

Feedback from Consultation (email, phone, letter)

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
Online feedback form	Resident	All options	All	How can the wards be changed, when the electorate does not receive polling cards for Town council elections. (Brandon) Only those who have postal votes, tend to vote, the town residents will not generally vote without a polling card. And if this was to change, then it would not be fair to those who have stood in by-elections.
Email	Borough/ District Cllr		All	<i>Response superseded by a later submission from the councillor</i>
Online feedback form	County Cllr	All	All	I would not be in favour of changing naming conventions away from geographical names.
Online feedback form	Resident		All	Nobody really cares as long as the bins are emptied. The proposals are just fine. Keep the names simple and real. Dont invent a new midlenbanbury name. Dont change the stationery or signage or logos. No point in re branding the Titanic.
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	All	All	<i>Response superseded by a later submission from the councillor</i>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Brandon	Brandon	Option C is preferred, with three separate wards for the town. The names suggested are fine.
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Bury St Edmunds	Bury St Edmunds	Southgate - the current boundary with Westgate is Horsecroft Road, turning into the narrow section of Hardwick Lane and then across the road at its junction with Vinery Road into Barons Road. That line then turns into Rembrandt Way. Instead, continue along Barons Road until just past Boon Close where you will see a newly adopted bridleway linking to Cullum Road. This adds around 100 electors to Southgate: Sharp Road, parts of Hardwick Lane and Barons Road, and takes the total to over 3,800 from 3,710. Moreton Hall - Opposite the junction of Symonds Road and the second exit from Raedwald Drive please turn line left across Ten Acre Field or the Clump – it doesn't much matter which as there are no properties or electors here – until it reaches Mount Road. It should then turn east. The effect is to transfer Downing Close and Lawson Place to Moreton Hall Ward. This again is around 100 electors. Please change 'Moreton Hall South East' to 'Moreton Hall': 'Eastgate + Moreton Hall North West' to 'St Nicholas': 'Mayfield' to 'Hardwick Heath' and 'Glastonbury' to 'Linnet'.
Email	Resident	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	I wish to express my opinion that the new housing to the east of Moreton Hall, together with the new Sybil Andrews Academy, should be included in the Moreton Hall Ward. Apart from the old Rougham Airfield, now used only for small non-commercial aircraft, this area is closest to the Moreton Hall housing and commercial development, and therefore I feel it should be included in Moreton Hall. The village of Rougham is far removed from Moreton Hall, and we are separated by the very busy A14.
Online feedback form	Resident	Bury St Edmunds	Bury St Edmunds	Option E - I believe that Option E best reflects the needs of the residents of Bury St Edmunds. In particular with the inclusion of the new Moreton Hall development within Bury St Edmunds rather than Rougham.
Online feedback form	Resident	Abbeygate	Bury St Edmunds	I think the proposed names of the wards are right. I think all wards should have approximately the same number of people. Some of the plans show large areas of rural land which does have the potential for development. I would have thought they would have been governed differently from town area.
Letter	Community group	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	Strongly object to proposal to split Moreton Hall ward into two. Firmly of the opinion that new houses currently in Rougham ward and those yet to be built should be part of Moreton Hall. Reasons are:- - Rougham village centre is 3 miles away on other side of A14 via contry foad with virtually no footparth or cycle way. the new houses will use MH facilities at Lawson Place. The area to the east of Lady Miriam Way is not open countryside but is Business Park designed to provide employment from Lady Miriam Way to Sow Lane and Jn 45. - MH has own compact transport links via footpaths, cycle ways and cars. Rougham has none of these and is a spread-out village very rural in character where as new houses will be eastern boundary of BSE urban area. - MH has established community centre and active residents association. Whole community successfully fought against planning application by McDonald's. The whole of MH is affected by permanent traffic chaos at Jn 44 of A14 and to split any section off is not in our view sensible or indeed

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>desirable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If split into two then the cohesion will be lost especially over traffic and planning issues and problems and issues in Eastgate ward, part of which is effectively fringe town centre, may not be the same as MH - MH was established to enable the urban centre of BSE to grow and is a cohesive unit and has its own facilities. It is separated from the town by the A14 and is a self contained cohesive unit within the built up area of the town - Identifiable boundaries are Orttewell Road to the west going down Mount Road with Eastgate ward to the north and MH ward to the south the north then along the A14 then along the eastern boundary at Sow Lane and the northern boundary along the railway line. The RA preference is for MH ward boundary to be Sow Lane to the east, Orttewell Rd to the west, going down Mount Rd on the Jn 44 side and then the railway line to the north and A14 to the south - plan provided showing proposal.
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Bury St Edmunds	Bury St Edmunds	<p>Option F requires two changes to make it better than the original submission. The first of these is that the ward boundary between Westgate (Glastonbury) and Southgate (Mayfield) wards moves westwards to its original boundary along the middle of Horsecroft Road from Stonebridge Belt before turning right along the middle of Hardwick Lane until its junction with Vinery Road. The boundary line then crosses over to the middle of Barons Road as now. Rather than dive down the middle of Rembrandt Way, the line continues eastward along Barons Road past Boon Close before turning left along the bridleway by the bus stop which links Barons Road to Cullum Road. My estimate is that around 194 electors will be affected – Runnymede Green (44) Canterbury Green (50) - plus c50 each in Barons Road and Hardwick Lane from the original Option F Table. The overall impact would be to take Southgate Ward back up to 3904 from 3710, a % shortfall of 0.29 on the 2055 electoral average. Westgate Ward's electorate would fall from 4345 to 4151 – a difference of 2% above average.</p> <p>The other change would be to the Moreton Hall (South East) and the Eastgate (+ Moreton Hall North West) wards. The main purpose here is to bring the Moreton Hall Preparatory School into the Moreton Hall Ward. The electors affected would number c99 – Downing Close (83) Lawson Place (3) and Mount Road (c13) – taking Moreton Hall Ward up to 3998 from 3899 – a variance of 2.73%. Eastgate Ward figures would decrease from 4080 to 3981 – a variance of 3.16%.</p> <p>All the above changes would also apply to Option F1. However, this option assumes that Rougham North Ward electors decide in 2021 to become an outpost of Bury St Edmunds rather than remain attached to Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish. The failsafe position must always be the status quo not the change option, which is why Option F1 cannot be implemented until 2023, if at all. This also means the Option E should be renumbered Option E1 and E1 renumbered E.</p>
Email (& letter)	Resident	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	<p>As a resident of the current MH ward for BSE I wish to respond to your consultation on proposed ward boundary changes as follows: I suggest a modification of Option E and enclose a copy of my proposal (not rec'd)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - The MH ward should remain a single entity and not split into 2 wards 2 - I have marked in red the natural constraints that form the practical boundaries for MY i.e. railway line to the north, A14 to the south and west, Sow Lane to the east. 3 - Eastgate (area in blue to west of A14) should be incorporated into Abbeygate ward with additional cllr if needed 4 - The area to the north of the railway line as far as Compeigne Way (again in blue) could be incorporated into Gt Barton or could remain in MH 5 - Roughtam would be as currently shown in green on Option E and would be primarily rural ward to South of A14 <p>The MH ward should maintain its community identity as a single ward. I see nothing to gain by splitting the ward just to make numbers add up. I can only see confusion. The MH ward should continue, as now, as a predominantly urban area served by 3 cllrs.</p>
Online feedback form	Community group	Bury St Edmunds	Bury St Edmunds	<p>The Mildenhall Road Estate Residents' Association considers that the best options for our area will be either F or F1. We are concerned about losing the identity of the "Northgate" ward as this has been our ward name for many years. Perhaps "Tower and Northgate" could be used?</p>
