

## Starkie, Emily

---

**From:** Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews  
**Sent:** 13 June 2016 10:41  
**To:** Starkie, Emily  
**Subject:** FW: East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council Boundary Reviews

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

-----Original Message-----

From: Councillor Roy Galley [REDACTED]  
Sent: 13 June 2016 10:38  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council Boundary Reviews

Dear Review Team,

As the County Councillor for the Buxted and Maresfield CED and District Councillor for the Wealden Ward of Nutley, Fletching and Danehill, I am writing to express support for the Wealden Council proposal that the Shortbridge area ,parish ward Wk, should be included in the new Buxted and Maresfield CED and the Danehill and Fletching Ward for Wealden District Council.

Shortbridge is part of the wider community of Piltdown which historically has a significant community identity ,for example as the location for the Piltdown Man controversy in, I think , the 1930s.It has also been linked to the ancient parish of Fletching since Medieval times. Whilst Parish boundaries are not part of this review ,the strong community cohesion of Piltdown, including Shortbridge, and Fletching, is an important local factor in determining electoral boundaries.

This proposal to keep Shortbridge in the Buxted and Maresfield CED and the Danehill and Fletching Wards would transfer approximately 100 electors.This would have a positive effect in both cases of moving numbers towards the preferred norm.For the CED , numbers in your current proposals are -1percent for the Division and - 6percent for the Ward.

The Commission was originally concerned that the Wealden Council proposal would create an unviable parish ward with some 10 voters in the Copwood area being in the Fletching Parish but part of the Uckfield North and Isfield CED. This could readily be resolved via a community governance review with the aim of transferring Copwood residents into the Isfield Parish with their near neighbours.

What is of paramount importance , in order to avoid confusion, is that CED and Ward boundaries are coterminous. The Wealden Council proposal is eminently sensible and the County boundaries clearly need to align with District boundaries.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Roy Galley

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

This message is intended for the use of the addressee only and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you have received it in error please notify the sender and destroy it. You may not use it or copy it to anyone else.

E-mail is not a secure communications medium. Please be aware of this when replying. All communications sent to or from the County Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Although East Sussex County Council has taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free, we can take no responsibility if a virus is actually present and you are advised to ensure that the appropriate checks are made.

You can visit our website at <http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk>