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Good afternoon,

Please see attached the views of Alburgh Parish Council.

Jackie Ellis
Clerk to Alburgh Parish Council
Draft Recommendations for new electoral arrangements

Views of Alburgh Parish Council:

We do not agree with your recommendations for many reasons. Please see below:

Our proposed new ward is too large.
At present we share a ward with four other parishes which are important to us, most especially Wortwell. We do not agree with your new plans to separate Alburgh and Wortwell as we have very strong historic parish links. To separate these would be extremely detrimental to our local community.

Transport Links:
There are no good links across our proposed ward. There is a bus service to Wortwell, Harleston, Denton and Norwich. There is no bus service to Bungay other than the school bus. There are no links with the east of the ward.

Community Groups:
At present we hold joint meetings with 5 parish councils once a year. They are Alburgh, Wortwell, Denton, Topcroft and Earsham. People from our parish attend events in Wortwell and likewise with people coming to our events. Children from Wortwell come to Alburgh and Denton Primary School. We have an oil buying syndicate and share a parish magazine with Denton.

Facilities:
The proposed new ward does not reflect where people go for shops, etc. People go to Harleston for medical services, leisure, shopping because of the bus service. The benefice covers a much smaller area than that of your proposals and provides further community links between the existing parishes within the present ward.

Interests:
At present we work well together, protecting the Waveney valley, keeping the local bus service, the village hall. The current 5 parishes work well as a small group to maintain a vibrant village life. We feel that larger villages would not support us. Councillor Murray Gray keeps us well informed and supports us.

Identifiable boundaries:
Alburgh has strong links with Wortwell. We historically share allotments, a pocket park, both parishes use each other’s village halls, playing fields and marshes. Wortwell is a rural village and not a town and should not be put together with the town of Harleston.

We feel the proposed ward is too large. It works well at present with one Councillor, Murray Gray who is very successful in reflecting our needs, we do not see how 2 councillors would manage the proposed much enlarged electoral ward and we fear a loss of continuity and identity.
The residents of Alpington and Yelverton are strongly opposed to leaving the Rockland Ward and joining the Brooke Ward as a result of these proposed boundary changes. Both as a resident and as Chair of Alpington & Yelverton Parish Council I wish to record the position. The timing of the consultation on the proposed changes did not allow us to debate this openly at a Parish Council meeting, however I have proactively engaged Parishioners on the subject and found resistance to the proposals. It is unfortunate but a probability that most of these people are unlikely to go online to register their comments. The reasons quoted include: - We are happy to be part of Rockland Ward - The existing arrangements work well - The current District Councillor is excellent and lives in our Parish. - We don't want a DC from another Parish or Ward. - We don't want the SNDC Leader as our DC. I trust this explains the strength of feeling and will be taken to be a representative sample from Alpingtom and Yelverton Parish. Thanks

None Uploaded
With regard to the above draft recommendations, please find attached a letter endorsing our boundary changes.

Regards,

Catherine Alborough
Clerk to Bawburgh Parish Council
Dear Sirs

Electoral review of South Norfolk : Draft Recommendations : November 2016

In the above document, paragraphs 33 & 34 refer to a suggestion from Costessey Town Council that Lodge Farm and surrounding sites in Bawburgh should be included in Old Costessey Ward. Paragraph 34 also mentions that you have not heard directly from Bawburgh Parish Council on the matter.

Bawburgh Parish Council have consulted for several years on this proposal with Costessey Town Council, and it was thought that their recommendations were meant to be a joint response.

Therefore this letter serves to act as our formal proposal that alterations to the boundary around Lodge Farm area, and as outlined in the draft document, are fully endorsed by Bawburgh Parish Council, as are other amendments proposed such as Bawburgh Parish Council moving to within Hethersett Ward from Cringleford Ward.

With regards,

Catherine Alborough

Clerk to Bawburgh Parish Council
Electoral Review of Wards in South Norfolk

20th January 2017

Dear Sirs

We write with regards to the above in relation to the decision to restructure the current arrangements to place the Parish of Stoke Holy Cross into a new ward. It is the view of this Parish Council that if at all possible the Parish in question should remain as at present. Whilst we appreciate that in terms of the statistical analysis of the population in the area and for ease of governance the restructure of the wards is deemed necessary, we believe that there are material and powerful arguments which counter these points and which we hope will persuade you to reconsider the position.