Online feedback form	Borough/ District Cllr	Bury St Edmunds	Bury St Edmunds	<p>Whilst i still believe that single member wards provide equal representation it is clear to me that this option is not currently available. I think F and F1 are the best options and use most natural boundaries across all wards. Concentrating on the new area I will call Tollgate i believe option F (or F1) is the most sensible and fulfils the need to reflect interests and identities. Tollgate junction/Station Hill Junction/Anglian Lane are all connected sufficiently to be a cohesive community.</p> <p>If one included Springfield Road etc (essentially King Edward school area) their issues are more closely connected with the Town Centre, hence it is why I reject any option which includes them in any new ward incorporating the current Northgate ward.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
Letter	Community group	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	<p>MH Residents Association strongly object to any proposal that MH ward into two. We are also firmly of the opinion that the new houses currently in Rougham ward and those yet to be built should be part of Moreton Hall.</p> <p>In any boundary review we understand that regard has to be had to the following considerations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transport links - shared interests - community group - facilities - identifiable boundaries <p>To take the issue of the new homes first. Rougham village centre is 3 miles away the other side of the A14 via a country road with virtually no footpath or cycle way. These new houses will use the MH facilities at Lawson Place. The area to the east of Lady Miriam Way is not open countryside as may have been suggested but is a business part designed to provide employment from Lady Miriam Way through to Sow Lane and Junction 45.</p> <p>Transport links Moreton hall has its own compact transport links via footpaths, cycle ways and cars. Rougham has none of these things and is a spread-out villave very rural in character where as the new houses will be the eastern boundary of the Bury St Edmunds Urban area.</p> <p>Shared interests Moreton Hall has an established community centre and an active residents association. The wholecommunity successfully fought against the planning application by McDonald's. The whole of MH is also affected by the permanent traffic chaos at junction 44 of the A14 and to split any section off is not in our view sensible or indeed desirable.</p> <p>Community group If split into two then the cohesion will be lost especially over traffic and planning issues and problems and issues in Eastgate ward, part of which is effectively fringe town centre, may not be the same as MH.</p> <p>Facilities MH was established to enable the urban centre of BSE to grow and is a cohesive unit and has its own facilities. It is separted from the Town by the A14 and is a self contained cohesive.</p> <p>Identifiable boundaries Orttewell Road to the west going down Mount Road with eastgate ward to the north and MH ward to the south the north then along the A14 then along the eastern boundary at Sow Lane and the Northern Boundary along the Railway Line.</p> <p>The Residents Association preference is for the MH ward boundary to be Sow Lane to the East. Orttewell Road to the west, going down Mount Road on the Junction 44 side and then the railway line to the north and the A14 to the south and attach a plan showing our proposal which is based on version E amended.</p> <p>We would welcome the oppportunity of addressing the Boundary Commissioners and showing them around the MH area.</p> <p>A copy of this letter and plan has been sent to Councillors of all parties who either represent Moreton Hall or live on Moreton Hall and represent other wards.</p>
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	<p>I have been a St Edmundsbury Borough Councillor serving the Moreton Hall ward (originally part of Eastgate ward) since 1995 (23 years). I have also served as the Suffolk County Councillor for the Eastgate and Moreton Hall Division from 2001 - 2005 and from 2009 to date (13 years).</p> <p>Having lived on Moreton Hall since 1978, almost from its beginning, I have seen the continuous housing and commercial expansion. I originally stood for</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>election to ensure that Moreton Hall evolved for the benefit of its residents and to ensure the impact on our neighbours in Eastgate was acceptable.</p> <p>Although the first build dwellings of the Moreton Hall estate were initially in the Eastgate Ward, the rapid level of housing expansion soon justified the creation of a separate ward. This was a straightforward process as Moreton Hall, then as now, had clearly defined boundaries with the railway to the north, the A14 trunk road to the west and south and Rougham airfield and Rougham parish to the east. There was, and remains, one important difference between the wards; one is long established with its name reflecting one of the historic entrances and its proximity to the town and the other, a very large new housing estate alongside a large and expanding Suffolk Park.</p> <p>I was the councillor involved in the creation of the Eastgate Community Association and latterly I initiated the setting up of the Moreton Hall Residents' Association. Both are prospering, both have excellent knowledge of issues affecting their local communities and both have achieved high levels of representation for local people by local people.</p> <p>The priority for any review should be to benefit communities and to protect their identities. It should not centre on the numbers represented by each member because that principle loses credibility in two or three-member wards, particularly if there is different political representation. What is to prevent every constituent contacting just one member in a multi-member ward? Clearly, nothing, so the equal representation falls at the first hurdle.</p> <p>I understand that this conforms with guidance, but we should not interpret guidance as mandatory. Over many years, the DCLG "guidance" on housing densities and parking standards was obeyed without challenge. That guidance has now been relaxed but it is far too late to prevent the consequences of crammed in housing with inadequate parking.</p> <p>Councils are supposed to represent communities; not divide them. The covering email from Leah states that, "... the options for the council wards reflect, as far as possible, the interests and identities of communities." I agree that they should but the proposals for the Eastgate and Moreton Hall wards do not because Eastgate is urban, Moreton Hall is suburban and Rougham is rural. That alone is reason not to mix them. The interest and identity of communities must not be compromised for council expediency.</p> <p>Reference is also made to "acceptable electoral equality." While juggling figures may satisfy the quest for equal numbers, the cabinet system of local government ensures power remains vested in just a handful of members.</p> <p>The issue of house occupancy is another factor that is variable and can quickly create imbalance. For example, I live in, and am surrounded by, three and four-bedroom houses with just one of them occupied by more than two people. Circumstances can change that will alter the balance.</p> <p>I question why, when local government has so many challenges, energy is expended trying to create a black and white solution in a grey world.</p> <p>I see no justification in changing the boundaries of the Eastgate or Moreton Hall wards but would accept the inclusion of the 500 houses at Lark Rise into Moreton Hall</p>
Online feedback form	Borough/ District Cllr	Southgate	Bury St Edmunds	Preferred options are E and E1
Email	Resident	Moreton Hall	Bury St Edmunds	<p>My personal view is for a variation on option F1 for Moreton Hall which will include the new Taylor Wimpey Houses.</p> <p>The Appledown Drive area should be included as it is located to the east of Orttewell Road which should from the natural boundary, but the western boundary should be the road leading north south which leads from the A14 via Sow Lane up to the railway line which I have marked on the attached map.</p> <p>The area to the west is rural in character and would better fit in my opinion with either staying with Rushbrooke and Rougham or being part of Thurston or Great Barton.</p> <p>As far as Moreton Hall is concerned it is important for cohesion of the neighbourhood that the new Taylor Wimpey Houses are incorporated in Moreton Hall Ward . They will use the Moreton Hall Facilities and there is no natural link with Rushbrooke and Rougham with Rougham Village centre some 3 miles away to the south of the A14.They will also use the Sybil Andrews Academy which was specifically built to accommodate the growing Moreton Hall population.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
Online feedback form	Resident	Option G	Haverhill	The takes into account the influx of new houses. Names should be kept as Haverhill East, South and include Central. Not Haverhill East being called Wilsey as this may offend people living in Roman Way.
