tac returns when its needed in the parish - finborough road - lower road & Starhouse lane is desperate for upgrading. Leave Parish as is please!!!	
Everything is okay as is	

<p>I do not agree with larger communities such as Stowmarket encroaching on smaller communities such as Onehouse. This is almost certainly for financial reasons meaning that villages lose out on amenities & control. Do not change historical boundaries It seems the reasons to remain as it is, is sound & suitable</p>	
<p>When I moved here I wanted to live in Onehouse</p>	
<p>Stowmarket has developed quite a lot in recent years and should remain as it is</p>	
<p>We moved to Suffolk to be a part of the Onehouse community! And wish to stay part of this rural area we have come to enjoy</p>	
<p>Historically the marked area has always been Onehouse. It should not, nor is there any valid reason for that to change</p>	
<p>My wife and I have lived in Onehouse since we married in 1981. We have always enjoyed village life which we fell is different from living in a town. We feel to change the boundaries would erode the individuality of a special village</p>	<p>We feel the space between the village of Onehouse and Stowmarket should be save guarded for future generations. It should not be possible that further Onehouse land could be taken in the future.</p>
<p>The land is part of Onehouse, the residents are part of Onehouse, granting the change would diminish our village identity all in the name of Stowmarket gaining CT revenue</p>	
<p>No need to change just because a few houses have been erected</p>	
<p>Most people give little thought to whether they live within the Onehouse or Stowmarket areas. Essential services are provided by MSDC. I feel that the application has been made for financial reasons i.e. greater share of council tax</p>	<p>Why does it take nearly 2 years to conduct a simple review!</p>
<p>I don't believe Onehouse Parish should be bullied into surrendering both valuable and particularly historical parts of their parish</p>	
<p>The boundary needs to reflect the identities and interests of the communities that already exist i.e Onehouse and it's residents. I used to live in Onehouse and feel very strongly that it should remain as it's own parish and not lose itself within Stowmarket. Leave the boundary as it is.</p>	<p>I am pleased that the Community Governance Review has recommended NO CHANGE to the boundary. Great decision. I hope, like many other decisions, that the recommendation isn't overturned at a later date.</p>
<p>I live on the Millgrove development. I moved here with my husband in March 2021. Sadly my husband passed away shortly after. I have nerve damage in my spine and are no longer able to drive. There is no public transport nearby and is quite a walk to the nearest bus stop, which means I have to get mini cabs when I want to go anywhere</p>	<p>I feel it would be very wrong for us to be joined with Stowmarket as there is no comparison. Stowmarket is a town with all the amenities readily available to residents there. I am 79 years old and as I stated before we can not be compared to a town such as Stowmarket. I have to pay for mini cab fare when I need to go anywhere, like library, shops, chiropodist, optician, dentist</p>
<p>In full agreement with the cross-party working group of Councillors who have recommended no change</p>	<p>In full agreement with cross-party wg</p>
<p>The burial ground (known as the Paupers Graves) should never be a part of Stowmarket, as it is and always should be kept within the Parish boundary of Onehouse. Built in 1781 and known as "The house for the poor" at a cost of £1200 and the burial ground next to it became the final resting place for many farm labourers of the Onehouse Parish which included Harleston at that time. The Onehouse Parish Council has performed a lot of clearing up of that site and found a bath belonging to the workhouse, where bodies were bathed before burial. This bath has been placed in the burial ground in Onehouse.</p>	

<p>So much history which belongs uniquely to Onehouse should never be lost because of a land grab by Stowmarket. Please do not be a part of destroying the unique history that is Onehouse.</p>	
<p>This is about council tax, leave Onehouse as Onehouse so they can control their parish council tax</p>	<p>There is always some other reason for change, leave the boundary as it is</p>
<p>It seems that Stowmarket want to gain extra finances by including more houses in their area. Leaving the boundaries the same is fairer to the Onehouse community, who could gain from more residents in their parish.</p>	
<p>I chose to live within a rural community parish. Not in a town.</p>	<p>The new developments have brought people into the community who have no respect for the countryside. Dog Walkers are parking in community church room car park & the woodland area has numerous dog poo bags scattered about. The whole ethos of the village will change if option 2 is successful.</p>
<p>You were not clear enough for the reasons for change. So leave the boundaries alone. I wonder if it is for political reasons? To help the next election?</p>	<p>Seems like a lot of work and wasted time when other things need addressing. You haven't given pro's & con's so leave it as is. Not that the electorate are listened to with the current government</p>
<p>Onehouse Parish land! Important to our community in Onehouse. Why should Stowmarket benefit from the funds due to Onehouse?</p>	
<p>Don't think Onehouse should be gobbled up by Stowmarket</p>	
<p>We would like the boundaries to remain the same because we wish to stay as part of the Onehouse community as we have been for 30+ years</p>	<p>With regard to this vote - there are three adults living in our property so do we get three votes? All three of us have chosen option 1.</p>
<p>I don't see why there is a need to change things. The only reason that Stowmarket Council want to do it is to make more money which is wrong.</p>	<p>Onehouse would use the money better than Stowmarket Council</p>
<p>Stowmarket & Onehouse should retain separate identities. Onehouse community is not part of urban Stowmarket</p>	<p>urban + rural communities are inherently different, that difference should be retained & respected. The views + preferences of the residents affected by any boundary/governance change should always be paramount in any decision that affects their lives.</p>
<p>I don't agree to Stowmarket taking part of Onehouse, swallowing up neighbouring villages. They must benefit from the extra council tax revenue</p>	
<p>Current boundaries best reflect needs of residents</p>	
<p>I think it is important for villages to maintain a degree of independence, and not be swallowed up into larger towns. Also, as the local press has reported in the past, the Council does seem keen to "land grab" at any given opportunity.</p>	
<p>Although disappointing that no clear areas have been left between the parishes, this is not a good reason to absorb the development into Stowmarket. I also appreciate that there will be a difference in council tax payable between the two areas which may cause disgruntlement in the new development.</p>	

<p>However, the two parishes are very distinct in character & history. Changing the boundaries will also affect those residences already classified as Onehouse.</p>	
<p>Too many villages are loosing their identity and there for the map of the county is changing to fast</p>	
<p>Stowmarket has and is being ruined by the excessive amounts of housing being/having been built and keeping the existing boundaries at least gives a small bit of control over its border/containment</p>	<p>The villages surrounding Stowmarket should retain their identities and green undeveloped space should be retained in between the villages and the town. The Stowmarket CIL charge should raised so as to deter the inappropriate development in Stowmarket</p>
<p>This is bureaucratic nonsense and a complete waste of time and money. Clean up the grass verges and pavements around all these areas. Stop agreeing planning permissions when infrastructure not supported.</p>	
<p>Stowmarket Town Council + Mid Suffolk District Council should be offering tax payers 'good value for money'/ spending tax money efficiently. This questionnaire and associated costs should be channelled in a more efficient manner.</p>	<p>If people are unhappy with their electoral boundary they are free to move to an alternative location. I see no benefit in amending the boundary.</p>
<p>Stowmarket alone needs to work harder to maintain a high level of maintenance</p>	
<p>I have lived in Stowmarket all my life and I would like the boundaries to stay the same</p>	
<p>I do not think there is any benefits for Onehouse to change the boundary. A lot of villages worry about being swallowed up by large towns and losing their own identity.</p>	
<p>Onehouse development belongs to Onehouse to gain any extra amenities</p>	
<p>I can see no logical reason to change the boundaries</p>	
<p>If boundaries are changed the smaller area currently belonging to Onehouse could lose vital funding and services</p>	
<p>New houses should not determine a boundary change. Too many new houses soon there will be no boundaries left.</p>	<p>Whilst I understand the need for the survey with costs as they are surely this money could be put to better use. These are historical boundaries and changing them may cause tremendous upset to those that will have their addresses changed.</p>
<p>Fine as it is</p>	
<p>Council tax is more affordable in Onehouse</p>	
<p>We have lived in the area for 35 years and are very familiar with the area and new housing. The Paupers' graveyard, particularly, is seen by us as part of Onehouse Parish and we don't feel any particular connection to the new housing in areas B and C</p>	<p>We appreciate being asked for our opinion with regard to this issue and thought the case could be argued either way, one hopes the new housing and increased community will benefit Onehouse Parish going forward</p>
<p>To Keep the village in its rural and existing boundary and to protect the community element</p>	
<p>No Change</p>	
<p>If Onehouse is absorbed into Stowmarket, next thing Stowmarket will absorb Needham Market and before we know it we'll all be part of Ipswich.</p>	
<p>At all levels of government there has to be dividing lines; be it at parish, district, county, or parliamentary levels, in order to define responsibilities and simplify administration. This, in addition to historical antecedents is what the current arrangement archives... Recognising that the Stowmarket bid is in essence a</p>	<p>Leave well alone, there are more important issues to address</p>

simple resources grab. Success will simply encourage new to claim Stowupland, Combs Ford, Haughley, etc, etc	
The urban sprawl of Stowmarket is slowly killing any community cohesion that we are enjoyed. Further erosion is not welcome and Onehouse should, if possible, remain such.	
I have lived on Union Road for nearly 2 years and identify as Onehouse. I enjoy the Onehouse Parish and being on the outskirts of Stowmarket.	
Having read all 5 points made by the cross-party working group of councillors I agree with their recommendation for no change.	
With global Climate uncertainty, it is madness to keep building on productive food growing land, could well lead to a domestic food crises. Move the building of housing & Ind estates onto brown field sites, or into areas of the country where poor quality soil.	
Leave as is	
Boundaries should be left as originally set	
As per items in enclosed letter	
To keep Onehouse as it is and maintain its identity and village life	
Too many changes happening to the development of Stowmarket, more shops + facilities please! And don't spoil Onehouse	
Stowmarket and Onehouse are separate entities and should remain so.	
I purchased my house based on it being in Onehouse	
Already insufficient resources in Stowmarket	
To keep a separate identity for Onehouse	
Leave it as it is - it's been like it for years - we don't want change or further developments!	
I don't want to be part of Stowmarket. I have always been part of Onehouse. Any money from new houses should go to Onehouse	
Agree Paupers Graves should remain within Onehouse. Also existing properties remain in Onehouse	
Cannot see reason to change	
We need to grow the town	
Stowmarket Town Council have already had the boundary changed to incorporate the Taylor Wimpey developments. Enough is enough of this land grabbing!! I have lived in Onehouse for 41 years!	It's very unfair that the whole of Stowmarket can vote - what effect does this have on the residents of Cedar's Park or Combs for instance??
Residents of Onehouse should have the right to their village, Stow Council would override Onehouse in a decision on vote. Resident of Onehouse because it is a village and do not want big brother controlling them.	There is only one field between Stow & Onehouse, and I worry that Mid Suffolk would give the go ahead to wrap the whole village in houses. Stow Council do not push enough to do no more. Onehouse will. Pity you don't ask the town if they would like to see more land laid in taking.
There are insufficient health, dental services at present and with the substantial house building in Stowmarket this would further aggravate situation	
If this went ahead you have to worry for the people of Onehouse	
This is a very large development, Stowmarket is large enough already - given the state of the roads, the upkeep, etc More should be done with existing money	
No compelling reason given for the changes. Leave things as they are, too much council interference.	

Agree with working group regarding community identities	
Onehouse was once a small village outside Stowmarket, we moved to Onehouse to be out of Stowmarket and it appears more and more of Onehouse land is being taken for more houses to be built on	
I cannot see any benefit of moving the boundaries	I think Area A and C should be part of Onehouse. The new development area B does not have a connection with Onehouse so could become part of Stowmarket
Having grown up by Workhouse, and now living on Chilton Hall Estate I have seen both sides of the argument and I feel the boundaries should stay the same as it has always been. The building of new houses shouldn't change a parish boundary	
Completely unsure why this boundary should change. In my mind a complete waste of money, time, working hours & public money, when roads, lights, pavements, schools & care services in Mid Suffolk could use this money being spent on this!	Use public money wisely Babergh + Mid Suffolk District Councils! Why change a boundary for the sake of it - ridiculous.
Planning permission was granted on the basis of the developments / areas highlighted remaining with the boundary of Onehouse, together with those that purchased a property, had the boundary been in Stowmarket their would have been a cost benefit	
Although I have some sympathy with the argument the new homes on the Union Road development should form part of Stowmarket rather than Onehouse, I cannot support the move of Area A, the larger part of Area B and Area C to Stowmarket, particularly as they include Paupers Grave + Stow Lodge - historically part of Onehouse	Wording of options confusing and overly complex. If restricted by legal requirements try adding explanatory note! "in other words..." or "this means!..."
We feel it is important that locals areas maintain their historical connections. We also have historical family links to these areas and both councils have an ability to work together	
Clear boundaries need to remain. Too much development without infrastructure. Stowmarket is a doughnut Town. - Rebuild the centre!	
If we merge or the boundaries change, where will it stop. Keep them separate, keep boundaries the same stop making the Town bigger & fix the problems we have... build more shops, schools + surgeries.	It's just all a tick box exercise
I live in Stowmarket. Onehouse has always been a little community on its own. Don't like the idea of losing its identity.	
Stowmarket & Onehouse have their own identities which should remain separate. I can not see the need to make it part of Stowmarket.	
I do not think the infrastructure is in place. Stowmarket already has far too much traffic along Chilton Way especially heavy duty vehicles, with the ongoing housing developments	There is no consideration for existing house owners with the amount of traffic coming through Stowmarket on a daily basis vehicles are constantly speeding with no penalty's in place. It is only a matter of time before there is a major incident.
Because it sounds like a good idea and can help people out.	
We would like to see any funding going to these new development areas directed to Onehouse area, and not absorbed into the overall spending for Stowmarket.	
Stowmarket has took land from Onehouse already and the only reason they want to take this land is because Stowmarket can get their rates	