Geographically speaking, the village of Stoke Holy Cross is in close proximity to Poringland, in particular with regards to Upper Stoke. This is reinforced by the infrastructure and transport links which serve the local area, and which bind Stoke into the Poringland/Framingham Earl area to the east rather than the proposed new ward to the west. The physical barrier of the Tas valley also demarcates the two areas quite clearly.

Over time this has led to the development of close ties between the villages and has built up a strong sense of community. There are many social and community links between the parishes in the area which we are concerned may be lost if the proposals come into effect. In particular, the Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council is closely involved in the Six Plus Strategic Group, consisting of the seven parishes of Bixley, Trowse with Newton, Framingham Earl, Framingham Pigot, Stoke Holy Cross and Poringland. Through this body the Parish Council have developed and invested in several local projects, such as the 6 Youth Council and Good Neighbours scheme amongst others, to the general benefit of the surrounding community.

This is only one example of the inter-related nature of the activities which operate in the area and form the networks which give it such a strong sense of place. It is this interconnectedness of the social, political and economic relations which would believe should be preserved and we would therefore urge you to reconsider your decision.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely

Mark Harris
Chairman
Dear Sir or Madam

Regarding the Electoral Review of South Norfolk proposed new ward boundaries

Denton Parish Council have unanimously agreed that they do not think it is a good idea for Denton to be part of the proposed new Ward of Ditchingham & Earsham.

The proposed new Ward covers a much larger area than our current one and although this would be covered by two councillors we feel this would not be beneficial to the residents of Denton.

We are happy with the current situation where we have one councillor for Denton, Alburgh, Earsham, Topcroft & Wortwell

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give our view

Yours sincerely

Zoe Whiting

Clerk - Denton Parish Council
Apologies, hopefully this version will be accessible.

Regards,
Deborah

Deborah Sarson (MILCM)
Town Clerk

The information contained in this email is intended only for the person or organization to which it is addressed. If you have received this email by mistake please notify the sender immediately before deleting it. Unauthorized disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality and may be legally privileged. The contents of this e-mail and any attachments may contain data that falls within the scope of the Data Protection Act 1988 and the recipient may be bound by it. Whilst anything containing a virus would never knowingly be transmitted, the council cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free and it is your responsibility to ensure your system is protected against viruses.
Review Officer (South Norfolk)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1 4QP

Dear Sirs

Re: South Norfolk Boundary Review

Diss Town Council very much appreciates the Boundary Commission’s responsiveness to local representations and wholly supports the Commission’s proposals to combine Diss and Roydon as a three member ward. This is much more representative of the local community than a Diss and Scole ward could ever be.

Roydon as a community seeks to retain its own identity in spite of its close proximity and affiliation to Diss, which Diss Town Council has always supported. It is therefore proposed/requested that the name Roydon is somehow incorporated in the ward title, perhaps as Roydon and Diss (as it is understood that the ward cannot have the same name as a County Council ward).

Sincerely,

Deborah Sarson
Town Clerk
Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached comments from East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council on the above consultation

Yours faithfully

Carole Jowett
Clerk to East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council

Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. If you have received it by mistake, please disregard and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Unless this e-mail relates to East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council business it will be regarded by the Council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the Council. They may also be disclosed to other people under legislation, particularly the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this email and attachments are free from virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.
6th January 2017

Review of ward boundaries within South Norfolk Council

East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council has reviewed the draft recommendations and has the following objections to the formation of a ward grouping it with Stoke Holy Cross and Swardeston Parish councils.

The proposal fails to meet two of the three criteria namely:

- Reflect the interests or identities of local communities.
- Provide for effective and convenient local government.

The reasons for this are that there is no synergy or connection with Stoke Holy Cross. The boundaries do not meet and there are no connections or shared facilities or services between the 2 parishes.

The schools that serve East Carleton are in Mulbarton, Hethersett and Wymondham and access the facilities in Wymondham. The doctors’ surgeries are in Mulbarton and Hethersett as are leisure activities and shops as there are none available in either village.

Furthermore the road infrastructure is entirely separate Ketteringham being accessed via the A11 and East Carleton via the B1113 both being different arterial routes into the city of Norwich and both separate from the A140 which serves Stoke Holy Cross.

There has been a suggestion by the reviewing officers that these two wards might be combined with a total representation of three councillors.

Whilst East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council understands the need to satisfy the arithmetical considerations for elected members a joint “Mulbarton and Stoke” ward could overcome this with three councillors rather than the 2 currently proposed.