Online feedback form	Resident	Option G	Haverhill	I feel the proposal of option G provides the best split of the area. Personally I would revert to naming the areas by compass location so that everyone in an area can feel a part of it and not excluded
Online feedback form	Borough/ District Cllr	All Haverhill wards Option H is by far the best option	Haverhill	<p>This is a very exciting opportunity to correct the mistakes of the past and have the right number of wards in Haverhill that reflect our local communities. The current 4 wards is not fit for purpose in a town of this size and I fully welcome the proposal to increase the number to 6 wards.</p> <p>Option H is my preferred option because it recognises the importance of the Town Centre and has a ward of its own. It is also essential that the names of the wards reflect our communities and are easily identifiable. Currently residents struggle to understand which wards they are located in by the names. Below are some ward name suggestions.</p> <p>Haverhill Central-- Peas Market or Chantry Mill Haverhill East-- Chalkstone Hill Haverhill South East-- Wilsey or Wilsey & Roman Way Haverhill South-- Clements & Parkway or Puddle Brook & St Botolph's or Clements & Castle Haverhill West-- Chimswell & Hanchett or Chimswell & Haycocks or just Chimswell Haverhill North-- Arrendene</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Option G	Haverhill	I feel that option G is the best option for the residents of Haverhill.
Online feedback form	Resident	Option G	Haverhill	<p>Option G is the best option.</p> <p>It maintains the traditional "estates" groupings, which most people identify with.</p> <p>The names should remain geographical, because although people may identify with an area some names have negative connotations.</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Option G	Haverhill	<p>Option G is much more sensible and cohesive. It keeps our current communities together, with the new Haverhill Central ward forming naturally.</p> <p>Option H seems to only make sense on the basis that it puts the high street in Central.. but it splits the other wards ineffectively and would create much more imbalance and disruption.</p> <p>I am not sure why there are these two stark options under consideration when option G is clearly more logical and less harmful, from every perspective that I can think of as far as ward boundaries go.</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Option H	Haverhill	I support option H in the southern part of Haverhill. I feel that where I live on the Clements Estate we have close ties to the area around Queensway on the other side of Burton End. Both estates are similar in character, and there are stronger ties between these areas and between the Clements and Cleves Road. Cleves Road is of similar character to the Chivers Way/Hanchett Village area, and it makes sense for these areas to be joined in a single ward. I think that the other proposed wards reflect local communities well, and would be a better option than G. I also support the compass-point names for the wards as proposed. If G were to be adopted, I would suggest that Haverhill Central would not be a good name for that ward, as the ward only takes in the very edge of the town centre and extends a long way out of town. I would suggest Haverhill St. Felix as a better name for this ward, as it includes both St Felix Church and St Felix School.
Email	Parish Council	Haverhill	Haverhill	<p>Haverhill Town Council considered the two options provided in respect of Haverhill, Option G and Option H. The Council have asked me to make the following observations:</p> <p>1 – Thank you to the officers and working party for their work on this matter. We appreciate the complexity of the task.</p> <p>2 – The Town Council did not feel able to commit support to either option over the other at this stage. Instead, the Council have opted to make observations in respect of both:</p> <p>a) The Town Council support the principle of smaller wards with single or two Councillors representing each ward.</p> <p>b) The Council would prefer to see local historical identities for wards rather than geographically defined names. This is particularly pertinent where the extended and complex geographical nature of proposed wards mean that such terms are inaccurate.</p> <p>c) Positive comments about Option G were that the Council preferred the less complex boundaries and the apparent headroom in two wards' electorate to allow for expansion of the town.</p> <p>d) Positive comments about Option H were about the establishment of a Haverhill Central ward that was mostly coterminous with the Masterplan area and CBD. This was felt to be a good idea.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>e) Negative comments about Option H was that 1, the 'South' ward actually pushed too far north and would make no sense to the residents and 2, the complexity of the ward boundaries in Option H would be confusing for residents to know which ward they were in and who their Councillor was, which polling station to use and for canvassing purposes, volunteers knowing which ward they were in to ensure the correct candidates are represented. E.g. Camps Road/Burton End road passes through three wards.</p> <p>The Council suggests that the existing options offer a good basis for tweaking areas to satisfy the electorate count criteria whilst establishing a clearer boundary structure which can be easily understood by the electorate.</p> <p>Thank you for taking these views into account</p>
Email	Parish Council	Haverhill	Haverhill	<p>Haverhill Town Council considered the two options provided in respect of Haverhill, Option G and Option H. The Council have asked me to make the following observations:</p> <p>1 – Thank you to the officers and working party for their work on this matter. We appreciate the complexity of the task. 2 – The Town Council did not feel able to commit support to either option over the other at this stage. Instead, the Council have opted to make observations in respect of both:</p> <p>a) The Town Council support the principle of smaller wards with single or two Councillors representing each ward. b) The Council would prefer to see local historical identities for wards rather than geographically defined names. This is particularly pertinent where the extended and complex geographical nature of proposed wards mean that such terms are inaccurate. c) Positive comments about Option G were that the Council preferred the less complex boundaries and the apparent headroom in two wards' electorate to allow for expansion of the town. d) Positive comments about Option H were about the establishment of a Haverhill Central ward that was mostly coterminous with the Masterplan area and CBD. This was felt to be a good idea. e) Negative comments about Option H was that 1, the 'South' ward actually pushed too far north and would make no sense to the residents and 2, the complexity of the ward boundaries in Option H would be confusing for residents to know which ward they were in and who their Councillor was, which polling station to use and for canvassing purposes, volunteers knowing which ward they were in to ensure the correct candidates are represented. E.g. Camps Road/Burton End road passes through three wards.</p> <p>The Council suggests that the existing options offer a good basis for tweaking areas to satisfy the electorate count criteria whilst establishing a clearer boundary structure which can be easily understood by the electorate.</p> <p>Thank you for taking these views into account</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Haverhill	Haverhill	<p>Option G better reflects local communities and existing wards.</p> <p>Unclear why we have wards of unequal numbers of councillors. If anywhere, wards with smaller numbers of councillors would sensibly be located where population growth can be anticipated to reduce need for future restructuring of wards.</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Option J	Mildenhall	Option J
Online feedback form	Resident	Mildenhall	Mildenhall	<p>Option J reflects a better overall representation for the area if Great heath is given 2 councillors. The two wards should be called Mildenhall North and Mildenhall South to best reflect the new areas without harking back on old names which will undoubtedly confuse . With the new building projects south of the town the population increase may necessitate two representatives in the south area in the future.</p>
Email	Parish Council	Mildenhall	Mildenhall	<p>Mildenhall Parish Council met to discuss the consultation on District ward boundaries on 21st March 2018. The results of their deliberations are summarised below:</p> <p>There was a consensus that the three names i.e. Queensway, Kingsway and Great Heath, were acceptable and sensible given the new boundaries, but that the loss of Market ward would be regrettable, given the history of Mildenhall as a Market town and the iconic Market Cross in the Market Place. This three ward option will allow a Town Council (as it will be in 2019) comprised of 12 members, equally distributed with 4 members for each ward. The proposed new Rural Ward of "The Rows" is appropriate and the name remains fitting for the area.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				It was unanimously agreed to support the three ward Option I for Mildenhall, with the names Queensway, Kingsway and Great Heath wards (although appropriate alternatives may be suggested) and that the proposed new Rural Ward of "The Rows" is appropriate.
