14th June 2016

Reference New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

Dear Ms Starkie,

Piltdown Residents Association represents the 330 electors that live in and around Piltdown. We write to object to the Draft Recommendations for the re-drawing of District and County wards in Wealden and East Sussex, specifically Fletching and the new Uckfield West Ward.

You have received submissions from several of our members, including Katrina Best, Wayne Emerson, and Robert White. We felt it important to write to you as the Association to confirm that our members are fully supportive of the comments raised in these letters, and also in the submission made by our Parish and District Councillor Peter Roundell.

We have held several public meetings, raised a petition and canvassed the opinion of local residents, all of whom are in agreement that the draft LGBCE recommendations are not workable for our community and will disenfranchise residents.

We trust that the submissions made to you regarding this matter will allow you to re-examine the recommendations and to produce a warding plan that better reflects the three statutory requirements.

Yours Sincerely,

The Committee of Piltdown Residents Association

Enc
Petition – 6 pages
Letters from residents - 18
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS &amp; EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARROTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUDSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COWSILL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. BARNBROOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village. Any queries contact either:
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUSAN LAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONALD LAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIA SHELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GELAY SHELLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. BURROWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ross Borton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village. Any queries contact either...
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xavier Nicholls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lena Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnnie V. Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vivienne H. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael J. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Netland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Lowry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Manville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alwin Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Cope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emma Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael John Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauline Laxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brianne Mulholland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village. Any queries contact either
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village.

Any queries contact either [email address] or [phone number].
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Wooden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claire Bailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village.
We the undersigned object to the Boundary Commission Electoral Review proposed annexation of part of Piltdown because it does not meet their specified criteria and will disenfranchise many residents.

ADDRESS

All signatories must either be residents within Piltdown or have close interests in the village. Any queries contact either Director of the Piltdown Environmental Group.
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

13th June 2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shorbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
10th June 2016

The Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary Commission of England
14th floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

East Sussex and Wealden District Electoral Reviews

I have reviewed the proposed changes by the Boundary Commission to annexe Shortbridge and parts of Piltdown from Fletching and include within West Uckfield.

I have lived in Shortbridge for over 13 years and I have always played an active role in the Fletching community.

I was fortunate to have been a pupil at Fletching School as well as playing an active part in the Fletching Cricket Club and playing golf at Piltdown.

The current proposal will divide this community and my interest will no longer be aligned with those of West Uckfield and enjoyment in community life sadly threatened.

I therefore strongly object to the proposed change of boundary and recommend that the current status is maintained for the sake of the community and for all those that voluntarily contributed their time to the welfare of this area.

Yours faithfully

Molly Reynolds
10th June 2016

The Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary Commission of England
14th floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

**East Sussex and Wealden District Electoral Reviews**

I have reviewed the proposed changes by the Boundary Commission to annexe Shortbridge and parts of Piltdown from Fletching and include within West Uckfield.

We have lived in Shortbridge for over 13 years and we have always played an active role in the Fletching community.

At the Fletching Cricket Club, I have fulfilled in the roles of Chairman of the Junior Section and currently, Honorary Treasurer.

In addition, my wife continues to play a significant role with both Fletching Parish Church and the Friends of Fletching community charity for the Church.

We have always affiliated ourselves with Fletching, as our sense of community is aligned with those living in a similar rural location.

The current proposal will divide this community and our interest will no longer be aligned with those of West Uckfield and our voluntary participation in community life sadly threatened.

We therefore strongly object to the proposed change of boundary and recommend that the current status is maintained for the sake of the community and for all those that voluntarily contributed their time to the welfare of this area.

Yours faithfully

Fred Reynolds
10th June 2016

The Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary Commission of England
14th floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

East Sussex and Wealden District Electoral Reviews

I have reviewed the proposed changes by the Boundary Commission to annexe Shortbridge and parts of Piltdown from Fletching and include within West Uckfield.

I have lived in Shortbridge for over 13 years and I have always played an active role in the Fletching community.

I have served on the Committee of Fletching Pre-School for a number of years and I continue to play a significant role with both Fletching Parish Church and the Friends of Fletching community charity for the Church.

I have always affiliated myself with Fletching, as my sense of community is aligned with those living in a similar rural location.

The current proposal will divide this community and my interest will no longer be aligned with those of West Uckfield and our voluntary participation in community life sadly threatened.

I therefore strongly object to the proposed change of boundary and recommend that the current status is maintained for the sake of the community and for all those that voluntarily contributed their time to the welfare of this area.

Yours faithfully,

Cindy Reynolds
The Review Officer (Wealden),
LGBCE,
14th Floor, Millbank Tower,
London, SW1P 4QP.

Dear Madam,

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting the choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully,

Donald M. Lay
11th June, 2016.

The Review Officer (Wealden),
LGBCE,
14th Floor, Millbank Tower,
London, SW1P 4QP.

Dear Madam,

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting the choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully,

Susan M. Lay
The Review Officer (Wealden)  
LGBCE  
14th Floor,  
Millbank Tower,  
London  
SW1P 4QP

Date: 12-6-16

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

Gillian Gaunt
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date 12/6/16

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Pitdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Pitdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Pitdown.
- Pitdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Pitdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray wast of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Pitdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Pitdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully
Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Mr and Mrs Borton
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date 1.2.6.1.5

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date...12/12/12..................

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Sharpbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully
Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

A J Bentley
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date: 12-6-2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

• I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
• They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
• Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
• The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
• The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

A Glynn-Jones
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date.......................

Dear Madam,

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

S. Hands
Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date: 14.6.16

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

CL SAINSBURY
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date: 14th July 2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date........

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Pitdownton, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Pitdownt Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Pitdownton.
- Pitdownton has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Pitdownton community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Pitdownton, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Pitdownton electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours sincerely,

T.A. Phillips.