As elected councillors have given due consideration to the proposal then their lead should be followed	
Onehouse is a no light village, which appears to have been changed with street lights on the new estate. More and more houses being built on Onehouse land, to change the boundaries would make Onehouse smaller and the opportunity to build even more.	
For reasons 1 + 3 listed	
The reasons stated in the letter	
The new developments that encroach on those areas are very unfortunate. Need to retain green spaces, wildlife corridors (down to the rivers) wherever possible. Good reasons have not been given to change the boundaries.	
We see no reason for a change in boundaries	
We chose to buy a house in Stowmarket because it was a small country town.	
I believe boundaries should stay as they are and not adjusted to sit new developments	I think Stowmarket has more than enough houses built. As there has been little to no improvement on the infrastructure
I agree with cross-party working group	
No change	
The current boundary between Stowmarket & Onehouse was in existence when the planning applications + planning consents were granted for these new developments and therefore they should remain as is, as for the time applications were granted.	
To Keep the identity of Onehouse	
I don't see any reason to change boundaries. Onehouse should remain as a village and not be enveloped into Stowmarket.	
We would like the boundaries to stay the same as they are now	
My understanding is the community of Onehouse wish to remain as is. They are a small village and feel they a slowly losing areas of the village and this is yet another step at joining them up to Stowmarket therefore losing their identity.	
Whereas we accept the need for more local housing - thought must be given to creating local communities... Onehouse is a community which supports the old and the young - centred around the church, the community centre and dog walking. The recent housing developments will benefit from remaining part of the Onehouse community. Stowmarket has it's own challenges, why add to those?	
Stowmarket is already being ruined. Don't ruin Onehouse too!	
As a thirty one year resident of Onehouse I have watched with some dismay as more and more houses are erected and feel that eventually the whole area will be enveloped into a larger Stowmarket with the possibility of more & even larger development(s) in the future. As Onehouse Parish Council would have no if incorporated within the Town Boundaries.	
Purchased my shared ownership to be part of Onehouse community and limited funds for extra council tax	Stowmarket had no interest in this land until houses and dwellings were placed here so their reasoning has got to be extra revenue which is unfair and almost stealing from Onehouse
The current boundary separates the town of Stowmarket and the village of Onehouse. This is what the Villagers want and further development will be detrimental to the area. Stowmarket is a	

market town, it needs to stay that way. It must not be turned into a soulless, sprawling estate.	
We want to keep the integrity of the village & not become part of the Stowmarket sprawl	
I do not wish to be swallowed up by Stowmarket with Even more potential development	
In the accompanying letter there is no evidence or thought as to the benefit of the proposed area coming into Stowmarket, only that it already identifies with Onehouse	Residents need more transparency as to the reasons behind this - none have been shared
I think the boundaries should remain the same, it is clearly an attempt by Stowmarket Town Council to gain extra revenue by means of council tax currently located within the Onehouse Parish boundary	
No logical reason to make this move. Stowmarket is big enough - and in recent years has become overdeveloped.	
There seems to be a strong sense of Onehouse community. The Parish Council works. I can't see any real benefit of change	
The old work house + the Paupers Graves especially have always come under Onehouse and should remain so, it is part of all our history	
Experience of Stow Town Council Town taking over village communities	
Stowmarket is bigger enough without adding Union Road development	
Reasons 1-5 of the cross party working group	
Lived here for over 50 years, areas in question have always been in Onehouse. Stow Town Council should resolved this prior to planning permission	Why was this issue not sorted out prior to planning permission. Stow Town Council are useless!!
The current boundaries have been in place for a long time and work well. If it not broken don't fix it	
I have lived in Onehouse for over 50 years and feel the loss of this area would be very detrimental to the village and its identity	
There is no reason to change the boundaries, and I hate "progress" for no reason other than some bright spark thinks it might be a good idea, but offers no positive advantages for anyone else. We live here, we are not guinea pigs!!!	
Like to keep the status quo. Council I'm sure have enough to deal with - don't see the need or value in extending the boundaries	
Leave as it. I can understand if the huge new housing estate(s) are placed in Stowmarket. I'm fed up with small villages being swallowed up by bigger towns they lose identity	
I feel that this is an attempt by Stowmarket to secure additional revenue	
Agree with recommendation + reasons in letter	
No change necessary	
Because Onehouse is special and needs to stay as it is.	
Agree with findings of review	
Its absurd - outrageous - Onehouse wants its village to stay a village not to attach itself to Stowmarket + vice versa. Infrastructure, drainage, flooding of areas are worse now than before, with more concreting over countryside. People need green spaces for mental health wellness - Wimpy Taylor site gardens so small no tress have been planted as houses are so close together.	Build on Brown sites!! Doctors - Community centres - Community hospital - Youth clubs - better infrastructure is what the Council needs to be putting in - roads need to be corrected before putting in more. Better maintenance of drainage-water - needs to be a priority - get this right - people would allow change.

	<p>Keep it as it is... We live in a beautiful area, value it. Before its all gone forever for our future generations. So many bad decisions have already been made - better ones need to happen - going forward - people will move out of the area if things don't improve - lots of new housing already up for sale - poor quality buildings.</p>
<p>Onehouse should be kept as one house, not a lot more houses, not enough space, are doctors our struggling, not enough ambulance, schools overcrowded - not enough facilities! No need to change it</p>	<p>Not enough services available, we're already struggling to cope. Leave Onehouse as Onehouse!!!</p>
<p>Stowmarket should remain a local town council and not be required to usurp other parish councils</p>	
<p>I do not believe the residents of Onehouse are reflective of those in Stowmarket. Therefore the boarders should not be merged.</p>	
<p>This would be unfair to the residents of Onehouse. They would just become part of Stowmarket, if this continues Onehouse itself will eventually disappear and be swallowed up by Stowmarket</p>	
<p>Area A has historical links to Onehouse. If boundary is moved is only a matter of time before more new developments fill the vacant land.</p>	
<p>There is no need for additional change for change sake. Stowmarket has already looked to continually more boundaries rather than work with all the hinterland parishes to support residents and space. Change would not benefit residents - increasing costs and yet again penalise Onehouse Parish.</p>	<p>The review needs to ensure that reasons/ news expressed support the community. Not just a numbers game.</p>
<p>Mid Suffolk is becoming unrecognisable, its shocking and depressing. The land is historically within Onehouse. The developments/ new houses within Onehouse are proportionally high in comparison to older houses and by keeping the new housing developments within Onehouse, it is good reason for no more further housing to be approved. Where do you draw the line - Stowmarket and other large towns cannot continue to expand so that they completely engulf surrounding natural environments. We are losing our historic England too rapidly. There are already too many people for local services such as medical + dentistry + schools.</p>	<p>District planners need to refuse more development on fields + natural areas, and preferably all. Instead consider other more intelligent options to future planning. Please point to all relevant legislation when refusing future planning developments - we have enough new housing developments in Mid Suffolk already. We can look at maps 50 and 100 years old and see the land lost - natural England is being lost too rapidly and anyone who has long history in the country will not want it becoming a concrete jungle... Look at ecology + climate emergency reports - we have a crisis and if we keep allowing growth, our future generations and our environment will pay unreversible cost for our poor decisions.</p>
<p>Don't understand it</p>	
<p>Need to leave Stowmarket Town alone and concentrate on centre not outside boundaries</p>	
<p>Stowmarket is growing. Expanding to quickly, our infrastructure (Schools/doctors/dentists, etc) are not able to cope with the extra demands</p>	
<p>I bought my house here 13 months ago. I am part of Onehouse! Council tax will go up if we are moved into Stowmarket. I will have to change my address on stationary, websites etc. This is a desperate money grab by Stow T.C</p>	<p>I think the propaganda being spouted by Stow T.C online is ridiculous. They haven't lost Elm. They never had it to begin with!</p>
<p>Don't see why the boundaries should change, happy with the way things are now</p>	

<p>I have lived here for 44 years & see Stowmarket slowly encroaching on Onehouse. I would like to put an end to this march gobbling up our Parish.</p>	<p>It is very sad that Stowmarket Council want this change purely for their own financial gains & no benefit to those that would be in that new boundary.</p>
<p>The current boundary reflects the individual identity of Onehouse community and the associated interests. The newer developments along Union Road straddles a parish boundary that has been in place many years. Maybe the residents would like any funding from council tax to support the Onehouse Parish? I know we do.</p>	
<p>Stowmarket to stay Stowmarket Onehouse to stay Onehouse, at the size it is now</p>	
<p>Because the only reason for the change is to build more houses which are not required as infrastructure is not there I think Stowmarket is big enough & extending in other sections so doesn't need to expand</p>	<p>Stop building Instead of worrying about boundaries, the parish councils should be looking into dredging the rivers & repairing the river banks to prevent future flooding as both Onehouse & Stowmarket has experienced considerable flooding & this doesn't look to be improving any time soon.</p>
<p>Stowmarket Town Council cant look after what they have now, increasing the area will make the situation worse. There are no good reasons for the existing parish boundaries to be changed</p>	
<p>We have lived in Onehouse Road for 54 years and we are quite happy for things to stay as they are thank you We feel that due to local history that our property falls within the Onehouse parish</p>	<p>Further information around taxes and loss of revenue for Onehouse Parish/ Stow Town Council</p>
<p>I believe this because if we keep joining up towns and villages England will become one big town with none of our lovely villages to be seen such as Buxhall, Finboro, etc Just seems to make sense</p>	<p>I feel strongly about maintaining our history and the Paupers Grave area is very much part of that and should be left as is.</p>
<p>Possible impact on services & spending in my current Stowmarket area Happy the way things currently are.</p>	
<p>There are already too many people using local infrastructure (doctors, schools, roads, etc)</p>	<p>The map provided is very un-clear. Perhaps the names of all the roads for each option could be included?</p>
<p>I don't understand why the boundaries need to be changed, they've been that way for many years, not all change is good change. Leave things alone. Stowmarket is already too big. Leave boundaries as they are!</p>	
<p>Don't want to be part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>The proposed changes are quite a large area & I am not convinced it is necessary</p>	
<p>Service in Stowmarket we at an optimum Having this development in Stowmarket will place even more pressure on GP practises, schools + NHS dental services, therefore it will be a detriment to current Stowmarket residents.</p>	
<p>Onehouse has its own identity and is not part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>I see no reason for change</p>	

Cannot see any reason for change Onehouse is a pleasant community and I don't think joining would benefit Onehouse community.	
Stowmarket is already large enough & growing	Stop building more - we need green space Cedars Park virtually touches Stowupland now, Onehouse & Stowmarket are merging, there's buildings all down between Needham & Stowmarket - When will it end?
The residents of Onehouse do not wish to be part of Stowmarket Town Council	
I once knew a man born as an illegitimate child (died in the sixties abandoned by his 17 year old month. The areas in question belong to Onehouse. - Leave it there - it's history.	
If it is not broken do not fix it	
Current representation is appropriate. Not clear there would be additional funding for expanded area	
I don't see the need to chose boundaries just because you want to build some houses. This should have been thought about before starting	Building for to many houses and not providing the doctors surgeries or other services needed
As noted in the accompanying documents	Apart from far too much new housing being undertaken especially in the light of drainage, sewage + loss of habitats in a very rural (before interesting) & beautiful part of the county. Lets hope Onehouse Woods are not on anyone's radar...
Believe in keeping existing boundaries and do not feel that where development takes place beyond Stowmarket's boundaries that Stowmarket Council lays claim to these areas at expense of village parish councils	I am unhappy about Stowmarket expanding beyond its present boundaries towards Onehouse, Stowupland and beyond the A1120 with Gateway 14 development
Onehouse need to remain a small village which people recognise. Making Union Road development areas part of Stowmarket takes away their identity. Stowmarket is becoming a very large town with all the developments, and Onehouse needs its own identity	
I feel that an urban area should not "swallow" any part of rural areas	
I can see no reason to change the boundaries - there is nothing wrong with the current arrangements	
Leave the boundary along and just stop building!! Because I think the best answer! Just stop all this building, it's a travesty that all that green space is being lost! Just stop! We don't have the infrastructure, or the facilities :(Why bother with all this when it's going to happen anyway! I'm cynical that it's just lip service. Just look at Gateway 14! We have far too many new houses now, far more than the town can support. Just stop building. Why can't the letter and the options be written in plainer English? Consequentially I made the wrong choice - keep the boundaries as they are - I assume that's choice 1 but who knows, it's not very clear is it? or maybe that's how you'll get the decision that you want!
I am agree with option 1	
I see no need for change	
Because I feel that the Parishes should keep their own identities & not be altered	
To keep Onehouse a separate identity to Stowmarket	

Stowmarket cannot support any more housing. Doctors, dentists & parking will be unable to cope.	
I can see no reason for this change. Stowmarket is big enough why take land away from Onehouse it should not be slowly nibbled away by Stowmarket	
Lower council tax	
Stowmarket want to grab council tax from Onehouse	Good Recommendation - sensible
No comments	
No need to change boundaries when our boundary was changed the only difference it made to us was an increase in council tax charges	
Stowmarket has already expanded enough	
I think Stowmarket is large enough as it is. Changing one boundaries will lead to less councillors and currently the infrastructure in Stowmarket is inadequate to meet the expanded housing, cars and people	
Just keep it as it is	
1) Worked as a volunteer with members of Onehouse Council I think they should run areas named 2) Moving boundaries a big paperwork load will cost cash	
If its maintained as ours isn't not much point. I thought we pay council tax to have our paths + road taken better care of. The road up this end are a disgrace, all we get for our money is bins emptied.	
I agree to Onehouse having/ own their own identity which is their historic right.	Am glad your seeking views of both Onehouse and Stowmarket
No more development west of Stowmarket!! Including the thin edge of the wedge!! To further development west + even north + south!!	
I think Onehouse + Stowmarket should remain separate. I lived in Onehouse for 30 years. I think they should remain their own communities	
Because Stowmarket is a big enough area as it is. Stowmarket is big enough for doctors, hospitals, dentists are need before we extend.	
The land was part of Onehouse parish long before the houses were built I see no reason why it should change now	From what I understand Stowmarket Council approved planning permission on land it didn't have and is now trying to move boundaries so it can get taxes from home owners who are paying a lower rate as they are in the next parish
Stowmarket Town Council say that changing the boundaries will "reflect the identities + interests of the two communities" How? In what way? There is no explanation. What is the benefit of changing the boundaries whom does it benefit? If STC cannot be bothered to show us why they want to change things then I can only oppose their request. Why have they not bothered to send out some information to explain. This is disrespectful to its residents and the community!!!	
I am a great believer in leaving historic parish boundaries as they are. Stowmarket and its rampant development has no right to suggest a boundary change in its favour to satisfy development/planning/building company demands & pressures	Yes, I think that the review should be further expanded to ensure the boundaries as they currently stand for all villages surrounding Stowmarket are protected against rampant development by Mid Suffolk Council with Stowmarket taking the brunt of outward expansion. Historical

	boundaries vitally important to preserve history.
Stowmarket does not need any new developments and boundaries are good as they are now	
I think these boundaries should be left as they are	
I think its important for small villages, towns etc to keep there own identity, mainly historical purposes, or it will become just another part swallowed up by bigger things, councils, housing, etc	There is plenty of room available for this within the Stowmarket boundaries, and developments such as towards Needham Market, Stowupland also. Also lots of unused & empty properties in Stowmarket itself.
I am fed up with the developments on the outskirts of the town. I have seen fields I have walked my dogs swallowed up by houses for city dwellers. Keep Stowmarket as it is.	
I believe it is important for boundaries to remain as they are and for villages to keep their identities. If we allow this boundary change before we know it Stowmarket will swallow up all the surrounding villages. These developments should never have been allowed to go ahead in the first place.	Why would they want to cant boundaries other than for more money
As per own notes	
Why waste time + money making these negligable changes? Use the savings to actually do good for the communities.	
Stowmarket Town Council should not be allowed to increase its already considerable area. To allow it to do so would act as a precedent for however many more large estates are to be incorporated into this supposedly market town.	I am appalled that an estate of this size, together with others of a similar magnitude, should have been imposed onto what was once a pleasant small market town. It has now become a sprawling eyesore
I don't want anymore development, I enjoy walking through the fields & don't want it spoilt with lots of newbuilds.	
Should have own identity. Too many houses being built in Stowmarket area. Not enough facilities to cope. Nothing up Chilton way/ Onehouse End. Taking away areas for wildlife again is just not on! There will be no fields/woods etc left soon! Angry.	Stop building houses! Cannot sell the ones built already. Stowmarket is changing a lot & lots of people from further away moving to Stowmarket and you can tell certain things that changes due to this. We often walk & now round the area show on map & its gradually taking the space away from us!
We bought a house with a Onehouse address. We would not have bought the same house in Stowmarket - Plus it may have cost less.	It seems unfair to discuss moving existing properties into a different area. This should have been determined before the new houses were built - I assume it would have been turned down.
Need to keep it simple - if you add more boundaries it gets confusing	
Residents have not been in Stowmarket council previously - e.g. when they purchased property	
I moved to my new address from Woolpit as it was part of Onehouse + wanted to be part of a village community	
Current boundary reflects the interests of Onehouse	
I don't think towns should swallow up smaller parishes so they eventually loose their identity. There seems no financial or urgent reason to do this	I think the CGR has made a very thoughtful decision having regard to existing residents and historical links. Clearly independently minded working group - well done!
I agree with all the recommendations No.s 1 - 5 as outlined in your letter dated 6/11/23.	
I see no reason to change boundaries - as it is Stowmarket Town	

