

## Kingsley, Paul

---

**From:** Julia Tovee [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 20 December 2016 08:21  
**To:** reviews  
**Subject:** South Norfolk Council's response to the Draft Recommendations  
**Attachments:** SNDC Response to the LGBC draft warding v2.docx

Good Morning,

Please find attached South Norfolk Council's response to the LGBC's draft recommendations.

Kind Regards  
Julia

Julia Tovee-Galey  
Electoral Services Manager

[REDACTED] [www.south-norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk)



South Norfolk Council, working with you, working for you.

---



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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.

E-Mails sent from and received by Members and employees of South Norfolk District Council, CNC Building Control or CNC Consultancy Services may be monitored.

Unless this e-mail relates to South Norfolk District Council business or CNC 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.

This e-mail has been checked for the presence of computer viruses although we cannot guarantee it to be virus free. We do not accept any responsibility for the consequences of inadvertently passing on any virus. E-Mail communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free, anyone who communicates with us by e-mail is taken to accept the risks in doing so.

---

## **The response of South Norfolk Council to the draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Norfolk Council published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England**

South Norfolk Council has authorised its Electoral Arrangements Review Committee to consider and respond on behalf of the authority to the draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Norfolk Council.

The Committee has agreed with almost all of the draft recommendations for the proposed new District Wards and their names. The only exceptions are the following four proposed Wards. The reasons for disagreeing and suggested amendments to the draft proposals are appended as relevant:

1. **Loddon and Chedgrave Ward** – The Committee believes that Carleton St Peter Parish should be moved from the Rockland Ward into the Loddon and Chedgrave Ward. This would improve the level of electoral variance within both wards. Loddon and Chedgrave Ward would improve from a -6% variance to a -5% variance, and Rockland Ward would improve from a 9% variance to an 8%.
2. **Stoke Holy Cross Ward** – The Committee considered the recommendation of the Commission that Stoke Holy Cross should be merged with Mulbarton to make one three-member ward. However, despite this, the Committee believes that, on balance, Stoke Holy Cross should remain as a one member ward, as originally proposed in the Council's submission. This would better reflect the differing individual characters of the two areas and ensure better Councillor involvement and accountability.
3. **Poringland, Framingham and Trowse Ward** – The Committee considers that the proposed ward name is 'wordy' and that a better alternative is the Poringland and Trowse Ward. This would also follow the pattern of other proposed ward names created by using the name of either one or two of the largest electoral parishes within that ward.
4. **Ditchingham and Earsham Ward** – The Committee considers the geographical size of the ward excessive as it would consist of twelve parishes. The Committee still believes that Geldeston should remain in the Loddon

and Chedgrave Ward as proposed in the previous submission of the Council. The electoral equality of parishes within the wards would remain the same overall as Ditchingham and Earsham ward electoral equality would decrease from 2% to -4% but Loddon and Chedgrave ward would improve from -6% to 0%. (Note: if Carlton St Peter is also moved into the Loddon and Chedgrave ward as discussed above, the ward would only have a variance of 1%).

## **Parish Electoral Arrangements**

On behalf of the Council, the Committee would like to make the following comments and suggested amendments:

- **Paragraph 68 Bawburgh Parish Council** – The Committee supports the draft recommendation.
- **Paragraph 69 Costessey Town Council** – The Committee supports the majority of these draft recommendations. The only amendment that it would wish to see is that the name of Queens Hill Ward in the draft recommendations should be amended to Queen's Hills Ward.
- **Paragraph 70 Wymondham Town Council** – The Committee rejects the proposed warding contained in the draft recommendations. It recommends that the parish wards are amended into three wards aligned with the new proposed district wards, each with five members. This would be less confusing to the electorate and lead to a more manageable electoral administration.

South Norfolk Council will be undertaking a parish boundary review in 2017. The Committee believes that this may lead to proposals for boundary changes that may impact upon those recommended by the Commission and within five years of the conclusion of the present review. The Committee requests that the Commission considers any future boundary changes proposed by this subsequent review if necessary.