Email to Review inbox	Resident	Newmarket	Newmarket	No view on Options K or L. But wants decisions that affect Newmarket to be sponsored or led by a Newmarket Councillor.
Email	Parish Council	Newmarket	Newmarket	<p>Further of the Town Council Meeting last night, the council considered the options and would like on record their preference for option K – 6 wards of 1 district member. In addition to that, the council wishes to retain the original names where possible, and use Newmarket heritage names for other wards.</p> <p>As such we would like to suggest the following</p> <p>Newmarket North – Studlands Newmarket East – Severals Newmarket South East – All Saints Newmarket South West – St Mary's Newmarket West – Scaltback Newmarket Central – Phantom and Morton</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any queries,</p>
Email to Leah	Borough/ District Cllr	Hundon	Rural	Would like to understand the extraordinary carve up of Hundon ward.
Email to Leah	Borough/ District Cllr	Bardwell	Rural	<p>I would like to place on record my objection to the proposed ward boundary changes as they specifically affect Bardwell Ward. In short, my proposal is that there should be no change to the current Bardwell and Pakenham wards and that Ingham remains as part of Risby ward.</p> <p>For the record, I am reflecting not just my own, but also wide ranging local views, which have been expressed during a series of meetings/discussions involving Parish Councils (Barnham, Honington & Sapiston, Fakenham Magna, Euston and Troston), SCC Councillors Joanna Spicer and Rebecca Hopfensperger, the RAF, Borough Councillors Simon Brown and Susan Glossop. As a consequence of such wide ranging discussions, it is inevitable that resulting formal representations will be similar in many ways, but whilst accepting that the warding review had to start somewhere, there has been some understandable surprise that "Option A" proposed splitting RAF Honington across two different wards. I also believe the base commander will be writing to emphasise that this is not an acceptable position from the perspective of the RAF. Turning now to Barnham where concerns relate mostly to splitting the village away from Euston (and also the Euston Estate), I would ask that significant weight is given to the fact that Barnham and Euston share many things including clergy, school, village hall, Over 60s Club, British Legion, Women's Institute and as such they should remain inextricably linked. Similar historic, community and cultural links also extend across the remaining Parishes in Bardwell ward.</p> <p>The attached spreadsheet seeks to also highlight the issue that under this proposal Ingham Parish would be better served as part of Risby Ward (not Pakenham Ward). In short, the position highlighted in the spreadsheet can be described as follows:-</p> <p>Bardwell Ward (to remain as present) Bardwell 628, Barnham 476, Coney Weston 308, Euston 99, Fakenham Magna 128, Honington (Village) 254, Sapiston 141 - 2034</p> <p>Pakenham Ward (to remain as present) Pakenham 680, Troston 572, Honington (Station) 439, Great Livermere 178, Ampton 49, Timworth 48, Little Livermere 28 - 1994</p> <p>Risby Ward (from data in consultation) Delete Barnham – minus 476 but add Ingham 355 - 2023</p> <p>In summary the strengths are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeps existing communities together. • Ward electorates are in-line with West Suffolk electorate target (2,055 + or – 10%).

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnham remains part of Bardwell Ward. • Avoids splitting RAF Honington (supported by the RAF). • Keeps Euston Estate intact. • Ingham much closer aligned to Risby Ward than Barnham (Supported by local Ward Cllr). • Has the support of two SCC Councillors and 3 Borough Councillors. <p>If anything is not clear please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Email to Review inbox	Resident	Stoke by Clare	Rural	SbC has no association with Kedington or Haverhill but does for Hundon and Clare - please reconsider and redraw
Email to Review inbox	Resident	Lackford	Rural	<p>1. The proposal for Lackford does not reflect the links within the local community and therefore will not provide best and effective local government.</p> <p>2. Existing social links are essentially more important than pure numbers for electoral ward equality. Consequently, the proposals may be improved by returning Lackford, which is a community of 100+ houses, and possibly Ingham to the Risby ward, and removing the proposal for adding Barnham. (We are aware that this summary note is made without the benefit of electoral numbers.)</p> <p>3. Importantly the proposed name "Manner ward" for ward number 16, does not give any clue to a stranger as to the whereabouts of this ward and would appear not to reflect the communities within the proposed ward. A more appropriate identifiable name would be "Barton Mills and Worlington ward".</p>
Email	Parish Council	Stoke by Clare	Rural	I would be very unhappy with Stoke by Clare being changed to a ward with Kedington and Haverhill. We have had a long association with Clare Cavendish Hundon and Wixoe parishes with naturally shared facilities. We are very happy with the way this functions and see no advantage at all to changing this.
Email	Resident	Stoke by Clare	Rural	I wish to register my opposition to the proposed changes to the electoral area including Stoke by Clare. This community forms part of a series of villages along the A 1092 and has interest in common governance of transport, access and speeding. The new proposals would diffuse this focus and thus lessen the effectiveness with which such concerns are dealt with.
Email	Resident	Lackford	Rural	<p>At our Lackford Parish Council meeting last evening we discussed the boundary change proposals for the new West Suffolk District Council, and our Parish Clerk, John Sadler, will be reporting the collective and unanimous view of the LPC. We would like to emphasise that, while we understand the need for some balancing of wards, we are not happy with moving Lackford from our current group of parishes to the new Manor Ward. We would like to add my own submission to support that of Lackford Parish Council with the following observations:</p> <p>1. Lackford and Icklingham should be transposed, to the advantage of both parishes. Lackford 'belongs' with the Risby group of parishes, and Icklingham 'belongs' with the Manor group. These are longstanding links, with which the people of both parishes are comfortable. The numbers of electors in each are very similar, so that variance from the average would be almost unchanged.</p> <p>2. Transposing Lackford and Icklingham would be administratively more efficient for the respective Ward Councillors. Communications for Lackford, particularly transport, are more convenient with the Risby group than with the Manor group. A similar argument can be made that travel for the Ward Councillor for Manor Ward would be more economic to Icklingham than to Lackford.</p> <p>We make these suggestions with the objective of being helpful and constructive, and request that they be taken into account before any submission is made to LGBCE.</p> <p>Lackford is in the catchment area for Risby primary school, older children attend schools in Bury St Edmunds. There is no contact with schools in the villages of the proposed Manor Ward.</p> <p>We have no village hall in Lackford, so larger gatherings for social events are held in Flempton Golf Club, Culford or Fornham All Saints village halls.</p> <p>Church activities are centred on the Lark Valley Benefice, which includes Flempton, Hengrave, West Stow, Culford and the Fornhams. It does not include any of the Manor Ward churches.</p> <p>All medical surgeries are based in Bury St Edmunds.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				Lackford people tend to go to Bury St Edmunds for all shopping and social activities, which takes us through Flempton, Hengrave and Fornham All Saints. We rarely go through the Manor Ward.