Council that want the change I presume it is in their interests and not in Onehouses' interest. I have lived here 50 years.	
Cannot see any valid reason to change	
I see no compelling reason to change the existing boundaries at this point.	
This is an appalling document. There is no information on why I should vote one way or the other so therefore have chosen no change. Will change have any benefits such as efficiencies or is it just away to increase money supply to Stowmarket at the expense of Onehouse? Without reasons why should there be any change.	What a waste of time and money. A ridiculous document asking people to vote for something whilst giving them no information/ reasons to do so. Do we really have democracy by guesswork? Dreadful use of Council tax payers money.
Onehouse is a village and should remain so	
This is the most sensible option and does not involve abortive work + effort	
The area would get too big to get representation for the current area populated. (everything is getting to large and there are not enough facilities provided)	
No need for change in our opinion	
Villages are already being swallowed up across the country + I believe that villages + the country way of life should be protected. I would prefer if all these new houses were not being built at all but definitely not on green land	Britain's like certain traditions + boundaries should fall into this category. Stowmarket is already too big for its amenities + focus should be put on reviving the town before even thinking about increasing the parish size. I appreciate the council gets more money the bigger it is but it doesn't stretch far enough with what it has already. Especially road traffic.
Agree to decline. It's worked in the past and reflects identities and interests of the two communities. "If it's not broken - no need to fix it!"	
The current boundary does reflect the identities and interests of these two communities of the area	
Agree with Cross Party working group for the reasons given for "no change"	
Onehouse is spread over several different areas currently with properties in Lower Road, Forest Road, Union Road and Finborough Road. The new houses are actually joining up parts of existing Onehouse. As far as I can tell existing people in Onehouse are quite welcoming to the new development.	This is an issue that should have been dealt with several years ago and long before people were sold there houses. In my opinion it would be unfair to sell there houses as being in a "Village" and then move them into a town. From what I have read Stowmarket doesn't really care about the people, they just want their money and this isn't a good enough reason to change.
Respect traditional/existing boundaries which respect traditional alliances & connections	
Onehouse is a village and does not want to be swallowed up into town. This is pure greed and land grabbing by the council. They've done it before and Onehouse has not benefitted in any way	The council should concentrate on reviving the Town Centre. Residents of Onehouse want to remain a village not be part of a town.
Facilities in Stowmarket are under enough strain so neither it nor Onehouse would benefit from integration	
Although on paper it makes sense as the areas houses look more part of Stowmarket than Onehouse. It feels more of a land/power grab.	
Stowmarket will become too big & there's not the infrastructure to support an increase in occupants. I cannot see what benefit	

Stowmarket would derive by having a larger community. Services would become too diluted.	
Onehouse has a distinct identity that would be severely damaged if it were merged with Stowmarket	The request from Stowmarket should not have been considered. STC knows full well that the people of Onehouse are very much against the idea of the Village becoming an out post of Stowmarket
Some many years ago when Planning permission was given for the Northfield estate, the idea was it should be a modern rural village to avoid it looking as a suburb of Stowmarket. No or minimum of terraced houses. Each property to maintain a tree in its front garden, no extensions, including porches, in front of the building line. I came here in 1982 attracted by these conditions and the rural identity and so felt other residents who might be affected by the boundary change feel the same way. Happy with things as they stand	
Onehouse is a community which does not need to be swallowed up by Stowmarket. Stowmarket has already grown too much & this will only give the council further ambitions for development	Leave Onehouse alone
I think we have enough area's to look after and to maintain properly. The current boundaries which reflect historical boundaries which has been part of Onehouse village identity	
Because the boundary for Onehouse should stay where it is, or Stowmarket will just keep on expanding & villages will be swallowed up & lost. What next - Onehouse, Harleston, Finborough, Rattlesden, etc? Leave the £ to the villages.	Stop building!
Onehouse should not become an annex of Stowmarket, it has its own identity and should remain independent. Stowmarket is big enough already.	
For all the reasons given in your paperwork you attached to this Happy as it is already	
I can see no reason why it should be moved why move for move sake I believe the boundaries should remain as they are	
I live in the village of Onehouse and want to continue to live in Onehouse. I do not want to live in Stowmarket or for the area to become part of Stowmarket" Wash lane has been in Onehouse for many many years and I do not see why we should be included or become part of Stowmarket presumably due to all the new development in Union Road. We are part of a small community and want to continue to be. We have been residents for many years and don't understand why we should now lose our community and identity due to the new housing developments and new incomers!	Include the new developments in the Stowmarket boundary just leave Wash Lane (Area C) in Onehouse. We are quite happy where we are thank you!
The current boundary between Stowmarket & Onehouse already reflects the identities and interests of the communities of the area, and I feel there is no need to change.	
Not enough infrastructure to support all of the new developments already and they slightly better at fixing the terrible roads + pot holes than Stowmarket Leave things as they are	
To prevent a continuous estate extending from Stowmarket to Onehouse, and preserve the Chilton Fields Sports Club + grounds	

<p>To maintain the historical integrity of the existing parish boundaries and slow the spread of urban sprawl</p>	<p>I'm pleased we have all been given the opportunity to comment about this</p>
<p>1) Onehouse boundaries are longstanding and I do not want the village to be eroded & consumed by Stowmarket. 2) The owners of the properties think they are in Onehouse. 3) Onehouse can use any funding to benefit the village e.g. Hall repairs.</p>	
<p>There is no benefit in changing the boundaries for the inhabitants. The Onehouse land is historically and traditionally Onehouse - no need to change</p>	<p>I would be interested to know what extra facilities are being provided for all the additional households: schools; doctors surgeries; transport. I haven't seen anything about the extra traffic on the Stowmarket roads being managed: will there eventually be an additional link to the A14?</p>
<p>There seems to be little or no benefit to make this change</p>	
<p>We purchased our property due to it being within the Onehouse community and do NOT wish to become part of Stowmarket. This should have been addressed when the development was initially started and is therefore unfair on the residents have to change communities</p>	<p>It would be helpful if information was released to residents affected illustrating how it would actually affect them if the change is to be made. We believe that we should remain part of Onehouse as this played a big part in the reason for purchasing our property.</p>
<p>I feel that Onehouse will loose what control it has over its own future and it will loose its village status. The village will be swallowed up by any future planning applications.</p>	
<p>Feel it is best to leave things as they are</p>	
<p>Onehouse district needs to keep it's historical identity</p>	
<p>New development of nobby houses Onehouse road</p>	
<p>We agree the 5 reasons for no change to the boundary between Onehouse & Stowmarket.</p>	<p>The options are almost impossible to follow with the double negatives. The existing boundaries on the map is unclear because the grey boundary line has been tainted with the pink area + blue hatching. The blue hatched area referred to as the proposed Stowmarket amendment appears to show land to the east of area B and east of the Parish boundary which is already in Stowmarket. Is the proposal to move this to Onehouse?!! May we suggest you consult the plain English campaign (plainenglish.co.uk) to improve wording of these consultations as they are easily understood.</p>
<p>Don't want Onehouse to be swallowed up by Stowmarket.</p>	
<p>Do not see reason for change</p>	
<p>Too many more important issues to deal with at present</p>	<p>A pointless waste of tax payers money at a time our communities really need support. If there are staff employed on such a project who is checking the value for money they deliver</p>
<p>The majority of the land (sites A, B & C) fall within Onehouse and I feel there is no reason to change this. Other than splitting site B into Onehouse and Stowmarket, it should remain as Onehouse.</p>	<p>Split site B as to part Onehouse and part Stowmarket</p>
<p>The identity of Onehouse should be preserved</p>	

I feel that the people of Onehouse have shown that they have a strong pride in being from Onehouse and that community spirit should nurtured	
Stowmarket is big enough as it is	
This is another way for Stowmarket Town Council to take on more land move boundaries to suit them.	
Don't see any need for change	
The Stowmarket area is getting too big. Stowmarket Town Council decided to spend millions on Regal and community centre with no thought trying to get money back	
To maintain the current status quo	
Because Onehouse land should stay Onehouse and would help bring money to village and update all the old fashion stuff like village hall park	Help fund new park for all the young kids and families who have moved to Onehouse
Why change something that is working. Leave things as they are.	
I agree with the cross party working group	
No reason given by Stowmarket Town Council for request, although I'd imagine its monetary based on receiving the council tax funds. Given state of high street now I imagine most new residents will go further afield as existing residents of Stowmarket already do. Also what's to say this type of request won't be made again should another development be built on the boundary.	
I think historical land should be respected and no change is the correct outcome	It was great to be consulted
Prefer no to change this, But Do not know what the changes would mean in real terms, to the residents of Stowmarket? Bigger area to maintain = higher charges	
I have lived in Onehouse (a village) for nearly 50 years. My husband I wanted to live in a village near a town, not be swallowed up by the town.	
Planning permission should never have been granted for housing crossing an existing boundary. Any monies derived from the construction of these houses, should be ringfenced for a provision of infrastructure and services in the parish of Onehouse. Meanwhile Stowmarket continues to see a lack of investment in the town centre and other infrastructure.	
I would like Onehouse to remain as it is today in respect of history	
For exactly the five reasons clearly identified by the cross-party working group. No change is necessary or desirable!	
There seems to be no logical gain from moving the boundaries, except for financial gain by Stowmarket Town Council.	
Integration may lead to more building between Stowmarket + Onehouse. Schools and medical practises are at their limit. Further buildings would not fit.	
Following the advice of the working group of councillors	
To keep Onehouse as a rural village, and not to be incorporated into a town where Onehouse will lose its identity as a village.	
1/we strongly feel that the boundaries should remain as they currently are. There is too much land being sold off for developments and other prospects etc, keep things as they have been for many years.	Just leave it the way it is currently - what is wrong with it as it is? Don't need to move the boundaries

As there is historical connections the areas should remain in their respective boundaries	It was appreciated to be given the chance to give an opinion
Stowmarket has expanded far enough and Onehouse should retain its boundaries to continue to be a viable parish	
Stowmarket already overcrowded and facilities can't cope with more residents taking up Drs appt etc	
I do not see any reason to change the boundaries. A change would mean an increase in rates but we do not have the same facilities as Stowmarket i.e. no buses, no dog bins to name but a few	
Not sure why boundaries need to be changed in the first place. I am aware that any new build developments must pay local council money. It's a shame that the Stowmarket Council cant be clearer on this... what would be nice would be for the residents of Onehouse to have a say about what this money should be used for. As I'm sure Onehouse village is significantly underinvested in.	
It makes more sense	
I moved to Onehouse to be part of a small community and I feel we should be kept separate from these new developments which are in Stowmarket not Onehouse. I suspect the motivations of the Town Council are to build new houses on the small area of land that separates Onehouse from Stowmarket	
I think because we have enough traffic in Stowmarket and things are changing all the time	
I see no need for change at all	
Stowmarket Town Council Should be DISBANDED entirely. They are a costly drain on council tax payers and provide no service to the community at all. Any question on service clarification is forced off Mid Suffolk. They don't (and shouldn't have) any decision making ability. To summarise total waste of time.	
Lack of community support - i.e. not enough gp, schooling facilities, lack of funding for community facilities, GP surgeries overfilled by patients already. Not capacity for other NHS services to meet demand.	Stowmarket high street under funded & under valued. Lack of community funding & facilities. Council unable to fulfil current local demands alongside NHS facilities
There is too much development in the area now that cannot be good for the environment. The roads can't cope. Keep Onehouse more than just one house!	
As us residents of Stowmarket have no say whatsoever on whether or not all these houses are built what difference does it make what we say? Its just one more sprawling housing estate	There soon won't be any green spaces left at this rate! What about all these people that can't access doctors and more pollution etc
Council should be kept as small as possible, this then gives local people the chance to support local issues, and not leave it to larger councils	
I believe Onehouse needs to keep its identity and be independent	
We think the Parishes should be kept separate & stop further encroachment into Onehouse	
I agree with the five reasons given by the working group	
I agree with the five reasons given by the working group	
I am happy with the boundaries as they are currently	
Is Stowmarket not already big enough! I agree that Paupers Grave and workhouse have historical links with Onehouse and see no good reason to change that.	I believe that the views of the existing residents in Onehouse and the areas of A B and C should take precedence.
We don't believe there is anything wrong with the current boundaries	

<p>We would prefer if our council tax doesn't increase. Don't feel any need to change</p>	
<p>Onehouse is a small village & will easily be over shadowed by developments encroaching near the boundary & it is only right we can keep the existing boundaries rather a land grab from Stowmarket</p>	
<p>I have lived in Onehouse for more than 60 (sixty) years. Onehouse is a village, and not, or should be, part of Stowmarket. Please leave the boundaries as they are. I do not see any benefits or advantages for Onehouse to become part of Stowmarket. NO CHANGE</p>	
<p>No strong opinions on the developments, so following the recommendation.</p>	
<p>I believe no change is necessary</p>	
<p>I believe no change is necessary</p>	
<p>Stowmarket should not swallow up small villages. They will lose their identities</p>	
<p>Paupers Graves to remain as part of Onehouse</p>	
<p>I do not want the boundaries of Onehouse to change</p>	<p>Who subsidises the bus routes through Onehouse and why has it been cancelled</p>
<p>I chose NO CHANGE and for boundaries to remain as they are for the reasons listed in the letter provided. I believe it to be unfair to extend the boundary if those living in Areas A & C identify as Onehouse. However, to be fair, I do not believe I know a great deal on the matter.</p>	
<p>The only reason to extend the boundaries is financial. So why should Onehouse suffer to the benefit of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>This area has always been Onehouse parish and feel this should stay.</p>	
<p>This area benefits the village.</p>	
<p>This is a land grab. No to any boundary changes</p>	
<p>I believe the boundaries should not be changed and that the majority of Onehouse residents do not want them changed.</p>	
<p>The more Stowmarket Spreads the small villages will lose their identity</p>	
<p>We were told at the local residents meeting that it could increase our council tax, meaning that we would more than likely need to sell our house & move with our three young children. We also got told we'd need to remove Onehouse from our address, possibly incurring some admin charges from numerous companies. Just seems like Stowmarket council wants the extra revenue now by including Mill Grove into their boundary - which shouldn't be allowed. We bought our house in ONEHOUSE</p>	<p>Leave it as it is!</p>
<p>I believe we should keep the two communities as they are and with their own identity. We are a village, Stowmarket is a town.</p>	
<p>Onehouse should remain separate village, as should other surrounding villages such as Haughley</p>	
<p>I have lived in Stowmarket for 50 years. Area would be better represented if kept separate.</p>	
<p>Need to keep green areas available to mitigate the carbon production from vehicles. I do not see electric vehicles as carbon neutral due to what it takes to produce the elements that are needed to make the batteries, maybe a green council will investigate that! or not!</p>	<p>I daresay this will only postpone all the developments under the premise that homes are needed & must be built. But hurrah the postponement. :)</p>
<p>These pieces of land have always been in Onehouse why should Stowmarket take them over. It is land grabbing for profit. I hope</p>	<p>I am very concerned that what has been delivered for people to view and make</p>