East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council does not agree with the proposal to group it with Swardeston and Stoke Holy Cross and considers that the interests of its residents could not be met by one councilor representing 3 disparate parish councils. It is therefore strongly recommending to the Commission that the proposed “merged” ward with Mulbarton and Stoke with three councillors be adopted.

Yours faithfully,

Carole Jowett
Clerk to East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council
Dear Sir/Madam,

Concerns were raised at our most recent parish council meeting that plans to include Tasburgh in the same ward as Hempnall as part of the ward boundary review could result in Hempnall being included in the NPA, contrary to the parish council’s planning policy which is aimed at retaining our rural policy area status.

Please could you confirm whether ward reviews will affect our rural policy area status or not.

Regards

Ian Nelson
Clerk to Hempnall Parish Council

Now Available "Virtually" all the time at http://www.hempnallpc.org

We issue a newsletter quarterly which contains useful information for Hempnall parishioners. If you would like to receive a regular copy of the newsletter by email please click on this link

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

This communication is sent for and on behalf of Hempnall Parish Council, Karinya, Bungay Rd, Hempnall, Norwich, NR15 2NG

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This communication together with any attachments contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), please note that any distribution, copying, or use of this communication or the information in it, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error please notify us by e-mail and then delete the e-mail and any copies of it.
Hethersett Parish Council supports the recommendations contained in the review that affect this Parish.

Ian Weetman
Parish Clerk
Dear Sirs

Kirby Bedon Parish Council is very pleased that the commission concurs with its view that it has better links with Rockland than with Trowse.

Following the commission's visit and subsequent recommendation we look forward to remaining in the Rockland ward.

Yours faithfully

Helen Bosworth
Clerk to Kirby Bedon Parish Council
South Norfolk District

Personal Details:

Name: John Heaser
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Little Melton Parish Council

Comment text:

Proposed Hethersett Ward looks sensible to me

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th floor  
Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP

22 November 2016  
By email

Dear Sir,

**South Norfolk boundary review.**

Needham Parish Council wish to respond to the consultation on draft recommendations for South Norfolk.

It is proposed that the village of Needham, which is currently in the Dickleburgh & Scole District should be relocated into the Harleston District. As the Parish Council representing the residents of Needham we strongly disagree with this. While we very much enjoy the facilities that Harleston offer as our local market town we are two quite separate communities.

We are cut off from the town by the busy A143. This is exacerbated by a shrinking bus service that further separates us. We are even more remote from the other villages in the Harleston District of Redenhall and Wortwell.

However, we do have a great deal in common with the adjoining village of Brockdish. We enjoy strong links with Brockdish Parish Council where we cooperate over shared concerns such as heavy goods vehicles passing through the village and speeding. Almost our entire parish boundary in Norfolk is with Dickleburgh & Scole.

While Harleston is an expanding town we are a community of only some 140 or so dwellings. There is no logic in joining us to Harleston for the sole purpose of balancing numbers and we request that the boundary stay as it exists.

Yours faithfully

Andrew Major  
Chairman  
Needham Parish Council
South Norfolk District

Personal Details:

Name: Julie King
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Newton Flotman Parish Council

Comment text:

It is Newton Flotman Parish Council's view that Flordon should continue to be included within the Newton Flotman ward due to a natural affinity between the two parishes. It has been suggested that Howe could be moved to Poringland Ward to accommodate this, a move that may be more suitable for Howe.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
South Norfolk District

Personal Details:

Name: Catherine Moore
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Poringland Parish Council

Comment text:

Poringland Parish Council feels that the proposal to bring Trowse into the Poringland & Framinghams Ward does not reflect the locality. Poringland and The Framinghams has much more in common with Stoke Holy Cross and Caistor St Edmund, rather than Trowse which is more of a suburb of Norwich. The Council feels that this has been an exercise in making numbers fit rather than looking at the locality and rurality of the area. The Council would prefer to see smaller wards with one or two councillors, rather than larger wards with three councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Parish Council of Pulham St Mary have perused the proposed new electoral arrangements for South Norfolk Council and wish to comment on the proposals effecting the parish of Pulham St Mary.

The Council are pleased that consideration has been given in the proposal to reflect local communities and are happy that the amalgamation of the Pulhams and Starston with Dickleborough and Scole does provide for a fair geographical representation and most importantly keeps the Beckvale villages together. The Council would however request that consideration is given to the ward name and would like to suggest 'Beckvale, Dickleburgh and Scole' this is inline with the proposed amalgamation of three wards, allows several of the smaller villages to maintain their collective identity and also in the opinion of Council better reflects the demographic makeup of the ward.