Email	Parish Council	Honington Troston	Rural	<p>As you are aware the proposed boundary changes for the new West Suffolk cut RAF Honington in two halves again. The northern part in the civil parish of Honington (about 400 voters) going in a new ward with Bardwell and Honington village and the southern part (about 260 voters) in the civil parish of Troston staying in the Pakenham ward.</p> <p>This reverses the very sensible changes made about 15 years ago by the Boundary Commission and the Borough – and splits the camp right down the centre. It would seem that those councillors involved in this now did not know the area or did not realise what was being proposed was not really sensible (they thought they were putting the “camp” back with Honington village not realising they were actually leaving a split at the camp).</p> <p>Honington Parish Council met this week and do not support the proposed change and they will be writing to the Borough to say that the RAF station should in their view be all in the Pakenham/Troston ward and not split between 2 borough councillors.</p> <p>Replying as Chairman of Troston Parish Council, we agree with Honington PC and do not support the changes. There is a view that since this matter keeps coming up, is some desire that the Camp would benefit from having two Borough Councillors?</p> <p>If you need more detail, please don't hesitate to contact me directly 0787 668 0756</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Hawstead	Rural	I think Hawstead parish should be in the Horringer ward. Hawstead has more in common with Horringer and villages on the 5-8 mile outskirts of Bury than the current arrangement. It also makes more sense for Borough councillors to have their parishes grouped closely in a lump than strung out in a line. Our old Chedburgh ward has been a linear patch with parishes of different issues geographically strung out along it. Similarly we are poorly served by being excluded in our MPs constituency by being excluded from Bury St Edmunds whilst many villages much further out are in that constituency. We have very little in common with the rest of our constituency and this also needs improving on. The proposed name of Horringer ward seems a sensible one
Online feedback form	Community group	Barnham	Rural	We don't agree that Barnham should be removed from the Bardwell ward, is this really necessary? Presently the Euston Estate boundaries are located within the Bardwell ward, we have good working relationships with all Parish Councils and our, one Borough councilor, the added complications of dealing with yet more people seems to be yet another challenge to making things happen!! If indeed there are too many people in the new Bardwell ward (including Barnham) I am sure that we will be represented, after all its more about the individual councilor rather than achieving the precise ratio! Historic plans in the Euston Estate office demonstrate that historically the boundaries of the estate have been contained within one administrative area, including the Blackbourne Hundred!! Does this really need to change?
Online feedback form	Resident	Iceni	Rural	The Iceni Ward does not reflect Herringswell in that there are so few of us in the village (approx 135) compared to Red Lodge which has a few thousand therefore our voice/needs are not really heard over those of Red Lodge, particularly as Red Lodge will be expanding. I feel it would be more appropriate if Herringswell was included in Manor Ward along side similar smaller villages. The name Iceni would be more appropriate instead of Manor ward.
Online feedback form	Resident	Iceni Manor	Rural	<p>It is my opinion that Herringswell should not be warded with Red Lodge. The two communities have very different needs and Herringswell is swamped and overlooked by their much bigger neighbour, Red Lodge. Infact your alernative name choice of "Red Lodge" supports my claim!</p> <p>To remove Herringswell from the Iceni ward and include them in Manor ward would improve the electorate balance and group them with other small rural villages and hamlets who are similar in nature and needs.</p> <p>I would also support the removal of Herringswell in to the Manor ward from the Iceni ward, and then splitting Red Lodge across two wards.</p> <p>If this was not an adopted option, I would support the removal of Herringswell from the Iceni ward, but if it was felt that the ward would then not be big enough for a two member ward, it should be joined with Freckenham instead of Herringswell, as they are a larger electorate and would have a greater voice to be heard than the handful of electoral members in Herringswell.</p> <p>The chosen name of Iceni for Red Lodge/Herringswell ward is not right. Red Lodge is not an ancient village. It is new and expanding. The alternative name of Red Lodge would be fitting if the decision was taken to ward Red Lodge as a single entity, but would not be right if any of the other small villages were warded with it.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Wixoe	Rural	We feel that becoming part of the Keddington ward would be a bad fit. By joining Wixoe (rural) and Keddington (urban)., there would very little or no interest in our community.

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				Traditionally we have had a closer affinity with Clare. Hundon ward would be our first choice and Clare our second choice.
Online feedback form	Resident	The Fornhams Great Barton	Rural	<p>1. Not enough has been done to communicate these proposed changes to local residents. This is so significant a change that all residents have a right to know why this is being proposed and what the implications are so that they may make an informed decision. This has not happened and it is very unsatisfactory. It is not sufficient to argue that this needs to be done quickly. It's more important to do it well.</p> <p>2. With the proposed merger with Great Barton, an area apparently requiring more than a single Councillor will result in the Fornhams having less than a single Councillors time at their disposal. Given the number of concerns in the Fornham villages, we need more resources to communicate our views, not less.</p> <p>3. Just looking at the options for other villages, there are many villages of a similar size to Great Barton with a single Councillor and there are many of a similar size to Fornham with a single Councillor. It seems to make no sense that this merging is being proposed and it is inconsistent when compared with other Ward proposals. Neither is there an explanation.</p> <p>4. I would be interested to know why it is preferable for Fornham to lose its political identity with regards to the proposed ward name of 'Great Barton' when there is an option to choose 'The Fornhams and Great Barton' It's not difficult to guess at the possible long term thinking here but the proposer can have given little consideration to the feelings of the residents. The Ward name should reflect the community where possible. You should not even need to ask.</p> <p>5. Do the proposed wards reflect local communities ? Each has their own issues and concerns with their own Parish Councils. These must be kept separate.</p> <p>6. How can the proposals be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? The concerns above can be properly explained to residents along with the ramifications before decisions are made. How can people be expected to make recommendations for improvement without all of the facts.</p> <p>7. I object to these changes in the strongest possible terms.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Iceni Manor	Rural	<p>Herringswell Parish Council do not support the inclusion of Herringswell within the ward Iceni, with Red Lodge. Herringswell is a small hamlet of homes and is often swamped and overlooked their association with Red Lodge. The two communities have very different needs.</p> <p>We would support the removal of Herringswell from the Iceni ward and would like to see them included in Manor ward. Grouping Herringswell with other small rural villages and hamlets who are similar in nature and needs is more appropriate.</p> <p>Herringswell Parish Council would also support the splitting of Red Lodge into two wards along with the removal of Herringswell from the Iceni ward, and moving Herringswell in to the Manor ward as discussed above.</p> <p>If this was not an option, and the council considered that Red Lodge should not be a stand alone village as the numbers would not be large enough to support a two member ward, we would support the removal of Herringswell from the Iceni ward, and suggest that Herringswell is replaced by Freckenham, as they are a larger electorate, in the past they have been warded with Red Lodge, and would have a greater voice to be heard than the handful of electoral members in Herringswell.</p> <p>We think the alternative name choice you have provided as an alternative to Iceni, (Red Lodge) perfectly demonstrates that Herringswell is overlooked and should not be warded with Red Lodge.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Pakenham Troston	Rural	<p>A line needs to be made somewhere and for parish councils as long as the elected Borough or County Councillor does a good job in representing our area then we see no issue with the proposals.</p> <p>The particular ward name of Pakenham and Troston we feel is not representative of the proposed ward. Both those two named parishes form the northern part of the new ward and does therefore not fully represent the area. We would recommend Pakenham and Ingham as the new ward name as this represents we think the two larger parish communities and the most North/East and West/South parishes. This also encompasses the two major roads in the ward i.e. A143 and A134. We are not sure why Troston was selected as part of the ward name.</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Rougham	Rural	<p>Option B better reflects current excellent community co-operation and communication with regards things like Neighbourhood Watch and well established social media sites like Nextdoor Neighbour. The local community often refers to the 'A134 south corridor' which includes villages on and close to the A134 including Nowton, Rushbrooke, Sicklesmere, Great and Little Whelnetham, Bradfield St George, Bradfield St Clare, Bradfield Combust and Stanningfield. Maintaining the A134 'artery' within one ward as Option B offers (from Bury St Edmunds south to Bradfield Combust and Stanningfield) is a rational option and better serves those living along the A134. Thank you.</p>
Online feedback form	Resident	Rougham	Rural	Option B more appropriate
Online feedback form	Resident	Horringer	Rural	Prefer option A to remain as Horringer

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Hawstead	Rural	Proposal A which places Hawstead in Horringer ward seems right to me. It certainly reflects the geographical area that most concerns me and my immediate family, and through which we most frequently move. Most of our journeys are north to Bury or west to Horringer. Hawstead has historic links with the parishes of Gt Welnetham and Horringer.