<p>Stowmarket Council are covering the cost of this review and not us council tax payers.</p>	<p>comments on. These are not factual and are very incorrect also very unreadable.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for the boundary changes I have typed my answers as the sections are too small to get my answers in and my hand writing can be unreadable, so please allow this form of reply.</p> <p>Answers to Q3</p> <p>I have opted for option 1 as I live in the small hamlet in Onehouse located within the section C on your plan. This area is and has been a section of the village of Onehouse and I see no reason or advantage in it being transferred to Stowmarket Council quite the opposite, at least we can locate our council at Onehouse and not be fobbed off by the over sized Council of Stowmarket. Also I note the area C has been described as being part of the Union Road Development This is incorrect, it is nothing to do with this development.</p> <p>I would also object to the information within the documents provided by the Community Governance Review,</p> <p>1 It points out that the consultation is for the electorate of the area but it is noted that only ONE form is enclosed for each property and if there are a number of persons within the properties, they will be unable to have their views logged and may have differing views but would be unable to voice there opinions.</p> <p>2 Also the drawing supplied is illegible and incorrect, as section C points out that there is an area that has planning that has not been completed OPPs, this is incorrect as the building in this area has been finished for some years and fully occupied.</p> <p>3 The description given within the document says, in view of the development to the south of union road Areas A,B, and C which section C is NOT part of, with the exception of a small trench to the West end to allow for surface water drainage from Bloor Homes development (part of Section B) to pass into the river Rattlesden. This I do not feel warrants it being attached to this overall proposal.</p> <p>Answers to Q7</p> <p>As I would hope the discussion will be to leave all as it is i.e. NO CHANGE, I would hope that the costs, which I am sure will be on the high side will be fully covered by Stowmarket Town Council? Who are the instigators of this total waste of time and money, just so they can have more of our money to waste on yet more totally unnecessary projects? As I do not see why the residents of Mid Suffolk and Babergh Council should foot the bill for this pie in the sky project.</p>	
<p>It is important for village to maintain their identity. Also Stowmarket is getting pretty big and doesn't need "swallow" up the surrounding countryside and villages.</p>	
<p>We chose this location due to it being in Onehouse. See no reason for that to change.</p>	
<p>The existing boundary reflects the historical + present day separation between the town of Stowmarket & the village of Onehouse. The Paupers Graves, Stow Lidge, Chilton Meadows Care Home all look to Onehouse for pastoral support from the church at Onehouse, as do families living in the new developments built by Hopkins Homes & Bloor Homes</p>	<p>Speaking to parishioners in Onehouse there is real concern that their village will be swallowed up by Stowmarket + will lose its identity as a strongly connected rural community. This has already been seen at Combs Ford and the people of Onehouse</p>

	do not wish to be placed in a similar position.
I feel that the current boundaries enable effective local government	
Strongly feel that Stowmarket & Onehouse should retain their individual identities	
The current boundary reflects the interests of the local communities	
Why change it? It makes no sense to force people who have lived or whose houses have been part of Onehouse for centuries to move to a new Parish.	Your wording uses poor English language - "agree to decline?" or "disagree to decline" Has poor English been used on purpose to confuse?? Leave it alone please - spend the time and money improving the roads and paths between the two villages. Union Road is awful for cars and no pedestrian access.
Because the points raised by the Working Group are all justified reasons for NO change	
Villages/ areas should retain their identity, there is too much absorption of rural places in Suffolk	
I feel there is no reason to change centuries old boundaries	
Stowmarket is a growing town but its infrastructure will not be able to support any new developments thus strangling the Town.	
Historically the village of Onehouse holds the workhouses and Paupers Graves. This is part of local history and should stay the same.	
Onehouse has always been the "Next" Village. Stowmarket Town Boundary outside near the High school clearly denotes where Stowmarket finishes and Onehouse starts.	It is completely pointless when developers build massive housing estates all around Stowmarket and then provide no infrastructure in the Town to support this. Bury St car park behind the dentists and the regal car park after 0900am are classic examples of the chaos that is engulfing Stowmarket.
It makes sense	
More appropriate	
Any money due from the new properties (ie council tax) will fund Stowmarket & will have no benefit to the village. These parcels of land have always been part of the village of Onehouse	
Onehouse land shouldn't have been built upon in the first place - arable farmland that we'll never get back! Boundaries should not be moved.	
Enough is enough. No known additional infrastructure.	
No difference to us - we do not see any activity from Stowmarket Council	
No difference to us - we do not see any activity from Stowmarket Council	
We believe that each community retains its own identity	The developments that are under construction are being built without sufficient infrastructure being put in place.
I would support Onehouse residents who wish the area to remain part of Onehouse	
It's just land grab due to properties being built on it. No matter how many new houses get built no new services get added in.	

<p>Residents dislike having their identity taken from them as a community they have belonged to for many years. Onehouse is a happy community and do not wish to become part of Stowmarket</p>	<p>Stay as Onehouse. This really means more money for Stowmarket's Council with the building of two new housing estates leaving Onehouse worse off.</p>
<p>We lived in Onehouse for 26 years raising our family and believe the unique qualities of the village need to be maintained. There are no obvious advantages to the Parish and community of Onehouse being swallowed up by Stowmarket; in fact, quite the reverse. Onehouse has been an independent village with its own management in the Parish Council and community organisation and mentioned in the Domesday Book. Progress does not always mean and should not mean ignoring history + boundaries.</p>	
<p>There is no benefit to the public of it becoming part of Stowmarket. The uses of services suggested are ones which individuals pay for themselves. Towns can not change boundaries to suit their interests when they feel it would benefit them.</p>	
<p>The Paupers Grave and Stow Lodge are part of Onehouse and should remain so in the future as part of the identity of the Onehouse area.</p>	
<p>Town Council to get on with running the town. Regal to be sold off for redevelopment, free parking to encourage people to come to the town to shop etc, town is dying. More litter bins, Gipping Way speed limit to be reduced to 30MPH and Hollingworth Road good clean up needed. If the Town Council won't do this they should be closed down.</p>	
<p>Stowmarket has too many houses with poor road infrastructure. It has trebled in size since I moved here in 2005. Council tax continues to increase but maintenance is bad. We don't need more houses.</p>	<p>It always boils down to money, on the part of the government. Rather than increase Stowmarket boundaries, maintain roads and provisions inside the boundaries as they stand. Our roads cannot take the amount of people in our borough. Decisions to part close the A14, major thoroughfare of the east has caused despicable and dangerous damage to our country roads. Make better decisions about what we have before getting bigger yet again!</p>
<p>When we bought our house we liked that it was a part of the village of Onehouse. If we wanted to live in Stowmarket then we would have bought a house there.</p>	
<p>I don't want our village to become part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>We want no change</p>	
<p>My Mother born in 1919 worked at Onehouse Hall when she left school at 14. Onehouse has always been a thriving community.</p>	<p>If it works why change it</p>
<p>I think the historical boundaries should remain unchanged</p>	
<p>Want the estates to remain within the boundary of Onehouse. Our village identity must be retained,</p>	
<p>If Onehouse became part of Stowmarket any funding or important decisions would be made with Stowmarket taking priority, Onehouse will be left with minimal support by Stowmarket. Onehouse & Stowmarket are two very different places with different communities & needs.</p>	
<p>There is no need to change it. Stowmarket Town Council are just being greedy!</p>	

For the five reasons you have stated	
Prefer to be part of the community of Onehouse and where we believe what we pay in rates would be of good use. New to this area and this part of the appeal. We also use facilities outside of this area so don't feel we are a 'drain' on Stowmarket's finances Onehouse should stay as Onehouse	
The reason for choosing our new build house was the village location, we have moved from a busy traffic congested town.	We think its important to preserve the identity and community of small villages. We have already engaged with the local community. (have just arrived in the last few weeks).
I think that as Onehouse has a strong community identity areas of the existing parish should NOT be transferred to Stowmarket In future years there will be more building in various areas & then the boundaries will need to be moved again, so why move them now.	
We have lived in the village of Onehouse for 45 years. It is a community. It has its own identity with facilities such as a pub, church, community hall, and community playing field. Northfield Wood and Lakeside recreation areas are within its boundary as is the historic Paupers Graves and Stow Lodge building. People living here have CHOSEN village life. The new development will bring us additional investments both financially and in people. Financially the village needs investment to provide better connectivity for roads and footpaths. The lovely village hall needs modernising for comfort and accessibility to attract additional user groups. Having more residents would enhance village life and bring a wide range of interests, experiences and perspectives. The fear is that a boundary change would lead to Onehouse ultimately becoming a part of Stowmarket and losing its unique identity.	It is important that villages such as Onehouse do not become swallowed up by the adjacent towns. Suffolk rightly boasts its village image. It is also important that there is representation electorally to reflect the different needs of villages/ towns. Onehouse should have its views identified, not to be swallowed up by the town. The boundary should remain as it is, and the increased numbers of residents should be reflected in its representation.
There is no reason to change the boundary. The houses in the development sit logically within Onehouse being opposite Stow Lodge and the Paupers' Graves area with the additional land being bought by Onehouse Parish Council around it. The money from the community infrastructure Levy should be invested where the people live to enhance communication with the facilities within Onehouse - roads, footpaths, community areas. It should NOT be swallowed up by Stowmarket which already has much new development within its existing boundary.	Stowmarket Town Council had a boundary change approved quite recently. This further application seems to be more about acquiring the CIL money (which would not benefit the immediate area around the development) and using it over a large town. It is also important that villages such as Onehouse have adequate electoral representation to allow for their identity to remain separate from the town. It would be wrong for Stowmarket to swallow up villages.
Onehouse is a thriving community in it's own right. Steeped in history, I believe Queen Elizabeth the first stayed at Onehouse on her way to and from London and Norwich. They have their own magazine, community centre, church & pub. They should not be swallowed up by the vast housing estate that Stowmarket has become.	
The present situation appears satisfactory	
The Parish of Onehouse currently includes Stow Lodge/ Paupers Graves/ land off Combs lane and this is a historical boundary. We want to preserve our parish boundaries.	We strongly disapprove of a boundary change and want to preserve the Onehouse Parish. We have had to succumb to pressure for housing new development. We do not wish to be a suburb of Stowmarket.

No good reason why the boundaries need to change	Thank you for this letter
I see no benefit or reason to change the boundaries and agree the request should be declined and Onehouse boundary should be left as it is	
Because of historical link to Onehouse Paupers Grave + Work house. Onehouse has its own identity. New residents will use Northfield Wood.	
Why consider change at all? Onehouse is obviously a village & Despite ever encroaching development it should continue as it is.	
We are in agreement with the recommendations of the working party	
Prefer the boundaries to remain the same, we see no reason for it to change	
I want Onehouse to maintain its identity as it currently does	
Since moving into Mill Grove my family and I have become a part of the Onehouse community.	
There is literally no reason to change anything! Please stop wasting tax payers money on this nonsensical waste of time and focus on what will contribute to the community.	
Because it is mainly existing residential dwellings in the effected area on the map. It does reflect local interests already & feel like part of the community - no change needed!	Agree to decline the request!
Villages should remain as they are without Stowmarket taking over new housing in another village by moving boundaries	
We have enough new building going up and no infrastructure, the traffic around the town at certain times of day are grid locked. We also have Crest Nicholson Building on the Stowupland side of town and there is bound to be more than one phase of construction there	
The evidence supporting the proposal allows Onehouse to be independent. It allows the Parish Council to administer and support the interests of the Parish!!	
1) Historical part of Onehouse 2) I enjoy living in the village of Onehouse 3) Much as I enjoy visiting Stowmarket I feel that I have more in common with the rural community of Onehouse	
Stowmarket Council has already taken Onehouse land for developments that are not needed and can't sell now. Onehouse must retain its own (identity or status)	
Do not see the benefit of changing	
Stowmarket has become too big in the last 50 years. People I know living in Onehouse area like their "little village" atmosphere + do not wish to be swallowed up by the urban sprawl Stowmarket has become.	Stop further building in the proposed area. The roads of Combs Lane + Onehouse Road are not able to take the volume of traffic as it is! Just have the decency to ask the people of this town if they want to see anymore of our once beautiful countryside under concrete!!!
Keep it as it is. Not keep changing.	
Unnecessary	
I think the boundaries should stay as they are because I can only see Stowmarket's only benefit being a monetary gain.	
I am an O.A.P so it does not really affect me	
Stowmarket becoming too big	

Approve no change necessary. Advice provided in documents	
I believe things are correct as they are	
To much building in Stowmarket	
To retain as existing	
<p>I feel that the proposed change to the boundary will have a detrimental effect on the village, in terms of loss of land, loss of revenue and an erosion of the village's identity.</p> <p>Onehouse may be a small village and the additional housing development will increase the number of residents considerably, but this additional population will bring new opportunities.</p> <p>Onehouse has already, unnecessarily, lost land to Stowmarket with previous developments, and if this continues to take place our ancient village will be reduced to little more than a suburb of Stowmarket.</p>	<p>As a long time resident of Onehouse, I have spoken to many of the newer residents regarding this, and every person I have spoken with moved to their new home thinking that they will be part of village life and are extremely reluctant to be shifted within a town boundary for no good reason.</p> <p>The fact that this governance review has been necessary demonstrates the lack of consultation from Stowmarket Town Council with any of the stakeholders involved in this proposal and I hope, should the boundary remain unchanged that this will improve their future planning.</p>
Increased council tax	
<p>Aeras A, B and C identify best with the parish of Onehouse as they have/do now. These areas should remain with the Onehouse Parish and not be 'swallowed up' losing their identity if they were included in the ever expanding Stowmarket area.</p> <p>Not sure how affects us and what the pros & cons for this is...</p>	
<p>Whoever builds around Star Lane needs to improve this road - make it wider and curb it, make it a proper road. If you're building around this area and its becoming more populated make the roads better and street lights.</p>	
<p>There is no need to change boundaries just because of new development otherwise every village will be taken over by adjacent towns</p> <p>Because Stowmarket Council want to take their money that would be given as a result of the development. The money would be better going to Onehouse as it should be so that the village can develop</p>	<p>Glad the review is happening but we all know full well that Stowmarket Council will just override it and take the CIL% money and just spend it on things that on-one will see.</p>
<p>Parcels of land form existing developments. What would be the benefit of change?</p> <p>We agree with the reasons set out by the community governance review working group</p> <p>We currently live in Onehouse and we believe that it's Onehouse's right to retain it's land. Also any improvements to their area such as additional footpaths, play areas, shops, footpath improvements should be to the benefit of Onehouse village not Stowmarket. We feel that this is just an unfair and unjust land grab by Mid Suffolk Council and it should not be permitted. Onehouse has already suffered by losing it's boundaries.</p> <p>There is no good reason to change the existing boundaries. The residents bought houses believing they were living in Onehouse. A change for them would be increases in rates imposed by Stowmarket TC. When planning permission was given there was no application for boundary change as I understood it, at the</p>	