Lisa Aston
Clerk to Pulham St Mary Parish Council
Kingsley, Paul

From: reviews
Sent: 28 November 2016 15:33
To: Kingsley, Paul
Subject: South Norfolk sub
Attachments: SNorfolk_LongReport-2016-10-25-FINAL.pdf; SW SNC Proposed Wards.JPG

Rebecca Smith
Review Assistant
LGBCE
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London SW1P 4QP
0330 500 1251

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

How are we doing? Click here to give us your views.

From: reviews
Sent: 28 November 2016 11:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Pulham Market LGBC Comments

Dear LGBC,

Please read the comments below that Pulham Market Parish Council would like to be considered as per the attached documents.

*Pulham Market Parish Council would like to thank everyone associated with the ‘due process’ that has taken place. We would like you to please reconsider the name of the ward that is being proposed due to the historical nature of the three original wards and would like to propose ‘Beckvale, Dickleburgh and Scole’ as a more suitable representation of the ward.*

Kind Regards

Clare

Clare Crane
Clerk to Pulham Market Parish Council
The information contained in this email is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. If you have received it by mistake, please disregard and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality and may be legally privileged. Emails sent from and received by Members and employees of Pulham Market Parish Council may be monitored. They may also be disclosed to other people under legislation, particularly the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless this email relates to Pulham Market Parish Council business it will be regarded by the Council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the Council. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise.
Dear LGBC,

Please see comments below from Starston Parish Council.

We are both relieved and delighted that the LGBC have listened to our reasoned arguments as to why Starston Parish should remain with other rural Parishes, rather than be incorporated into a ward with our local market town Harleston. Hence, we support the draft recommendation for the new ward, on the basis that Starston remains with Pulham St Mary and Pulham Market Parishes. This ensures that our rural community identity is maintained, supports effective local government and achieves electoral equality. Thank you for listening.

Clare Crane
Clerk to Starston Parish Council

The information contained in this email is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. If you have received it by mistake, please disregard and notify the sender immediately. Unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality and may be legally privileged. Emails sent from and received by Members and employees of Starston Parish Council may be monitored. They may also be disclosed to other people under legislation, particularly the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless this email relates to Starston Parish Council business it will be regarded by the Council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the Council. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise.
Electoral Review of Wards in South Norfolk

Review Officer
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Dear Sirs
Please find attached consultation comments from Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council

Regards
Barbara Cattermole ~ parish clerk
Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council
Mrs Barbara Cattermole – Clerk to the Council

Review Officer (S Norfolk)
Local Gov. Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP       20 December 2016

Electoral Review of Wards in South Norfolk

Dear Sirs,

I write on behalf of Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council in response to the consultation on the review of parish wards in South Norfolk. The current proposal to merge Stoke Holy Cross with Mulbarton to form a three member ward has caused concern in the parish for the following reasons.

Stoke Holy Cross has strong, historical links with Poringland, Framinghams, Caistor and Bixley; working together for many years as the 5 Strategic Group and then more lately, being joined by Trowse to form the 6+ Strategic Group. There is a 5+ magazine which is distributed to all parishioners in the villages and we are also involved in the 6 Youth Council with members of our community attending. With the formation of the proposed new ward, the impact on these relationships would be considerable.

Services, such as doctors and nearby supermarkets (Budgens and Tescos) are located in Poringland and Caistor St Edmund respectively. Although Stoke Holy Cross has an outreach Post Office, the nearest Post Office for parishioners, which is served by public transport, is Framingham Earl.

Public transport is provided by regular buses from Stoke Holy Cross to Norwich or Poringland or Hempnall but not to Swardeston or anywhere on the other side of the A140.

The catchment area for the primary school located in Stoke Holy Cross includes Caistor St Edmund and Shotesham but not Swainsthorpe, Swardeston, East Carleton, Mulbarton, or other villages on the east of the A140. Stoke Holy Cross is also in the catchment area for Framingham Earl High School so substantial numbers of parishioners have links to that area.

The Church of England parish church in Stoke Holy Cross is part of the Venta Group which includes Caistor St Edmund and Arminghall and is part of the Loddon Deanery, which includes Poringland and Framinghams. Dunston is the last village in the Loddon Deanery this side of the A140. There are no links to other villages on the other side of the A140.