Letter	Resident	Barnham Fakenham Magna Honington	Rural	<p>May I first express my serious concerns over lack of information and publicity regarding these proposed boundary changes. I understand that some information was published in the Bury Free Press on Wed 7 March. For those of us that missed that publication we would be unaware of the proposals. There was no information provided in the Mercury.</p> <p>My borough councillor received emails on Wed 7th March and duly provided us with maps and some information at our parish council meeting on Tues 13th March. Time is too short to publish the minutes of our meeting on the official website and provide copy for the village notice board. We have 60 dwellings in our village and even a conscientious parish councillor would find it very difficult to provide villagers with information/maps and advise them of their options to the proposed boundary changes. Even those with internet provision (I have none) may not routinely refer to the website.</p> <p>I would suggest this lack of time made for consultation is very undemocratic.</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed ward boundaries as shown on the map.</p> <p>Barnham, Fak Magna & Honington are three very close knit villages and have been so for many years historically. We share connections through the Euston estate, farming in general, schools, village halls & churches. The village supported each other, for example, in the routing of HGV vehicles away from Barnham some years ago.</p> <p>To link Barnham with Risby makes no sense - the villages are miles apart and have no social/community connection of ward interest. Similarly it does not make sense to have a boundary line splitting RAF Honington - it is one community with the older Honington village (and Fakenham). Under this proposal any village problem would need the attention of 2 different wards, parishes and councillors, giving rise to duplication and complication.</p> <p>Whilst it is reasonable to try to even out ward areas based upon population numbers this must not be the only criteria which overrides the welfare and interest of Barnham, Fak Magna and all of Honington.</p> <p>A more sympathetic approach is needed for these communities. Please reconsider and please extend the deadlines and do more to inform the public.</p>
Letter	Borough/ District Cllr	Troston Honington	Rural	<p>Problem: proposed boundary cuts RAF Honington in 2 again. The northern part (about 400 voters) going in a new ward with Bardwell & Honington village and southern part (about 260 voters) in civil parish of Troston staying in Pakenham ward.</p> <p>RAF view: - this reverses the very sensible changes made about 15 years ago by the LGBCE and the borough to keep the "camp" as one - and splits the camp right down the centre. The Stn Cdr wanted it to be clear he believed it was important for the camp to be regarded as one entity. It would seem that those councillors involved in this new proposal either disregarded the view of the 2015/16 consultation or thought they were putting the camp back with Honington village not realising they were actually leaving a split at the camp.</p> <p>Parish views: - Troston PC discussed the matter on 5 March and did not support either Option A or B being proposed. Cllrs believe the existing ward boundary is a better option as it regards the camp as one entity. Honington PC met 12 March and also do not support the proposed change. They will be writing to the Bgh to say that RAF station should in their view be all in the Pakenham/Troston ward and not split between 2 borough cllrs.</p> <p>County & Bgh cllrs views: existing boundary kept the MQs on the camp together and was within SEBC numbers commitment and plan.</p> <p>Conclusion: meeting unanimously agreed that neither Option A or B kept camp together as one entity - and therefore, we did not support the proposed new boundary.</p>
Online feedback form	Community group	Risby Barnham	Rural	The inclusion of Barnham in the same ward as Risby does not reflect our local community here in Barnham. We are very closely linked with Euston and Fakenham, Magna and I look after those villages pastorally as the three churches work together. . The Women's Institute and the Over 60s clubs are made up of people from those three parishes. .The parish magazine is delivered free to the three villages viz Barnham, Euston and Fakenham and the trustees for the village hall are from the three parishes.. We have nothing in common with any of the villages listed in the new proposed ward., not do those villages border us. I would ask that this proposed change of ward to the Risby and Barnham is reversed and that we continue to be part of the Bardwell Ward which reflects our communities and offers good local government.l.
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Gt Barton	Rural	We would prefer the Ward to be named; The Fornhams and Great Barton Ward. We feel that alignment with Great Barton would be beneficial as there is currently a good relationship between the Fornham Parishes and Great Barton. We would like to stress that it is vital that we still receive the personal touch and swift response, as currently received by our District Councillor. And that the ward having two Councillors still ensures continuity and attention

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				expected. The Councillors must be able to work together well, with a clear plan for the management of communication and attendance at meetings with the Parishes.
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Honington Bardwell	Rural	<p>Both options for revised Rural Wards are the same for Bardwell, so these comments cover them both.</p> <p>The current ward of Bardwell has evolved over past reorganisations and this means that many established activities, facilities and decisions are made between villages because of the historical ties. In particular, the moving of Barnham from both revised ward options is not seen by Euston Parish Meeting and residents as being in the interests of both communities and will make local government representation and decision making fragmented and more complicated.</p> <p>These are some of the key points that have been raised to us concerning the reorganisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The village hall is shared between Barnham and Euston. Euston residents have use of the village hall and have representation on the managing committee. - Both Barnham and Euston are in the same parish, with services scheduled between the parish churches. - Euston Estate covers most of the parishes in the current Bardwell ward. Splitting representation creates issues for the ongoing management of the Estate, in terms of planning and ongoing projects that involve villages. - Euston and Barnham have a shared communication portal - the link. <p>We have had discussions with our Ward Councillor, who has been made aware of our concern over these proposed changes. He has proposed an alternative solution that we support namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The moving of Honington Part two (Station) that has an electorate of 439 into Pakenham ward, Honington village can remain as it is as it is quite separate to the Station and bringing Barnham back into the ward. Our understanding is electorate wise this option will meet the electoral size criteria that have been laid down. <p>The proposed name of the ward doesn't reflect the history or geography of the ward. We would prefer to see Euston and Bardwell.</p> <p>We understand that government policy is driving the proposed ward changes and the the timescales to define and implement the changes are very tight. However, we do not think the current proposals will lead to effective local government nor do they have the backing of the electorate. We therefore request that the alternative option proposed by the current ward councillor is adopted.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Stanton	Rural	There would appear to be little or no change to the current boundaries and proposed ward and Council support the proposals.
