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South Norfolk District

Personal Details:

Name: Michael Balmer
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am broadly in favour of a new Rockland Ward including Claxton, as I feel we are not served well under the current arrangements where we are at the end of the Ward rather than being a directly neighbouring parish to the main Ward. I also think we have more in common with Rockland than Chedgrave & Thurton.

Uploaded Documents:
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**South Norfolk District**

**Personal Details:**

Name: Peter Dewath  
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

**Feature Annotations**

**Map Features:**

Annotation 2: Logical Boundary  
Annotation 3: Abbey  
Annotation 7: Logical Boundary  
Annotation 8: South Wymondham

**Comment text:**

1) The proposed northern boundary of South Wymondham is illogical and will cause confusion - much better to expand Abbey Ward westwards to the eastern boundary of Wicklewood, and decrease the area of South Wymondham to follow B1172 and then cut across at Burfield Hall as shown in green on the plan. 2) The Boundary demarcation around Stanfield Hall is illogical - it should be in South Wymondham (centred to the nearest Market Town), NOT Stoke Holy Cross which is centred miles away.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Local Government Boundary Review Commission,

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

You have received three representations on this subject. The first was from East Carleton with Ketteringham parish council which agreed with your reviewer’s suggestion that the difficulties of satisfying arithmetical and practical considerations might be overcome by a joint “Mulbarton” ad “Stoke” ward with three councillors. My own council, Swardeston, is writing to you in the same terms.

The third has been from Stoke Holy Cross parish council which rejects it, although it does not seem to deal with the original proposal which was for a ward embracing Stoke Holy Cross, Swardeston and East
Carleton with Ketteringham, which would have only one councillor between them.

You earlier heard from me (chairman of Swardeston Parish Council) in a personal capacity when I had not yet had the opportunity to discuss the subject with my colleagues on Swardeston parish council.

Once again, I find myself embarrassed by time constraints. I shall not have the opportunity to discuss the response of our colleagues at Stoke Holy Cross before the close of consultation. So I make my own submission to you, which is that by rejecting the helpful suggestion made by your two reviewers, to create a three councillor ward embracing the newly proposed Mulbarton and Stoke Holy Cross wards, our colleagues at Stoke Holy Cross will make it even more difficult for a councillor to represent their interests in the way they say they prefer, unless the Commission decides to include them in award with Trowse and the others as before.

I therefore strongly recommend to the Commission that for the benefit of two of the three parishes in the proposed three parish ward, the three councillor ward be adopted.

Yours faithfully,

Ian Francis.

On 8 November 2016 at 16:43, Ashby, Jonathan <[redacted]> wrote:

Dear Mr Francis,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SOUTH NORFOLK: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has published draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for South Norfolk District Council. Today is the start of a nine-week public consultation on the Commission's draft recommendations on new ward boundaries across South Norfolk District Council.

The consultation closes on 9 January 2017.

View the draft recommendations
You can view the Commission's draft recommendations at [https://www.lgbce.org.uk](https://www.lgbce.org.uk) where you can find interactive maps, a report and guidance on how to have your say. The Commission has not finalised its conclusions and now invites representations on the draft recommendations.

An interactive map of the Commission's recommendations for South Norfolk District Council, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new wards is available on the consultation area at: [https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk). Further information about the review and the Commission’s work is also published on our website at: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).

**Have your say**

We encourage everyone who has a view on the draft recommendations to contact us whether you support them or whether you wish to propose alternative arrangements.

Before finalising the recommendations, the Commission will consider every representation received during consultation whether it is submitted by an individual, a local group or an organisation. We will weigh each submission against the criteria the Commission must follow when drawing up electoral arrangements:

- To deliver electoral equality where each district councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the district.

- That the pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities.

- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

It is important that you take account of the criteria if you are suggesting an alternative pattern of wards. You can find additional guidance and information about previous electoral reviews on our website to help you or your organisation make a submission.

**Get in touch**

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 9 January 2017. Representations should be made:

- Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at: [https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk).

- By email to: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk).

- Or in writing to: Review Officer (South Norfolk)

  Local Government Boundary Commission for England

  14th Floor

  Millbank Tower
The Commission aims to publish every response it receives during phases of consultation. If you do not want all or any part of your response or name to be made public, you must state this clearly in the response. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. All responses may be subject to publication or disclosure as required by law (in particular under the Freedom of Information Act 2000).

This is the last opportunity to influence the Commission’s recommendations before they are finalised. We therefore encourage local people to get in touch with us and have their say.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Paul Kingsley

Review Officer

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

0330 500 1525
In reply to your article in the parishioner. I shop in Bungay and access good local facilities there. We live on belsey bridge road but have had delays re police attending incidents as they don’t seem to know who deals with us as we are classed as south Norfolk but our address is classed as Bungay suffolk which led to unnecessary delays. Very frustrating! I think nr35 should be Suffolk as is Bungay. It’s all to do with the Waveney divide I think.
Many thanks
B J Frost-Townsend

Sent from my iPhone
Good morning,

My understanding is that Alpington and Yelverton will leave the Rockland Ward and become part of the Brooke Ward. This would mean we lose Vic Thomson as our hard working and supportive District Councillor.

I would not be happy to join the Brooke Ward as our parish and Parish Council endeavours would not be compatible. For example, the neighbouring Bergh Apton Parish Council (in the Brooke ward) have not supported Alpington and Yelverton Parish Council over major issues such the game farm, Solar Farm and Housing development. In fact they have supported the solar farm, game farm and housing issues contrary to our Parish Council’s and majority of parishioners’ stance..

I would prefer the status quo where we are confident of support which represents the views and concerns of Alpington and Yelverton.

Best wishes,

Kevin

Kevin Gotts, TechIOSH, LRPS
Proposed change to Parish Boundary

Since the creation of the combined "Tharston & Hapton" Parish boundaries some 50+ years ago, the Tharston Parish has developed by the building of the new residential areas of Tharston (I.E. the Taylor Wimpey - Sunguard developments), to the point where Hapton residents are now preventing the creation of a "Community" within Tharston. Our Village Hall (The old School) has been demolished by the T & H PC and we, the residents of Tharston has NO community centre. A Community Centre is important to developing a community within the Village, and the current Tharston & Hapton joint parish prevents any possibility of this occurring, i.e. those residents from Hapton do not see the need for Tharston to develop a "Community" There is a GREAT movement within the Tharston Village to utilise St.Marys Church as a new "Community Centre" and, with the support of St.Marys PCC, the Church could be re-ordered to provide a facility where the Community could/can meet and the Church can continue to provide the Baptism, marriage, burial facilities that is required. There are many residents of Tharston willing to do the re-working of the Church and contribute to that cost BUT we, Tharston, needs to be in control of the facility and not influenced/goverened by external forces. We lost our "Village Community Centre" 12 years ago when T & HPC purchased the old School Room - We, the residents, need it to be re-instated as a Village facility.

None Uploaded
Seems a very sensible solution to combine Ashby, Carleton St Peter and Claxton into the Rockland ward.
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South Norfolk District

Personal Details:

Name: Ian Shanks
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Alpington and Yelverton work well as it is, why change something that works well, if its not broken do not try to fix it. Our district councillor is local, who understands local issues, the new district councillor does not live in our parish. We are happy in the Rockland ward and joining the Brooke ward would be detrimental to the current set up.
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