Accessibility across the A140 is difficult to Swardeston and in fact no roads from Stoke Holy Cross are gritted in winter to provide safe access to the new parts of the proposed ward.

In short, we do not have any links with the villages on the other side of the A140 but have extensive links with Poringland, Framinghams, Caistor St Edmund and Arminghall. We work well together and do not see any benefits in changing boundaries; in fact, it will disrupt good working relationships across our group of parishes and would join us with villages that share no common ground with us, except possibly the problems associated with the A140.

It is our opinion that any reorganisation must take into account the undisputable fact that Stoke Holy Cross is both physically and socially part of the Tas Valley group of villages, that look to Poringland and Framingham Earl for local services. Stoke Holy Cross itself is a smaller centre with a more limited catchment but whose influence is almost exclusively, east of the A140. To link Stoke Holy Cross with the villages west of the A140, would be mixing communities with very different needs and aspirations from a planning point of view.
Therefore it is the strongly held view of Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council that any reorganisation of the existing ward boundaries must take the present service availability and catchment areas into account. It is our opinion that this must not result in an artificially generated boundary for administrative convenience, but should reflect the actual social, economic, and administrative structure of the area, which has developed over the years as a direct result of carefully, considered and adopted planning policies. To link Stoke Holy Cross politically to the villages to the west of the A140 would in our opinion completely ignore the existing situation and the future plans for the area.

Yours sincerely

Barbara Cattermole ~Parish clerk
Please find attached a response to the above consultation from Swardeston Parish Council

Yours faithfully

Carole Jowett
Clerk to Swardeston Parish Council

Disclaimer: The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. If you have received it by mistake, please disregard and notify the sender immediately.

Unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Unless this e-mail relates to East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council business it will be regarded by the Council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the Council. They may also be disclosed to other people under legislation, particularly the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this email and attachments are free from virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.
Review Officer (South Norfolk)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

6th January 2017

Review of ward boundaries within South Norfolk Council
Proposed new “Mulbarton” and “Stoke Holy Cross” wards
Suggestion by the reviewing officers that these two wards might be combined with a total “staff” of three councillors

Swardeston Parish Council has reviewed the draft recommendations and objects to the formation of a ward grouping it with Stoke Holy Cross and East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish councils.

The parish council considers that the pattern of the proposed ward does not meet two of the three criteria namely

1. Reflect the interests or identities of local communities.
2. Provide for effective and convenient local government.

The reasons for this are that there is no synergy between Stoke Holy Cross and Swardeston. The boundaries may meet but Stoke Holy Cross does not provide any services or facilities to any of the residents or businesses within Swardeston.

The schools that serve Swardeston are in Mulbarton, Hethersett or Wymondham. The doctors’ surgery is in Mulbarton as are leisure activities and shops that are not available within Swardeston itself.

Furthermore the road infrastructure is entirely separate both on different arterial routs into the city of Norwich.

There has been a suggestion by the reviewing officers that these two wards might be combined with a total representation of three councillors.

Whilst Swardeston Parish Council understands the difficulties of satisfying arithmetical considerations a joint “Mulbarton and Stoke” ward could overcome this with three councillors.
Swardeston Parish Council understands that the other 2 parish councils in the proposed new Stoke ward do not agree with the proposal to group them together with just one councillor to represent an area with entirely different infrastructure issues and no common issues.

The parish council therefore strongly recommends to the Commission that the proposed “merged” ward with Mulbarton with three councillors be adopted.

Yours faithfully,

Carole Jowett
Clerk to Swardeston Parish Council
15th December 2016

Dear Sir

South Norfolk District Council

Wymondham Town Council has taken the opportunity to discuss the proposed new electoral arrangements for South Norfolk District Council in terms of its effect on the Parish of Wymondham.

The proposed arrangements for South Norfolk District Council, in terms of a restructuring to create 3 new wards (Wymondham North, Wymondham Central & Wymondham South) each to be represented by 2 Councillors, are considered to be appropriate.

In respect of the proposals for the Town Council it is felt that the following will be confusing to residents;

Parish Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Number of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>2 Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwells</td>
<td>4 Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketts Park</td>
<td>1 Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusteas</td>
<td>5 Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3 Councillors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Town Council's preference is for the creation of 3 new wards (Wymondham North, Wymondham Central & Wymondham South) to be coterminous with the South Norfolk Council wards with each being represented by 5 Councillors.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Trevor Gurney
Town Clerk