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Manor	Rural	Freckenham Parish Council support the Manor Ward as detailed in the lists and on the maps.
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Option A (Horringer)	Rural	Hawstead PC is strongly of the opinion that , of the options available, Hawstead should be included within Option A (Horringer) as this best represents its locality
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Risby Barnham Lackford Icklingham	Rural	Andrew Smith has telephoned me saying he had talked to you with regards to Barnham going into his ward as it is now and Ingham staying in my ward, I agree with that , The other thing which I find strange is I have Ickingham and not Lackford meaning I will travel through Lackford to Ickingham so I know it is down to numbers but it would be better if I had Lackford
Email	Parish Council	Hawekdon	Rural	I am a member of Hawkedon Parish council and feel that Hawkedon would best be served by option A.
Email	Parish Council	Depden	Rural	<p>At a recent meeting of Depden Parish Council concern was expressed that the new boundary did not take into account the Church Benefice of Chedburgh, Chevington, Depden, Hargrave, Hawkedon and Rede.</p> <p>It was also felt that Depden has a greater social inter-action with Wickhambrook ie the doctors surgery, shop and links with Kellys Meadow</p>
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Barton Mills Risby	Rural	<p>These are my thoughts as to how the warding should look for the new council.</p> <p>Barton Mills (749) Worlington (550) Freckenham (275) Red Lodge 1 (1560) Herringswell (456) Total electorate 3590</p> <p>Barton Mills (749) Worlington (550) Freckenham (275)</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>Red Lodge 2 (1737) Herringswell (456) Total electorate 3767</p> <p>Tuddenham (300) Cavenham (94) Icklingham (299) Lackford (214) Flempton (124) Hengrave (132) Higham (122) Risby (596) Total electorate 1881</p> <p>This may seem a big ward but some of the villages meet bi-monthly and some quarterly and some only twice a year.</p> <p>Gazeley are happy to go with Kentord and Moulton but think that Dalham should be included</p>
Email	Parish Council	Higham	Rural	<p>The two proposals submitted are identical so far as Higham is concerned, so we appear to have no opportunity to offer a choice, as this seems to have been made. We lose our association with Tuddenham, Cavenham etc and our current excellent long-serving Councillor, Rona Burt, and are placed with Moulton, Gazeley and Kentford, all of them much larger parishes.</p> <p>The comments made by those who have responded to me following my circulation of the consultation are:-</p> <p>1 There is no mention of Higham in the proposed Ward name. 2 We would rather stay with the status quo – current councillor and parish associations as we fear we will be far outweighed by the needs of the other much larger parishes.</p>
Email	Resident	Lackford	Rural	<p>These are the personal observations of John F Sadler of 17 Holden Rd, Lackford on the proposed boundary changes for the combined Council of West Suffolk</p> <p>These observations apply to both proposals “A” and “B” and refer to the effect the proposals will have on the Parish of Lackford.</p> <p>I, John Sadler am concerned, about the proposed ward boundary changes that moves Lackford from the Risby ward group of parishes into the Manor ward. This move will not reflect the residents of Lackford, happy, long-standing and ongoing interaction with adjacent parishes within the existing Risby ward that works well and fits together. Consequently, the proposal will not offer cohesive or effective government.</p> <p>The Manor ward - The residents in the Parish of Lackford have no schooling, medical, social or religious links with the parishes of Barton Mills, Cavenham, Freckenham, Tuddenham or Worlington and to just append Lackford at the western end of the Manor ward will not bring about cohesive or effective government. The communities do not work well or fit together. I understand that the name, Manor ward, is historical but has no meaning whatsoever for Lackford. Furthermore, the name does not give any clue as to its whereabouts.</p> <p>Schooling - Lackford is within the catchment area of Risby primary school. Older children within Lackford attend the schools in Bury St Edmunds passing through the parishes in the Risby ward along the A1101 corridor. There is no schooling link with the proposed parishes in the Manor ward or in the adjacent wards in Mildenhall.</p> <p>Doctor’s surgeries - There are no surgeries in Lackford, all medical needs are catered for in Bury St Edmunds with travel via the A1101 corridor.</p> <p>Social events - Lackford is a small community without a village hall, and as such, social events are very often combined using the social facilities of the parishes of Flempton, Hengrave, West Stow and Culford, which are all within the existing and proposed Risby Ward.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>Anglican Church - There is an existing and ongoing very strong social link with the parishes of the Risby ward through the Church of England. The Parochial Church parishes of Lackford, Culford, Flempton, Hengrave and West Stow & Wordwell are all combined within the Lark Valley Benefice in the Church of England Diocese of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich and are currently, all within the Risby ward.</p> <p>Transport and Logistics - The omission of Lackford and the addition of Icklingham to the Risby ward does not appear logical. In order to get to Icklingham one would normally travel along the A1101 and pass through the Parish of Lackford.</p> <p>Balancing of ward boundaries - I understand that there must be some balancing of numbers within the wards. However the revised ward boundaries, as proposed, appears to give greater emphasis to the numbers rather than, and more importantly, a reflection of the existing an ongoing links within local communities.</p> <p>Summary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal that the Parish of Lackford is grouped within the Manner ward, does not reflect the existing an ongoing links within the local community and therefore will not provide cohesive or effective local government. 2. Existing and ongoing social links are more important than pure numbers for electoral equality. <p>However, further to a telephone discussion with Fiona Osman of St Edmundsbury Borough Council, I now believe there is a solution that would allow Lackford to remain within the Risby ward yet still keep the numbers within 10% of the ideal electorate number of 2055.</p> <p>I understand that it is almost certain that the Parish of Barnham will be removed from the proposed Risby ward, and the parish of Ingham will be reinstated into the Risby Ward. This changes the numbers as set out below, and thus should allow Lackford to be reinstated into the Risby ward, while still keeping the electoral numbers within the chosen parameters.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The proposed name "Manor ward" for ward number 16, does not give any clue to a stranger as to the whereabouts of this ward and would appear not to reflect the parishes within the proposed ward. A more appropriate name would be "Barton Mills and Worlington ward".
Email	Parish Council	Fakenham Magna	Rural	<p>At our recent meeting, Fakenham Magna Parish Council had the opportunity to review the proposal for the new set of wards for the future West Suffolk council. Naturally, we focused our view on our proposed new ward and our neighbouring communities, addressing your concerns of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the proposed wards reflect local communities and offer effective local government? • How can the proposals be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? <p>We were surprised and disappointed that the proposal has split Barnham village from the existing Bardwell ward and paired it with Risby. From a local community point of view this would seem to be a retrograde step for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barnham has been part of the Euston estate since 1692. Fakenham Magna, Honington, Sapiston and Euston are also part of the same estate and are therefore similarly affected by estate matters. 2. Barnham church has been united with Euston for over eighty years. Fakenham Magna is also in the same Benefice. 3. Barnham, Euston and Fakenham Magna have shared a local publication "The Link" for many years. 4. Fakenham Magna Parish Council have a representative on Barnham Village Hall Committee. This is a requirement of the committee's constitution, and is a reflection of the past and current links between the two villages.