<p>time. Why now, it has been refused once why are we/you wasting public money on this yet again.</p>	
<p>The village has continually been eroded thru' the expansion of estates like Wimpey, Hopkins and annexed by Stowmarket. We choose to live in a village for a reason - we want to retain it's integrity and value as a community. It serves no purpose to lose further land and is contrary to Suffolk County Council policy of retaining local communities. Where will the next area be for expansion of the town? This has to stop.</p>	<p>Other than the desire for Stowmarket to have yet a bigger precept and deprive our village of much needed revenue, what is to be gained? Stowmarket needs the goodwill of neighbouring villages to support local businesses and trade. Changing the boundary will not alter that. We fully support the current recommendation. The village wants to retain it's identity and integrity. Those on the Hopkins estate were told it was a village environment they were buying into. Nobody other than Stow Town Council see the need or desire to argue things.</p>
<p>I live in Combs Ford so this does not impact me directly, but I do feel strongly that Onehouse should remain as it is, of the wishes of existing residents are granted. I see no benefit to changing the boundaries & doing so will in effect wipe Onehouse from the map despite being a existing established community.</p>	<p>Stowmarket itself is becoming too large & does not need anymore land mass. This proposal seems to be for the benefit of having developers who can sell more with the label of them being in Stowmarket due to the train links to London. The land has been known as Onehouse historically & I can see no benefit to changing it going forward. The Paupers Grave is also of local historical significance & should be respected. Its time we started to preserve what we have. Hopefully if the proposal is declined it will detract housing developers from building more homes + we can keep what we have left of our once beautiful, open green spaces.</p>
<p>We strongly object to Stowmarket Town Council demanding another boundary change to include another section of Onehouse Parish to include the Hopkins Homes 'Mill Grove' development and Bloor's Homes on the Southern side of Union Road.</p> <p>This can only be described as purely a 'Land Grab' policy to obtain a financial reward from the developments currently underway and in no way constitutes any lasting benefit to Onehouse Parish.</p> <p>They use the argument that 'Onehouse parish council' objected to the developments now underway during the Planning Application and Land for Development phase. Comments that residents in the new developments will look towards Stowmarket for facilities is correct and they should be thankful that the Stowmarket economy is set to benefit from this. (Are they going to put barriers up to stop non-Stowmarket Parish residents from using Stowmarket facilities) We have never heard of so ridiculous a statement, and this confirms our belief that the application to change the boundaries is quite blatantly a financial argument to solely benefit Stowmarket Town council to the detriment of the surrounding historical villages.</p> <p>Stowmarket Town council are yet again wanting to strip the Onehouse Parish of the benefit of any section 106 and CIL developer payments, of which Onehouse Parish would be able to improve the facilities in the village community.</p>	

Several historically significant sites are within the Onehouse Parish boundary (Union Workhouse / Paupers Graves site etc) as well as a substantial number of current residences that have identified themselves with Onehouse Parish and not Stowmarket for several years/decades.

After the previous Boundary changes in 2014, Stowmarket has seen a large amount of Residential development around the Northern/Eastern/Southern and Western boundaries causing major reduction in greenfield buffer areas as well as the massive industrial development of the Gateway 14 site.

With major developments in the neighbouring parishes of Elmswell, Woolpit, Thurston, Stowupland, Rougham, causing urban sprawl from Bury St Edmunds, it is imperative that the surrounding smaller village parishes can retain their important historical identity for future generations and retaining the important Green Belt buffer zones and benefit from any imposed development within their boundaries.

A quote taken from the EADT report in December 2014 Boundary amendment is of great concern to current and new residents of Onehouse. " Mr Green added another concern has been that if boundary change came in after the homes were built, then the new residents may have been faced with an alteration to their council tax rate.

We moved here in 2023 wanting to be part of a village community. So much of our Local, Regional and National heritage is being destroyed/lost under piles of tarmac and brick, it is incumbent on the generation to protect it for future generations.

3.2. Disagree Comments

Comments	Additional Comments
Seems to make sense as it joined to Stowmarket and the majority of residents of those estates will have more links to Stowmarket	
Stowmarket has doubled in size over the past 30 years if services and other facilities are governed by one organisation I think it would be better for everybody	
Nice area to visit and its not far would like to see Bus route there form First Eastern Counties	As on left page, lived in Stow for nearly 30 years. Onehouse is always will be part of Stowmarket no question about it.
New housing is now part of Stowmarket and should be included in activities and communal happenings	
Onehouse residents were not consulted about the new developments and I do not feel that they add anything to the cohesiveness of the area. All houses seem to drive everywhere and community spirit is waning.	
It is clear that these developments are part of an expanding Stowmarket. An expanding Onehouse would be closer to the centre of that village. There are plenty of precedents for Stowmarket taking in areas from its surrounding parishes (Stowupland, Combs, Haughley(?), Badley(?)) as it has grown	It is understandable that residents on the edge of Stowmarket currently in Onehouse should opt for the status quo because they are paying less council tax thereby but they are more likely to use Stowmarket's facilities than Onehouse's which is unfair on Stowmarket residents who are paying for the facilities they use
1. If the new developments in Stowmarket become part of Onehouse, the green spaces between the 2 parts of Onehouse could be expected to developed as well. I strongly oppose this. It has been our concern all along. We need there to be a clear difference between the town of	The new development must be part of Stowmarket. Area A sits more easily with Stowmarket than Onehouse. My view is Starhouse lane divides Onehouse from Stowmarket - anything to the east of this road is Stowmarket. The area C is half + half. Need new boundary

<p>Stowmarket + the village of Onehouse. We do not want the character of Onehouse to be lost. 2.New boundaries will be confusing to residents. They wont know who is representing them</p>	<p>to reflect this. It has taken me a long time to get my head around this! Complicated wording doesn't help. I hope this doesn't create a barrier to getting an accurate response from Onehouse inhabitants. I would expect some people to be unaware of where the current Onehouse boundary is.</p>
<p>I like the idea of it all becoming part of Stowmarket. I'm hoping it will create more opportunities for local businesses.</p>	
<p>I choose Option 2 because I think A B C should pay to Stowmarket, I could not see anything about to Union Road so could not assess anything</p>	
<p>Stowmarket is a growing town and boundary lines changing are just a matter of course. I didn't feel the reasons given for declining the change were sufficient enough.</p>	
<p>I think the development is closer to Stowmarket which has all the required services, Onehouse is a small village which relies on Stowmarket town as support Not necessary</p>	<p>Join the two together. I think we have to move forward in our thinking and embrace changes as appropriate, this joining will be good for the residents.</p>
<p>Areas A, B and C are geographically closer to Stowmarket and will be more connected to Stowmarket Council and their services.</p>	
<p>I believe that Starhouse Lane from Finborough Road to junction with Forest Road makes more sensible boundary, and that residents in areas A, B & C will associate with Stowmarket and the services it provides rather than Onehouse</p>	<p>Worthwhile to consider in the light of the new residential areas, rather than just maintaining the status quo</p>
<p>Stowmarket is located in prime position in the county with road and rail networks now very important. And attracting development in both housing and businesses. It is important that the area has one voice in ensuring this area is developed properly and considerately when considering the house and business opportunities. It's a small world. We need to be working together to ensure the proper development of it with a united voice.</p>	<p>As I said before. This world is becoming smaller. It's ridiculous that built are area development is subject to pretty politics working different directions. We need to work together. Communities will be stronger working together</p>
<p>Recommendation by Stowmarket Town Council</p>	<p>Option 1+2 are written unclearly, confusing, complete gobbledy goop. Option 1+2 questionnaire not fit for purpose - refer to Stowmarket Town Council for clear options!</p>
<p>Stowmarket Town Council likely to have more resources + influence than Onehouse Parish Council. Most people living in the area probably do not mind. Stowmarket is expanding.</p>	
<p>Onehouse is effectively part of Stowmarket already & it makes more sense to bring it all together.</p>	
<p>Union Road is part of Stowmarket. And as such any off shoots from it should also become Stowmarket, Onehouse etc.</p>	
<p>It makes sense for the boundary line to fallow the natural break</p>	<p>All of A and part of B and C following the existing boundary line</p>
<p>I have recently moved to the area. From review of the map I would question why part of the estate I live in is not included in the old parish for Stowmarket. I have read from the documents that a sense of identities should be considered. What does that mean for the southern part of the Northfieldrian development when they are included in Onehouse not Stowmarket? I live physically closer to Onehouse than much of the area proposed to change. My</p>	<p>As a new resident to the area. I have had to do a lot of online travelling to find any information about the proposed changes. The documents provided are ruefully inadequate if you have no understanding of the reason this request for boundary changes was made. And there is no real qualification for why the working party chose to decline the request. The transparency here is poor! My thoughts are that as most of B's in new housing they are</p>

<p>main concern is funding of schools, sports facilities ofc which will be used by the people in areas A,B&C. Is there a parish precept paid to Stowmarket for use of these? Clearly these facilities are not available in Onehouse.</p>	<p>unlikely to have any attachment to either area but more likely to use Stowmarket facilities.</p>
<p>Onehouse doesn't have the amenities, therefore the occupants of these areas will use these in Stowmarket Town. Stowmarket should then benefit.</p>	
<p>It makes absolute sense and is far enough away from this main village of Onehouse to not have an adverse effect and no change to its identity. Economics make this sensible and viable. Totally support expansion of Stowmarket to encompass these areas. These areas benefit hugely from all the facilities of Stowmarket - so should Stowmarket not benefit from them? CIL/Council tax. Interesting that initially Onehouse & it's Councillors objected to the developments but now want to benefit from them? Additionally, those Councillors were against it as it spoilt the interest/ identities of the community - and now they use it as a defence!</p>	<p>The Working group point about Paupers Graves is wooly - the link to StowLodge historically interesting but 'so what'. When visiting Paupers Grave Wood I and I guess 99% of people would have no idea that they were in Onehouse anyway. Do the right economic thing and change the boundary!!</p>
<p>So much cost to Stowmarket residents. Confusing information!</p>	
<p>Because it is common sense that the boundary between Stowmarket Town Council and Onehouse Parish Council is Starhouse lane which provides a clear green space between the two areas. There is also the fact that Stowmarket has more facilities given the size of Stowmarket Town Council and Onehouse Parish Council.</p>	<p>It appears to me that it is a one sided effort by the cross party and I would like to know how the representation of the cross party was made up. Also how was a map of such importance sent out incomprehensible and unreadable. I am not alone on this thought.</p>
<p>The developments are in essence Stowmarket & there is clear space between the Town & Onehouse & preferred the residents are part of Stowmarket community</p>	
<p>Because these houses are for all intents + purposes part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>All impact will be on Stowmarket so it should be part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>My understanding is that council tax paid within a parish pays for services with that parish. Given the geographical proximity of areas A,B+ C to Stowmarket, it is likely residents from those areas will use Stowmarket facilities more than Onehouse facilities. It would therefore make more sense for monies from those areas (A/B/C) go to Stowmarket. I am also aware that the boundaries have already moved at least twice, with Stowmarket boundary moving west to take into account my development (Chilton fields) in 1990's and then more recently to include the newer current Northfields development.</p>	<p>I would suggest it would make more practical/geographical sense for the Stowmarket boundary to follow the north/south road boundary including the area currently excluded from the proposed expansion (west of area A) so it runs from the western boundary of the Northfields development south along the road boundary to include area B+C. Doing so would include all the land currently having planning permission for development, wholly within Stowmarket, still leaving clear geographical/undeveloped land west of Starhouse Lane within Onehouse Parish + the main village.</p>
<p>The properties in Union Road were sold on the basis that they are part of Stowmarket. There are NO facilities in Onehouse, meaning residents of Union Road will be using the facilities in Stowmarket. In view of this the boundary should be changed per option 2.</p>	<p>Failure to change the boundary will mean Stowmarket residents will have to pay a much higher council tax precept to cover the costs of Union Road residents using the facilities in the town, this is unacceptable.</p>

<p>I have lived in Stowmarket Chilton Hall for 40 years. Onehouse has always objected to Chilton Hall expanding to link up with Onehouse. They now have a green belt between any development from Stowmarket linking Onehouse. The new build in question B and C are Stowmarket side of this green belt, as such they should be in Stowmarket area. Presumably the only reason they require this development to be in Onehouse is so they can receive the revenue gained from this development. This should be given to Stowmarket, so they can make better use of the revenue for development of facilities that Onehouse could use.</p>	
<p>The built up areas A/B/C are literally continuations of Stowmarket areas and are barely/ not connected to Onehouse. Onehouse residents have vocally insisted they want to remain small and must not connect/join/merge with Stowmarket. I'm happy to let them stay small + separated. Stowmarket will continue to provide + pay for facilities, whilst Onehouse offers only a village hall and a magazine... Stowmarket would make much better use of the council tax.</p>	<p>The reasons to decline are tenuous and seem to mean very little. I'm disappointed the document refers to no opposing arguments/views... very one-side. I lived for 30 years on the Onehouse-end of Stowmarket, and volunteered at Onehouse Village Hall as many friends were in Onehouse. There was never animosity but persistently clear views in Onehouse they wanted small/restaurant.</p>
<p>The new developments would constitute a huge increase in the population for Onehouse Parish and overwhelm the Parish Council. As these development would more likely use/benefit from existing infrastructure & services/facilities provided by Stowmarket it makes more sense in my view to change the boundary to reflect this.</p>	
<p>I have chosen option 2 as the dwellings in A, B and C will be using services provided by the Stowmarket Town Council. Therefore they should have a say in how the Stowmarket Town Council is elected</p>	
<p>To expand Stowmarket because if Stowmarket doesn't grow, services would decline.</p>	
<p>The area is in effect part of Stowmarket it makes sense to bring it under the jurisdiction of S.T.C</p>	
<p>I believe that the Stowmarket Town Council are better equipped to be able to spend any 106 monies for the benefit of the majority in the Stowmarket area. All of these properties will see themselves as part of Stowmarket not Onehouse & all the facilities they use will be within the Stowmarket boundary</p>	
<p>Reasons 1 & 1 would still equally apply, paragraph 3 of the letter claims the land belongs to Onehouse which is not corroborates in any way. The residents in the areas A + B + C will derive most of their services from Stowmarket but under this proposal from MSDC would not be paying council tax for those services & amenities. It is clear from the map that giving areas A/B/C to Onehouse creates a 2-part parish separated by large green space and this one is led to the conclusion that MSDC will be seeking to fill that space with more housing without the attendant investment in the support services such a development would require.</p>	<p>I believe that this review lacks impartiality in the way it has been exercised - and presented so as to favour Onehouse.</p>
<p>Its proximity to Stowmarket</p>	
<p>A large number of residents would be very much connected to Stowmarket with no sensitivity to the needs of the</p>	

