

## Kingsley, Paul

---

**From:** Fuller, Heather  
**Sent:** 17 February 2015 10:23  
**To:** Kingsley, Paul  
**Subject:** FW: Consultation: Rochford District proposed ward boundaries

**Categories:** Rochford, Submission

---

**From:** Richard Shorter [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 16 February 2015 18:42  
**To:** Reviews@  
**Subject:** Consultation: Rochford District proposed ward boundaries

Sir,

Your proposals for District Council ward boundaries in Rayleigh looks sensible at first sight (until we start thinking about the Town Council ward boundaries), but it is difficult to see the logic behind your proposal to reduce by one the number of district councillors who represent Rayleigh when Rayleigh is likely to be expanding faster than the rest of the district. Separate proposals for 500 and 50 new homes on the land north of the London Road in Rayleigh are likely to go ahead, while proposed developments in Wakering and Stambridge are running into difficulties. Therefore, your objective of evening out the number of electors per representative is unlikely to be met in the medium term with this proposal.

Furthermore, we have already been turned over once on car parking charges when the councillors from the east of the district, where they do not generate any revenue from car parks, pushed through a proposal to increase car parking charges and stop free parking on Saturday afternoons, which would mainly affect Rayleigh. This was at a time the neighbouring town of Hadleigh, in Castle Point district, was introducing free parking on Saturday afternoons. This was finally rescinded after a huge public outcry.

However, when we come to the Rayleigh Town Council ward boundaries, your proposals are completely ridiculous. A Boundary Commission spokesman stated at a public meeting in Rayleigh last year that this exercise would not make any alterations to the Town Council ward boundaries at this time. So, why have you suddenly changed your minds?

If there is a funny rule that district ward boundaries can cross parish boundaries but town/parish ward boundaries cannot cross parish boundaries then either:

- a) The rule needs to be changed, or
- b) You need to find a way round it, or
- c) You should have taken this into account BEFORE setting the district ward boundaries.

What you have ended up with for the Town Council ward boundaries is a complete nonsense for these reasons:

1. In order to minimise the cost of running town/parish and district elections, it is desirable to have the same boundaries for town/parish and district wards. Then, each resident is in the same ward for each election and they only need go to one polling station. Just think how confused electors will become when they are required to vote in two elections on the same day but are in different wards for the two elections.
2. Your proposal to increase the number of wards from eight to ten means that there would be three very tiny wards, each with only one councillor. Who is supposed to represent those wards if that sole councillor is ill or absent?

I am not impressed by this poorly thought out proposal from the Boundary Commission.

Yours,

R J Shorter B.Sc. C.Eng. M.I.Mech.E A.C.M.A C.G.M.A