<p>village/ woods. They would be entitled to express an opinion about an area they do not understand.</p>	
<p>Because the land is clearly adjoining Stowmarket and as the key settlement within Mid Suffolk it makes complete sense that it should grow. Sadly Stowmarket and surrounding areas are governed by tinpot 'green' councillors who are short sighted and who believe small villages have a bigger say... will happily discuss further. Since MSDC predominately has a green majority what was the make up of the "cross-party working group" FARCE!!! Also whoever wrote Q2 should probably work for the SNP. It is so ambiguous that they would probably get the yes answer they are desperate for.</p>	<p>Have you heard of microsot farms? As a "Green" area I don't want my hard earned income wasted on postage costs for something I believe is a slam dunk result and that feedback given will make no difference.</p>
<p>The occupants have moved to these new houses to be part of Stowmarket + all of its facilities. They have not moved there for "Village life". If they wanted this then would move to a village. The revenue generated needs to go to Stowmarket to improve said facilities + help the Town continue to rebound, attract new independent businesses + visitors. Onehouse benefits in this scenario also!</p>	<p>The wording contained in this communication is really confusing. The recommendation should be "Should the Union Road development be part of Stowmarket?" 1 Yes - change boundaries to include... Stow.. 2 No - Leave boundaries so new houses remain in Onehouse "Agree to decline" & "Disagree to decline" will confuse people...</p>
<p>The areas A, B, C are connected to Stowmarket, not connected to the housing of Onehouse</p>	
<p>Geographically makes sense for the areas to be incorporated within Stowmarket</p>	<p>The wording of the options is not the best. I wonder if this was done intentionally?</p>
<p>Seems sensible</p>	
<p>These residents rely on Stowmarket's facilities - there is no school, doctors etc in Onehouse</p>	
<p>In my opinion/experience parish councils are too inverted in thinking. Instructure/development in society longer term benefits would be beneficial for the area to be under the larger org. (& community) i.e Town Council</p>	
<p>The areas A, B + C appear to be a real part of Stowmarket. So using Onehouse as part of their address will confuse & create problems with delivery etc as they will expect to find the roads within the village of Onehouse, some distance away.</p>	
<p>Functionally these are clearly part of Stowmarket. They will be immediately adjoined to the town & use its services. Anyone that can afford one of these can afford to pay the same as the rest of us.</p>	<p>Beyond any opposition clearly having no basis in reality (to adopting the estates as part fo Stowmarket). Also the workhouse served multiple parishes, not solely Onehouse, so that feels a faulty argument. This is frankly an administrative change.</p>
<p>Because potentially decisions could made by Onehouse Parish Council that impact on residents of Chiltern Hall Estate.</p>	

I think the boundaries should be changed to include areas A, B and C because:

1. The new boundaries keep the character of Onehouse and Stowmarket as separate settlements,
2. The boundary changes requested reflect the connectivity that the new developments have especially for pavement users including children, people with pushchairs and for cyclists.
3. Equality between different residents within the Stowmarket settlement.
4. Ability to provide effective local governance

I'll explain each point in more detail:

1. Character of Onehouse and Stowmarket

Stowmarket is a small market town surrounded by villages and countryside one of which is Onehouse. I am from Ipswich where the boundaries between town and villages and even districts are blurred. Stowmarket and Onehouse up until these new developments were not merged with any other village. Keeping the current boundaries significantly changes this character because instead of a small number of outlying buildings, there is now a very large portion of Onehouse which is merged with the settlement mostly made up of Stowmarket. This gets rid of the green space that clearly separated Onehouse and Stowmarket. It will be very difficult to argue that Onehouse and Stowmarket have the character of separate rural settlements. Using rivers and roads as borders and clear cultural markers that will not be built on, at the edge of the green space (I.e. Pauper's Graveyard) make sensible boundaries that can be understood for foreseeable future and to change the character would need significant infrastructure investment outside of any development. The suggested boundaries would help avoid a situation of a Greater Stowmarket which both those in villages and Onehouse want to avoid as this would change the character.

2. Connection

In a culture with a lot of drivers connection can be a vague idea for many but for people who are unable to drive and require pavement infrastructure to get about it can be clearer. The new developments are not connected by the same quality of (or at points any) pavements. As someone who does not drive it is clear the new developments are connected to Stowmarket by wider pavements with streetlights and features such as those needed for blind people in a way they are not connected Onehouse. Once the developments are completed there are also some houses in Stowmarket who will be better connected to Stowmarket via the entrance to the developments opposite Wash Lane (so going through what is currently Onehouse than going along Finborough Road towards Stowmarket). Broadly I do not see how the new development is connected to Onehouse for people with buggies, wheelchair users, blind people and those traveling by foot after dark (including school children in winter attending after school activities) and I am troubled if connectivity is based more on car users than connectivity in active travel.

3. Equality

It is a contentious subject about money as currently the Onehouse is entirely within its right to say that the development is within its parish. It does not however treat individuals equitably at the moment because neighbours are paying money to different councils. If it was a clear boundary then the problematic system of council tax would be less of an issue but it does not feel fair that just because of where a footpath down a field was, that I should pay Stowmarket Town Council along with those who will be in the houses built on the Stowmarket side, but those who are for example within easy accessible walkable distance to Stowmarket Town Council events like StowFiesta on the rugby ground do not pay towards it. Stowmarket Town Council funds groups used by Stowmarket residents outside of the parish so it feels even more unfair that residents within the same settlement are not expected to pay into the council that administers the majority of that settlement.

4. Governance: Using easily identifiable boundaries makes it easier for residents to understand who represents them and who to vote for. It also makes it easier for councils to use mail services to inform residents when there are clearer boundaries.

The current boundary would create confusion for residents, councillors and council staff. For example if neighbours on Teasel Way discuss matters relating to parish / town council or elections the detail that part of the very short road is in Onehouse and part is in Stowmarket could easily get lost. If utilities were lost on the development such as power or water or if people needed emergency services and said services were lost in Onehouse, would it be clear to others that it would be Onehouse attached to Stowmarket rather than the separate settlement of Onehouse detached from Stowmarket.

Councillors representing those wards will have to remember exact house numbers for their boundaries on Moore Road, Teasel Way and Honeysuckle Way (which sounds small but imagine councillors having to remember that detail at a point of residents' distress or for example during a district wide or town wide situation).

Council staff in the past have got confused between Combs and Combs Ford and council papers had to be amended when this consultation was voted for because a councillor had the incorrect ward attributed to them. These sort of mistakes are more likely with more confusing boundaries that require very detailed knowledge of ward boundaries.

The reading age/literacy level needed to understand options is very high. Public consultation documents should be much easier to read and understand.

<p>Basing it on car travel also broadens the area for connectivity and has potential for making it more difficult to impose conditions giving weight to access to active travel routes on new developments by saying the new development and the previous bulk of Onehouse are more connected than Stowmarket and the new developments.</p>	
<p>Consider a bigger area A better proposition increasing the size of area and population works to my family's advantage</p>	
<p>The income raised from these developments would be better served invested into Stowmarket</p>	
<p>It does not make sense to divide a housing estate in two. Let us all be one happy Stowmarket family!</p>	
<p>I class the areas A, B & C as being in Stowmarket.</p>	
<p>To preserve the rural identity of the Parish (and having spoken to Town Councillors involved in initial discussions)</p>	<p>Whilst I live in Onehouse (and work from home). I understand the reasoning behind the Town Council's proposal, having looked into the recent history of planning applications. I've spoken to Town Councillors, as mentioned. As an aside, I've been appalled at some of the accusations voiced on social media from the Onehouse side, and the language used. My wife and I are in agreement regarding our decision (thank you for your efforts, however)</p>
<p>The homes within the boundary change will be more of a drain on the resources of Stowmarket than Onehouse, so I believe the extra funding from their Council tax should go to Stowmarket. There's not a lot of facilities in Onehouse to spend money on, it is only the community centre, the money would be better put to use in Stowmarket. I do find it disappointing that this wasn't resolved before people moved into the new houses, they bought them believing they would be in Onehouse. Ultimately I feel its more important the funding goes to the right Council.</p>	
<p>To the best of my knowledge, the only amenity/facility in Onehouse is the community centre. Stowmarket on the other hand, being the much larger centre of population, has every amenity/facility you could wish for and, as such, would be where all the residents of the new developments and the enlarged Chilton Hall Estate would naturally be drawn to associate with/use/ Also Onehouse folk are vey cliquey!!</p>	

<p>The residents will use all the facilities in Stowmarket therefore, the boundary should be changed</p>	
<p>The proposed amendment sits more naturally within the Stowmarket community. It is some distance from the main Onehouse settlements. The new development will use Stowmarket facilities, naturally be seen as Stowmarket settlement and therefore should contribute to Stowmarket council tax. It seems unfair Onehouse Road or Chilton will pay more than their direct neighbours on Union Road.</p>	<p>It is a pity time and money + time is being spent on this issue, and that Councils could not reach agreement</p>
<p>Development area abuts existing Stowmarket development and occupiers will logically use Stowmarket facilities</p>	
<p>The areas in question are most logically identified as extension of Stowmarket when viewed from above, given recent residential developments. It would make sense to poll residents in areas A, B and C, giving greater weight to the decision of the majority there</p>	
<p>Not bothered doesn't effect</p>	
<p>The new estate is clearly part of Stowmarket. All residents will be using Stowmarket services. Stowmarket can absorb this new estate much easier than the village of Onehouse</p>	<p>The wording of these options is very confusing! This could have been avoided by providing a shaded map and asking whether the shaded area be a) Stowmarket or b) Onehouse</p>
<p>Onehouse has no facilities as such and the residents work in Stowmarket, their doctors and dentists are in Stowmarket, leisure facilities in Stowmarket and as such are part of Stowmarket.</p>	
<p>These areas will use the same services and need to be considered together in a new 10-25yr plan. It is essential that the rapidly increasing population is matched by more GP Surgeries, dramatically uplifted leisure & hotel facilities and improved parking & retail opportunities</p>	
<p>I think the charm of Onehouse is in the closeness of the village. The areas A B & C should incorp into Stowmarket as it is closer to this town.</p>	
<p>1) People living in areas A, B + C already use oversubscribed services in Stowmarket and yet council tax and developer contributions will go to Onehouse Parish Council who provide very little in the way of services. 2) These areas are a natural extension of Stowmarket having a border that is adjacent to the town. They are remote from Onehouse Village centre and therefore already identify more naturally with the town. 3)Onehouse PC has always wanted to keep separation from Stowmarket and this (Option 1) goes completely against that objective, meaning it will now have housing directly adjacent to the town boundary.</p>	<p>I am horrified with the level if information provided in the letter. It gives no details as to the reasons why Stowmarket TC has asked for the review - i.e. as I have stated opposite the oversubscribed services, monetary value. It is like the District Council doesn't either understand the position or has deliberately decided not to explain so that people are unaware of the consequences of choosing either option. I am disgusted as this is not transparent and open local government and if you have all decisions on this level of information its no wonder you are so poorly performing and out of touch.</p>
<p>Without increased infrastructure more houses will reduce the quality of life for those currently in Stowmarket. So without more school places doctors - healthcare more houses will not work</p>	
<p>Areas A , B and C are closer to Stowmarket than to Onehouse</p>	
<p>Aside from a village hall, there are very little amenities and no infrastructure in Onehouse, so it makes very little sense that the precept and C.I.L for the Union Road development, should go to Onehouse Parish Council. The occupiers of</p>	

<p>these properties will use Stowmarket facilities, so I see no other option other than to move the boundary.</p>	
<p>They adjoin the dwellings in Stowmarket and as you travel alone the roads to these dwellings, you don't leave Stow before going to their dwellings</p>	
<p>Make Stowmarket Bigger, & Bigger</p>	<p>All areas should by called Greater Stowmarket</p>
<p>By combining the two councils: 1. Money saved 2. One Council not competing with others 3. Interests of both communities discussed in one meeting not in a variety 4. Decisions made far quicker</p>	
<p>I feel it would benefit Onehouse Parish Council to remain as a smaller parish, all the extra homes would not benefit them also I know people who live in or around the new development who actually thought they come under Stowmarket already. To me going by the enclosed map the area is closer to Stowmarket than Onehouse.</p>	
<p>Physically, functionally and economically these 3 areas as developed, de facto form part of the urban area of Stowmarket. Whilst I understand Onehouse PC & residents wishing to retain & preserve separation from Stowmarket this has or will have happened once development has been completed. The residents of these areas will "consume" similar amounts of community facilities and as such should pay the same Town Council precept as other parts of the Town. It makes no sense to me that the development along Fuller way & Brooke Way are part of the Twon whilst the Union Road developments are outside the Town.</p>	
<p>The development reflects Stowmarket rather than the village settlement of Onehouse. The development directly joins Stowmarket where its residents will go for their services and it is approximately 1/2 a mile from the main part of the village of Onehouse.</p>	
<p>Formation of the 2 areas coming together will provide improved infrastructure for both Onehouse/Stowmarket - left divided the infrastructure has little chance of improvement for all residents</p>	<p>You refer to the Paupers Graves & Stow Lodge hospital - none of the new roads reflect the history of Stow Lodge i.e. why wasn't its wood names used as road names. Munnings Crome, Symth Constable, Cotman ??? Gainsborough Road is already established within the older estate. An email response to this suggestion would be appreciated.</p>
<p>It would make more sense for the new estates to be within the Stowmarket area. The residents of the new estates will undoubtedly use the Stowmarket facilities to a much greater extent and any CIL money or rates payable need to go to Stowmarket Town Council to be able to adequately provide the services the new residents will need.</p>	<p>I would like the members to look to this failure and consider how best + by whom these estates will be managed. If there are any future initiatives by Stowmarket Town Council none of the new house yet to be built will wonder why they are not included.</p>
<p>because I consider the proposed areas are more part of Stowmarket and not Onehouse which is a unique village and must be protected as such. I also hope this will help Stowmarket obtain the extra doctors surgeries and emergency services we desperately need. Also more school places, and of course these will cover Onehouse.</p>	<p>The town of Stowmarket is now due for urgent expansion of schooling, doctors surgeries, emergency services including police and affordable rented accommodation and recreational areas for our expanding population. There is also a greater need for local bus services to cater for this great rise in population, as many in our satellite villages are being left isolated and without access to private transport and facilities, this would boast our failing town centre which is fast becoming a ghost town.</p>

<p>Because of the proximity of the dwellings to Stowmarket, the residents would be using all the facilities exactly the same as residents in Stowmarket, and therefore should pay the same as the other residents</p>	
<p>Common sense</p>	
<p>With those pp's its basically Stowmarket. Better they're included so that tax goes towards facilities in Stowmarket they'll be using</p>	
<p>I think most of the people in these developments are more likely to use Stowmarket ament, and would not really go to Onehouse village</p>	
<p>The residents of A, B + C are more likely to use facilities provided by Stowmarket (Shops, Schools, Library, Doctors, etc) so their council tax should reflect that. Combs Ford residents pay to Stowmarket Town Council.</p>	<p>Mid Suffolk has not made it clear why it objects to the change. I also think 'Area D' to the left of A/ above B, to the right edge of the road to Onehouse should also be part of Stowmarket</p>
<p>Because they already part of Stowmarket. Makes no difference to us.</p>	
<p>I feel that all the new housing developments including all the Northfield View should be under Stowmarket as they all run into each other and seem to be closer to Stowmarket than Onehouse. There is an area of Northfield View which is not in the Stowmarket boundary. They all need to be together. Onehouse is a small village and does not need to cater for all these new developments. They need to be grouped together and all move to Stowmarket boundary. The Paupers Grave is a lovely site and needs to be kept as such. Whoever is best maintaining it needs to have it in their boundary. Time moves on and the history of the area needs to be remembered, it is unfortunate its rural setting is being lost to development. However from the map Stowmarket is expanding. Onehouse remains outside of the development really.</p>	<p>I think Parish Councils do great jobs for their local small communities. I feel these large new developments need to belong to Stowmarket and the smaller parishes keep their smaller communities. Time for a change in boundaries please. Thank you.</p>
<p>It seems more logical to be the way forward, for future generations</p>	<p>The Council have made wise decisions recently the re-modernising of the gym & pool & the restructuring of the Regal & the use of it as a theatre & great bar area. In view of the cost of the ventures £400,000 plus, I wish the Council could be more informative.</p>
<p>From my perspective as a resident of the new development on Onehouse way, the location feels as if it is more associated with Stowmarket than Onehouse. The location naturally associates itself with Stowmarket</p>	
<p>Areas A, B, C are all clearly now part of Stowmarket. In my view the reasons put forward by the cross-party working group are extraordinary silly, people who lie in the new houses will use the shops in Stow, the cinema, the museum, etc, they will be part of Stowmarket</p>	<p>Please do not waste any more money on this project as I think there are pressing issues for Mid Suffolk District Council, Onehouse Parish Council and Stow Town Council to deal with which are of greater community value for example: more community events, market place regeneration</p>
<p>Residents of new development will be able to contribute to the amenities provided by Stowmarket Town Council (which they will no doubt do anyway)</p>	
<p>Onehouse residents will be using the facilities of S/MKT, therefore need to contribute financially</p>	
<p>I have always lived in Stowmarket and know the area well. I and my family firmly believe that the new development very much feels like it belongs to Stowmarket and not Onehouse. It is a very short walk and in the same road as</p>	<p>The housing development is only on one side of the Road - could that not be incorporated into Stowmarket and the remaining left as Onehouse?</p>

<p>'Stowmarket' High School. Knowing someone who lives on the new development they also consider themselves a resident of Stowmarket. Onehouse is a small village without it's own facilities. A housing development of that size wouldn't fit with it. I think it would be confusing to suggest that Union Road is 'not' part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>Geographically the Union Road development seems to belong more to Stowmarket and is divided from Onehouse.</p>	
<p>Don't really care cant see what difference it makes. Far more interested in what local government are doing about providing realistic sports facilities in Stowmarket. Not the major development at the sports centre/ school which is not benefiting anyone. Also sort out the parking issues in Woolmers Close.</p>	
<p>Residents will commute & use all the facilities in Stowmarket. Area is directly attached to Stowmarket. Stowmarket Parish Council can provide a lot more to the residents there. Not sure what Onehouse Parish Council could use the money for to give them any benefit.</p>	
<p>Towns and villages grow over time, and as a result of that growth, these places assimilate the smaller communities on their periphery. There are numerous examples of this across the country and this is no different. Why shouldn't the whole of Onehouse eventually become an insignificant suburb of Stowmarket</p>	<p>It just demonstrates just how out of touch the ruling class is from reality. Common sense should prevail, but unfortunately, they are neither common or sensible</p>
<p>With all the new properties built south of Union Road these are in my opinion a continuation of Stowmarket and therefore the boundary should now be Starhouse Lane. But the area North of Union Road including the Paupers Graves should remain as they are now.</p>	<p>The maps are not clear enough to easily define the subject areas</p>
<p>No specific reason</p>	
<p>As the houses are in Stowmarket, they should be paying for the services in Stowmarket they are close to.</p>	
<p>I believe that the residents in these properties will use the services in Stowmarket and should pay the council tax for these services</p>	
<p>Because there is no amenities in Onehouse</p>	
<p>It seems logical to use the roads to mark the boundary between Onehouse + Stowmarket e.g. Starhouse Lane + Union Road</p>	<p>How much of this Community Review is to do with finance? Nothing mentioned as to the financial benefit a move/ no move makes to councils involved</p>
<p>Clearly, people living within these development areas will be making use of Stowmarket facilities i.e. schools, doctors, library, leisure centre, roads, etc paid for by Stowmarket people. They should therefore contribute to Stowmarket costs.</p>	
<p>Housing is required and hopefully that will make retail shops think that this is an attractive opportunity to promote and expand shopping experiences in the Town</p>	
<p>The several hundred residents already live nearer Stowmarket. Therefore should stay within the Stowmarket area and continue to use all the Stowmarket facilities they must already use!</p>	
<p>Onehouse residents use Stowmarket resources, e.g. library, shops, Regal, John Peel Centre.</p>	
<p>The area includes Stow Lodge not Onehouse Lodge but Stow! I also think everything on the right side of Starhouse Lane should be included in Stowmarket including any new</p>	

<p>builds. Also Paupers Graves should be included and purchased from Onehouse. I have included the map with the area E that should also be included as Stowmarket. Everyone sees Stow Lodge as Stowmarket anyway!</p>	
<p>General progress & development</p>	
<p>To become part of Stowmarket hopefully will improve better Road structure more affordable housing hopefully with the expansion will create more job opportunities and more retail shops in the town centre.</p>	
<p>With some housing already under the auspices of Stowmarket Town Council and who predominantly cater for many of the residents requirements such as policing, refuse collection etc, it would be prudent to allow them complete control rather than dual operational control.</p>	<p>Why not ask the residents of areas A, B & C what their individual preferences are!</p>
<p>Logical to extend Stowmarket boundary development is not near Onehouse</p>	<p>Extend Stowmarket boundary</p>
<p>This would increase the population/ size of Stowmarket, it would be good for the Town</p>	<p>The map was not big enough or clear to see the roads</p>
<p>Because there is too much building going off and nobody cares about the town when the should.</p>	
<p>Residents in those estates will be using facilities provided by Stowmarket, and as such the Stowmarket Town Council should get the precept from the council tax. Plus they should also get the CIL monies which will be a considerable amount, to help run the services</p>	<p>The wording of the options at Q2 are suitably confusing and has done a perfect job of obfuscating the intention of the consultation document</p>
<p>Option 2 has been chosen as we feel these houses are part of Stowmarket + the boundary should reflect this. We regularly walk our dog in the area not currently in the boundary + feel it reflects how up + coming Stowmarket is.</p>	<p>Bring Onehouse into Stowmarket Parish as with the increase in new developments it will eventually become part of the town anyway. The community is currently lacking provisions in the town centre + the review should also look into this. Considering the affluence joining the new developments people expect there to be restaurants etc to reflect its.</p>
<p>The letter talks about 'community inclusiveness' but the homes within the highlighted boundary are much closer to Stowmarket than Onehouse. i.e. the infrastructure and roads root the homes to Stowmarket rather than Onehouse</p>	
<p>It is obvious that areas proposed form part of Stowmarket. All residents in the new developments will look to Stowmarket to provide facilities not even available in Onehouse.</p>	<p>Should take into account planning history - Onehouse parish has consistently objected to any development on area concerned as they wanted a break between the two parishes. Now they want it as they can benefit financially.</p>
<p>It's IN Stowmarket. Let's not be silly.</p>	
<p>It's a matter of proximity. The development is closer to the populated area of Stowmarket than the centre of Onehouse where the density of homes is found. In fact the development already part of Stowmarket in the North of area A is closer to the centre of Onehouse than the proposed areas A, B and C</p>	<p>I think it makes no sense for dwellings either side of the same road. It makes inequalities in payments and services and divides what should be communities in the local area</p>
<p>These families will look to Town Council provided services in Stowmarket such as John Peel Centre, Regal, Town market, and events. And these houses should contribute to the town council precept. It is unlikely they will use Onehouse Parish provided services, which are minimal. This will increase tax revenue fairly to pay for Town Council services. It will increase tax revenue to this lowest tier of local government meaning we can all have better funded services for our community.</p>	

<p>There are not enough amenities now for a ever growing community we need more health centres, schooling. All these new housing sites do not have enough infrastructure when planning is given</p>	<p>More infrastructure must be included in our growing community if you want our approval e.g. New High School built but with less class/work rooms than the old one</p>
<p>Union Road was always part of Stowmarket to me</p>	
<p>We agree that Union Road developments should become part of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>This development is logically part of Stowmarket. Residents will look to Stowmarket Town Council to provide their services</p>	
<p>As a new resident in a new housing development I have little prior knowledge regarding the reasons for this review. I do not live in an affected area. My thoughts are most of Areas "ABC" are new housing, and the residents are unlikely to have any affiliation or attachment to either area. There do not appear to be many council facilities in Onehouse and this would lead me to believe Area "ABC" residents would be more likely to use Stowmarket facilities. This would therefore lead to Integration as the Area "ABC" residents would have their council tax paying for the facilities they use, Local issues would be raised by relevant councillors, and local By-Elections would reflect the affiliations of those electors.</p>	<p>This seems to be a very long winded process to deal with a new parish boundary. Why has it taken from 2014 to get to a consultation? The Working Party seem to have reached a decision which is not logical - areas of development adjoining Stowmarket should surely be in Stowmarket. Onehouse is a small village parish and does not currently support or sustain the facilities required by the populous of Areas "ABC".</p>
<p>Stipulated area are clearly geographically closer to Stowmarket than to central Onehouse. Area A being considered Onehouse would be like me declaring Chilton Field Sports Ground as an area belonging to Scotland</p>	
<p>There are numerous houses on this development - if they become part of Stowmarket they will have a higher rate of council tax which can help to fund much needed development of Stowmarket Town</p>	
<p>I think the residents will naturally look to Stowmarket for services and amenities, so I think they should contribute to the Stowmarket Town Council precept</p>	
<p>Residents on the new estates on Onehouse Road see themselves in Stowmarket - not Onehouse. That is the town they see as their local community, not Onehouse, and they will expect to benefit it from the resources of the town. Unless the boundary is changed we will have the bizarre situation on the Hopkins Homes development of houses on one side of a street being in Onehouse and the other in Stowmarket, with the boundary in some cases running through an individual house - mad! When Mid Suffolk planners sought opinions on this development, they consulted Stowmarket town council, not Onehouse Parish Council so even they thought the land was in Stowmarket! Option B is undoubtedly the common sense way forward and what the local people want - ask the Stowmarket society for example.</p>	<p>Listen to the local people - the area is in Stowmarket and needs to be recognised as such.</p>

Looking at the map provided it seems logical, and fair to both parishes, to extend the boundary of Stowmarket Town Council's area to encompass the development of Mill Grove (B), the remaining thin strip of land to the south (C), and the cluster of properties adjacent to Chilton Fields (A) that already benefit from their proximity to the services in the neighbouring Chilton ward of Stowmarket. Whilst parish councils only have limited responsibilities, residents generally turn to their nearest form of local government for support or guidance. I would question Onehouse Parish Council's (OPC) ability to cope with the large influx of queries it may have to deal with as a result of full occupancy of the development. However, I see it more likely that residents will naturally, due to their location, turn to Stowmarket Town Council (STC) with their queries and therefore, while STC has capacity to process these queries they should also be remunerated for the additional workload this will generate, through the local precept. If further reasons were needed, the Guidance of Community Governance Reviews document makes numerous references to "anomalous boundaries" that arise through developments expanding and then straddling the existing boundary lines:

16. A community governance review offers an opportunity to put in place strong, clearly defined boundaries, tied to firm ground features, and remove the many anomalous parish boundaries that exist in England...

17. ...it is important that principal councils seek to address parish boundary anomalies when they arise...

26. ... A review may need to be carried out, for example, following a major change in the population of a community or as noted earlier in this chapter (see paragraph 15) to re-draw boundaries which have become anomalous, for example following new housing developments being built across existing boundaries.

[see also paragraph 15 and 84]

The Guidance document also highlights the following points which I feel are relevant for the argument for changing the boundary between Onehouse and Stowmarket:

33. When undertaking the review they must have regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identities and interests of the community in the area under review, and the need to secure that community governance in that area is effective and convenient.

I fail to see how the village of Onehouse can effectively provide governance if it doubles in size, and with the new residents living in a disparate part of the parish some distance away (up to a mile) from its traditional centre. Should Mill Grove seek to set up a local Residents' Association it would have to liaise with two separate parish councils, which could be seen to reduce its own effectiveness and convenience. See also paragraph 63.

74. The 2007 Act requires principal councils to have regard to the need to secure that community governance reflects the identity and interests of local communities; the impact on community cohesion is linked strongly to it.

Retaining the current parish boundary through the middle

Extracts from Onehouse Parish Council meeting minutes:
8/2/21: OPC – co-ordinating objections to the Union Rd development planning application, the need to maintain a strategic gap, and questioning the need for the development.

22/4/21: (4.) [Public comment] In the Stowmarket Area Action Plan Onehouse was classed as a secondary village and not eligible for large development. In the new Joint Local Plan Onehouse is classed as hinterland and has already absorbed over the percentage of housing required with the Hopkins development.

11/10/23: Objections to 20 dwellings (21/05063) on land south of Forest Rd - residents are very concerned at the potential final numbers and the impact on the village.

11/4/22: 22/01397 Outline Planning Permission (Access points to be considered, appearance, layout, landscaping and scale to be reserved) Town & Country Planning Severance of garden and erection of 1 detached dwelling. 2 Star House Cottages, Union Road – OBJECT erodes the strategic gap and green space between Onehouse and Stowmarket and is against the SAAP and MSDC own policies. The entrance to the site is already dangerous with its proximity to junction of Union Road and Starhouse Lane. Onehouse has already been saturated with additional housing against MSDC policy as a Hinterland.

13/6/22: MSDC decision on 21/05063 Application for Outline Planning Permission (some matters reserved, access, layout and scale to be considered) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 - Erection of 20 houses/bungalows (including 7 affordable) open space; sustainable urban drainage systems; and associated infrastructure. Land South of Forest Road – permission refused. The proposal is within open countryside, which provides an important gap between Onehouse and Stowmarket, the loss of which would result in a reduction of the gap between the settlements, where the development would not materially enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community and by reason of overdevelopment would result in further harm to the countryside and this important gap between settlements.

MSDC decision on DC/22/01363 Erection of 1 detached dwelling and garage, including construction of new vehicular access. Land at Lower Road – permission refused. The proposal is located in the countryside, where the development of a new dwelling would not materially enhance or maintain the viability of the rural community. Future occupants will, moreover, be likely to be reliant upon the private car to access services, facilities and employment. The District Council has an evidenced supply of land for housing in excess of 9 years and has taken steps to significantly boost the supply of homes in sustainable locations. On this basis the proposal would not promote sustainable development

27/9/22: 2. To discuss options and ideas for the area of land from the Taylor Wimpey development adjacent to the Pauper's Graves prior to arranging a public meeting.

<p>of Mill Grove, or indeed incorporating the entire Union Road development in the parish of Onehouse would create a two-centred parish and would certainly damage community cohesion – not only in Onehouse but also between neighbours in Mill Grove if the boundary stayed as it is.</p> <p>83. As far as boundaries between parishes are concerned, these should reflect the “no-man’s land” between communities represented by areas of low population or barriers such as rivers, roads or railways. They need to be, and be likely to remain, easily identifiable.</p> <p>Paragraph 16 also mentions “clearly defined boundaries, tied to firm ground features” and from looking at the map it is quite obvious that in the main area B the boundary is no longer easily identifiable or tied to firm ground features. See also paragraph 85 and 164.</p> <p>As well as the national guidance there are also many examples of objections to various building developments minuted by Onehouse Parish Council (OPC) including Mid-Suffolk District Council planning application decisions. These often contradict the MS CGR Working Group’s reasons for not changing the current boundary, in addition to the village objecting to the Union Road development itself. The comments and objections generally refer to the need for a strategic gap and green space however it was also noted by OPC that there was a need to maintain green space between Onehouse and Stowmarket as it “maintains our integrity of keeping our identity of a village”.</p> <p>A final relevant point was made in a MSDC planning decision (DC/22/01363) which drew attention to future residents needing to use private cars to access local services. Stowmarket Town Council’s request to include the Union Road development within their boundary argues that the majority of residents, if not all of them, will be using services within the town which can be accessed by public transport. While it seems unlikely that OPC could argue against this, any services they do have would likely need accessing by private cars as it was also minuted that Onehouse no longer has any public transport. Planning application DC/22/01363 was refused in part for not being sustainable development.</p>	<p>Currently the area is being farmed. Cllrs need to consider what is manageable, set up costs and ongoing management costs. It was agreed to call a public meeting towards the end of November where Cllrs will put forward ideas and receive ideas from residents. However, there are some things which cannot be considered such as sports facilities, children’s play area, allotments due to limited and no parking facilities. We will need emphasis that this needs to be a natural environment to maintain the green area between Stowmarket and Onehouse and maintains our integrity of keeping our identity of a village.</p>
--	---

3.3. Other Comments

Comments	Additional Comments
<p>Don't engage at all on other issues raised by residents, just give an outdated blanket response & not treat individual cases individually. Do what you like, just take our money & do what you like. I'm not interested at all!</p>	<p>Useless t***s!</p>
<p>Areas A & C remain in Onehouse, thus retaining established lines. Area B to be taken into Stowmarket.</p> <p>The residents of the new homes in the area will look to Stowmarket facilities. It therefore seems logical that Stowmarket should benefit from the additional council tac in order to be able to enhance those facilities.</p>	<p>I really do not see the relevance of the demographic data questions</p>

<p>Taking on trust from the comments in the Community Governance Review that Areas A and C identify with Onehouse, these areas should reside with Onehouse. However area B relates to mainly new builds whose links between Onehouse and Stowmarket are not clear. Should Area B reside within Stowmarket given that it is likely that these residents will use Stowmarket services rather than Onehouse services and gain the benefits from Stowmarket yet pay their taxes to Onehouse. If a referendum for Area B residents be deemed too expensive to organise to note on their preference, then I would think that Area B should transfer to Stowmarket Town Council</p>	
<p>Area A remain with Onehouse Parish Council, I agree Paupers Grave/ Wood is identified with Stow Lodge and Onehouse Parish Council</p> <p>This proposal involves an increase in the precept for either the Parish Council or the Town Council due to the increase in the number of houses. Area B and C does not identify with the Parish Council and uses the Town facilities. It makes financial sense and best use of the precept for the Town to have responsibility for these areas and the Parish Council Centres around Onehouse Village</p>	<p>I am not sure this is best use of public monies and am very interested to know the cost of this process (please include both council officials and elected councillors costs)</p>
<p>Surely the key constituent are the residents who will be affected. It should be their voice that matters and listened to, else it will be drowned out by wider views taken from "unaffected" residents</p>	
<p>Work together with Stowmarket as a whole community not 2 separate Parishes.</p> <p>As Onehouse get forgotten. The Parish Council considers multiple dog bins around Onehouse and residents mowing Council grasses verges and open area's (liability insurance?) and also mainly no street lighting at Onehouse - this is the 21st century, not Victorian times.</p>	
<p>I understand that part of Union Road with new housing development is very close to Stowmarket. So arguably could be taken into Stowmarket boundary. But no further than that should be included. It is important that hamlets like Onehouse and other villages close to the Town should retain their historical identities and boundaries!</p>	
<p>Not bothered either way</p>	
<p>I understand the need for maintain existing dwellings etc within Onehouse, especially given the historic importance. However the new developments should be within Stowmarket. The property developers are marketing them as 'new homes in Stowmarket'! I appreciate this would make boundary loves 'messy' but this seems to me to be the right option. Eventually Onehouse is likely to become a suburb of Stowmarket, despite current planning recommendations. Hope this helps!</p>	

While I think it is essential that areas A & B should become part of Stowmarket, I find myself rather ambivalent about area C. This is a relatively loosely developed area which has grown piecemeal over a very long time and identifies with Onehouse through length of association — in contrast to the newly developed housing estates to the north.

I do find the council's reason for denying this proposed change quite baffling. The large new residential areas to the west of Stowmarket were granted planning permission on the basis of them being continuous with the built-up area of Stowmarket and with their consequent ability to share the community resources and infrastructure of the town. And yet the council's view is to deny this and assert that the residents will identify with a neighbouring village which has no shop, school, or medical services, and little community social infrastructure. Retention of the existing parish boundaries will also have the unfortunate effect of randomly placing part of one of the new housing estate across the parish boundary with neighbours arbitrarily in either Onehouse or Stowmarket, or even having the boundary slicing through their property. The argument about effective and convenient local government is spurious. The review has no effect on county and district council boundaries so at that level it remains as effective and convenient as a present, but this is a boundary review about local government at parish level. One only has to consider the problem identified in the last paragraph above to see that parish level local government will not be effective or convenient for the new residents. Discussion of the Paupers Graves is an interesting red herring. The old workhouse was constructed for the Stow Poor Law Union, where the parishes of Buxhall, Combs, Creeting St. Peter, Great Finborough, Little Finborough, Harleston, Haughley, Old Newton, Onehouse, Shelland, Stowupland, Stowmarket, and Wetherden pooled their resources to provide indoor relief for the poor. The fact that it was built in Onehouse parish is largely irrelevant, the location was more likely considered attractive as being reasonably remote from existing dwellings, close to the biggest settlement, but not so close that it would be seen as distinctly Stowmarket facility. The burial ground was neglected for many years but is now maintained by a dedicated body of volunteers who are residents of both Onehouse and Stowmarket. The parish boundary review has no relevance to the graves and its relationship with the former workhouse would not be affected by it. The many residents of the now converted former workhouse however could benefit by the parish boundary recognizing the functional attachment of their homes to the town where they consider themselves resident.

3.4. Unsure Comments

Comments	Additional Comments
<p>No G.P, No Schools, No Shops in Stowmarket, No Dentist You will do what you want to do</p>	
<p>It doesn't bother me either way</p>	
<p>Clearly there is a hidden agenda! Possibly financial so do not fully understand the big picture!</p>	
<p>From the enclosed paperwork cannot see why Stowmarket Town Council would want to extend the boundaries!</p>	
<p>I cannot see exactly where the Stow Town boundary is as the map is not clear - there are no road names. Is this done deliberately to confuse people. It seems to me that the new developments in Union Road are more in Stowmarket than Onehouse, as they already neighbour existing estate.</p>	<p>The map is totally unclear - even when enlarged on a computer</p>
<p>I don't know enough about how it would affect residents. Would it mean more money for the Town Council - what do the residents of Onehouse want?</p>	<p>I think it affects the residents in the designated area most, so their wishes are more important. It may not affect us unless money is diverted to them.</p>
<p>As I don't understand the implications of whether the request is decline or not on the residents of Stowmarket</p>	
<p>It's logical to expand Stowmarket boundary as Stowmarket expands its housing, but Onehouse residents may not want to come under the Stowmarket area or change their address.</p>	
<p>The impact of the change has not been explained. As a Stowmarket resident I don't know how this will impact me, e.g. council tax, access to services, etc</p>	
<p>Doesn't really affect me</p>	
<p>Do not know the area well enough</p>	
<p>What impact does this have on tax bands, elections and roads? If it doesn't effect those incomes to households and road closure, I don't see why not. But not knowing the many pros and cons, I am unable to understand why.</p>	<p>Council tax, road tax - closures but not parking spaces or potholes being fixed. I have had to change 5 tyres this year since march 2023 due to pothole. I try to claim and to progress get deny! These are issue that need to be fixed. As I how avoid these roads and takes 40 mins to get to work. Also the new estate on Northfield View, Stowmarket - all neighbours have different council tax bands and mine have changed twice this year! I am now paying £170 a month for a two bed house! I am a teacher who cannot afford food! You need to look at pirority within the Council! Then I try to raise these issues through email or calling sitting on hold over 2 hours and have tried on different days over the past few weeks and still cant get through. Please improve your services!</p>
<p>Has a learning disability does not understand</p>	
<p>Not Sure</p>	
<p>We have recently moved to this area and feel we don't know enough about the reasons for the decisions</p>	
<p>As I have not been resident in Onehouse/Stowmarket for very long (1 Year), the inner workings of the respective Councils are not known to me which makes it impossible to understand the pro's + con's of Option 1 or 2</p>	

I do not know which option I prefer as I have only recently moved into this county, and do not know the town and surrounding area very well at all.	
Went with your recommendations (quite a big area & new population). New to area/ Sorry having read again.	
I haven't lived here long, so don't have an opinion on the topic	
I don't know because I have only lived in Stowmarket for 6 months and still don't understand and know everything about the community governance of Stowmarket	
Its how it has gone now, Build Build Build	Down the bottom of Union Road turn left need a footpath down to Finborough Road, and Finborough Road need humps on the road to slow speeding vehicles.
Which other option that would result in a pavement from Onehouse to Stowmarket, and would improve current bus service to and from Stowmarket from Onehouse	I am a resident of Onehouse that have resided here for nearly 45 years
Stop building on our beautiful fields. New doctors is badly needed	
Don't really have the complete info to make an educated decision. Why change something that has worked in the past6	
I am disabled and only know the High Street/Rec area. Lots of houses (new ones). No Parking (3 bed house ONE car? Cloud cocoo land at least 4 car places needed), No School Places, No jobs, No doctors places, No Dental places.	
The roads on the map are so faint it is unclear where the boundary is supposed to be	Show clearer map details so that we know what we are voting for
I feel it should be a decision for those that live in this locality. I do not know enough about the situation to give an honest answer	
I think that both options have sound reasons for being favoured. Personally, based on the information provided, I prefer Option 1. If Areas A and C are already in Onehouse and Area B is still being developed, why change things? However, I can't really give a considered opinion (including "community inclusiveness") because a) I don't know what Onehouse Parish Council think about this and b) Until every dwelling in Area B is occupied I don't know what they think either.	
We don't feel it is our decision to make as we are not in the affected area. However, the confusion that has been caused over the years by the land registry & council saying we live in Stowmarket whilst the Post Office insist we live in Stowupland leads us to think if there is change it should be sorted out with the Post Office.	
We don't feel it is our decision to make as we are not in the affected area. However, the confusion that has been caused over the years by the land registry & council saying we live in Stowmarket whilst the Post Office insist we live in Stowupland leads us to think if there is change it should be sorted out with the Post Office.	
It is unclear to me who will have responsibility of the Land on our Western border	
Do not have enough knowledge of why the proposals are being recommended by the community gov review group	
Without seeing more plans, it looks like a community/ estate could be split. Understanding this better would help make a decision	
No map enclosed, as stated. Not enough clear information to make an informed decision. Very poor communication.	

<p>We feel we don't know enough and we are of an age and don't feel we should say agree or not agree</p>	
<p>I am undecided as I don't have enough information to make an informed decision and I don't think it will be applicable as we are planning on moving out of the area</p>	
<p>Not sure why it matters if its part of Stowmarket or not</p>	
<p>I am not sure of any advantage in changing the boundary. I assume Stowmarket would gain extra money from rate but would also have extra costs because of the up keep of the area.</p>	
<p>Relatively new to Stowmarket, I don't know what a community organisation is</p>	
<p>I am not informed of current affairs</p>	<p>I don't really know what this is about & am fairly disinterested. Sorry.</p>
<p>I don't have enough information as to what the proposed changes would mean for me, if any.</p>	
<p>I cannot see that it will affect one way or the other. I have lived at this postcode over 60 years and always understood Union Road was in Onehouse.</p>	
<p>Either way wont effect us and the housing that's being built is very close and eventually I expect we will all become one area anyway</p>	
<p>Because I am unsure if it will affect me at all</p>	
<p>Because we do not understand what difference it makes to the current situation. Does it mean more councillors, therefore more Junkets expenses and jollies? Or will we get the abysmal traffic jams sorted and pot holes, doctors visits, etc sorted out?</p>	<p>All of the previously mentioned. Building so many more houses without infrastructure and amenities our roads can hardly cope, dentists doctors etc etc</p>
<p>Unsure the legality of the 'co-terminus' is relevant. How far are the responses received taken into careful consideration? Will this community review make any difference whatsoever to the identities & interest of the two communities? How cost effective is this review? Will it make a positive impact on life in both communities in the longer term?</p>	<p>In the realignment of continuity of the boundaries until the community tax rates ensure that ALL residents pay or are charged the SAME AMOUNTS for the leisure centre charges? Currently there's a discrimination between those who live in Stowmarket & those in Onehouse. The review may benefit those living in either Parish Councils if it takes into careful consideration the infrastructure available currently.</p>
<p>Many thanks for your recent correspondence concerning the possible boundaries changes between Onehouse and Stowmarket. Before making a decision, it would of course be useful to know it the changes are a financial benefit to my present location. If not, I suggest we stay as at present. I trust you can understand my reasoning.</p>	
<p>I am unable to complete question due to lack of Information provide the positive +neg affects this would have</p>	<p>Stowmarket is growing at an astronomic rate and destroying the whole area!</p>
<p>Because you've only given me one side of the argument. There's no explanation of Stowmarket Town Councils reasons for requesting the boundary change.</p>	<p>Only that is should provide both sides of the issue to allow residents to take an informed view! Otherwise, what's the point of consulting, at all?</p>
<p>How will this affect me</p>	
<p>Whilst in principle we have no objection to the proposal, as new residents would be reliant on Stowmarket more so than Onehouse, the land was originally in Onehouse control, and the urban sprawl of Stowmarket should be contained prior to surrounding villages, such as Onehouse being engulfed and subsequently lost.</p>	

3.5. Photo Responses

Area C view from Wash Lane junction towards
Stowmarket 2022

Google Maps 5 Wash Ln

England
Google Street View
Mar 2022 See more dates

Google

Image capture: Mar 2022 © 2023 Google

B7115
Moore Rd
B7
Brambler Ct
River Pot
Wash Ln


Added and updated
connections with infrastructure
that has features suited
only for Stowmarket connections
(including structures for blind people)

Onehouse side of boundary recommended to be kept in opt 1

Brambler Ct
Moore Rd
Phillis's Dock
HoneySuckle Way
Teasel Way
Onehouse Way

messy
messy boundary recommended to be kept in opt 1

Stowmarket side of messy boundary recommended to be kept in opt 1



4. Representations from Community Organisations and Other Respondents


- Stowmarket + District Lions Club
- Onehouse Parish Council
- Landlord
- OHS Women's Guild + Onehouse P.C.C
- Chilton Fields
- St John The Baptist Church
- CIC & Stowmarket Football Club
- Paupers Graves Maintenance Group
- Combs + Finborough Benefice
- Stowmarket Town Council
- Church Warden for Combs
- Oddfellows
- District Councillor St Peter's Ward
- Women's Institute
- County Councillor
- Parish Councillor
- Great Finborough resident & Stowmarket Property Owner

5. Equalities Monitoring

Age Group

The majority of responses received were from the **70-79** age bracket followed strongly by the **60-69** age bracket. These two age brackets make up **49.18%** of the total responses received. No consultations were received by **16-19** age bracket and **7.55%** of the respondents preferred not to disclose which age bracket they belonged.

Demographic Data: Age Brackets



20 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 59	60 - 69	70 - 79	80+	Prefer Not to Say
2.36%	5.78%	8.96%	16.04%	23.35%	25.83%	10.14%	7.55%

Disability

The majority of respondents do not have a disability with **70.40%**. **14.98%** of respondents did disclose having a disability, whilst **14.62%** preferred not to disclose whether they had a disability or not.

Community Governance Review for Onehouse and Stowmarket
Second Phase Consultation - Reported Disability