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>5. Local issues that affect Barnham are more likely to affect the surrounding communities of Euston, Fakenham Magna, Honington and Sapiston than Risby. From the point of view of the councillors and the communities it would seem beneficial to keep Barnham in a ward with its closer neighbours.</p> <p>The new ward boundaries not only have spliced Barnham away from their nearest geographical neighbours, they have also managed to divide the camp at RAF Honington into two adjoining wards.</p> <p>To answer your second concern, a simple improvement to the issues raised would be to move Barnham to the Honington & Bardwell Ward, shift the RAF base into the Pakenham & Troston ward, and finally move Ingham to join Risby. This would not only maintain electoral equality, but also maintain the historic community links between Barnham and its neighbouring villages.</p>
Email	Parish Council	Fornham All Saints	Rural	<p>1. The Parish Council of Fornham All Saints, having considered the proposals to create a ward encompassing Fornham All Saints, Fornham St Genevieve, Fornham St Martin & Great Barton and taking into account the following questions would like to submit the comments to each as below:</p> <p>2.</p> <p>1. Do the proposed wards reflect local communities and offer effective local government? The Parish Council of Fornham All Saints opposes the allocation of one ward with 2 councillors to include the above parishes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a concern that there will be penalisation of The Fornhams by having 2 Councillors – difficult to envisage this working with equal share of duties and responsibilities – there may be an issue with only one being ultimately responsible for issues raised. Concern that the largest ward will in effect have the one Councillor and that the other villages will be left with a reduced resource. • Concern that Fornham All Saints will be subsumed into Great Barton. • Loss of identity for Fornham All Saints. • Similar-sized parishes are retaining one Councillor representation which should be considered here. • Despite working together on one project, Fornham All Saints has no or little affinity with Great Barton. <p>2. How can the proposals be improved whilst maintaining electoral equality? The Parish Council agreed that it wished to maintain the status quo and remain as the 3 Fornhams with the inclusion of a village/villages geographically closer i.e. on its borders e.g. Culford/Hengrave/Flempton. It was felt that there was more “village-ness” in hooking up to smaller villages surrounding Fornham All Saints and staying with Fornham St Martin and Fornham St Genevieve.</p> <p>3. Are the proposed names of the wards right? The Parish Council does not support the name and would wish to see the name Forham included in the title of the ward – the suggested name of The Fornhams and Great Barton is acceptable. However the comments raised above are still valid.</p> <p>The Parish Council would also like to state that whilst it recognizes that a longer more formal consultation period will be entered into during the Summer of 2018, the Parish Council is concerned that this consultation period on the initial options for the new ward boundaries to inform both St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath’s recommendations is not sufficiently long enough or detailed enough.</p>
Email	Parish Council	Lackford	Rural	<p>These are the unanimous observations of Lackford Parish Council on proposed boundary changes for the combined Council of West Suffolk</p> <p>These observations apply to both proposals “A” and “B” and refer to the effect the proposals will have on the Parish of Lackford.</p> <p>Lackford Parish Council are extremely unhappy and concerned, that the proposed ward boundary changes that moves Lackford from the Risby ward group of parishes into the Manor ward. This move will not reflect the residents of Lackford, happy, long-standing and ongoing interaction with adjacent parishes within the existing Risby ward that works well and fits together. As a consequence, the proposal will not offer cohesive or effective government.</p> <p>The Manor ward - The residents in the Parish of Lackford have no schooling, medical, social or religious links with the parishes of Barton Mills, Cavenham, Freckenham, Tuddenham or Worlington and to just append Lackford at the western end of the Manor ward will not bring about cohesive or effective government. The communities do not work well or fit together. The Parish Council understand that the name, Manor ward, is historical but has no meaning whatsoever for Lackford. Furthermore, the name does not give any clue as to its whereabouts.</p> <p>Schooling - Lackford is within the catchment area of Risby primary school. Older children within Lackford attend the schools in Bury St Edmunds passing through the parishes in the Risby ward along the A1101 corridor. There is no schooling link with the proposed parishes in the Manor ward or in the</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>adjacent wards in Mildenhall.</p> <p>Doctor's surgeries - There are no surgeries in Lackford, all medical needs are catered for in Bury St Edmunds with travel via the A1101 corridor.</p> <p>Social events - Lackford is a small community without a village hall, and as such, social events are very often combined using the social facilities of the parishes of Flempton, Hengrave, West Stow and Culford, which are all within the existing and proposed Risby Ward.</p> <p>Anglican Church - There is an existing and ongoing very strong social link with the parishes of the Risby ward through the Church of England. The Parochial Church parishes of Lackford, Culford, Flempton, Hengrave and West Stow & Wordwell are all combined within the Lark Valley Benefice in the Church of England Diocese of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich and are currently, all within the Risby ward.</p> <p>Transport and Logistics - The omission of Lackford and the addition of Icklingham to the Risby ward does not appear logical. In order to get to Icklingham one would normally travel along the A1101 and pass through the Parish of Lackford.</p> <p>Balancing of ward boundaries - The Council understand that there must be some balancing of numbers within the wards. However the revised ward boundaries, as proposed, appears to give greater emphasis to the numbers rather than, and more importantly, a reflection of the existing an ongoing links within local communities.</p> <p>Summary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal that the Parish of Lackford is grouped within the Manor ward, does not reflect the existing an ongoing links within the local community and therefore will not provide cohesive or effective local government. 2. Existing and ongoing social links are more important than pure numbers for electoral equality. <p>However, further to a telephone discussion between the Clerk and Fiona Osman of St Edmundsbury Borough Council, we now believe there is a solution that would allow Lackford to remain within the Risby ward yet still keep the numbers within 10% of the ideal electorate number of 2055.</p> <p>We understand that it is almost certain that the Parish of Barnham will be removed from the proposed Risby ward, and the parish of Ingham will be reinstated into the Risby Ward. This changes the numbers as set out below, and thus should allow Lackford to be reinstated into the Risby ward, while still keeping the electoral numbers within the chosen parameters.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The proposed name "Manor ward" for ward number 16, does not give any clue to a stranger as to the whereabouts of this ward and would appear not to reflect the parishes within the proposed ward. A more appropriate name would be "Barton Mills and Worlington ward". (We are aware that this proposal is made without any knowledge or association with the parishes proposed for this ward.)
Email	Parish Council	Barnham	Rural	<p>Barnham Parish Council would strongly recommend the status quo regarding warding boundaries. It would like to continue being a member of the Bardwell Ward: Bardwell 628, Barnham 476, Coney Weston 308, Euston 99, Fakenham Magna 128, Honington (Village) 254, Sapiston 141 = 2034 people.</p> <p>This is based on the Barnham's very strong historical links with its neighbours – particularly Euston and Bardwell.</p>
Email	County Cllr		Rural	<p>This is my official response to the current consultation on proposed new ward boundaries as they effect the Suffolk County Council Blackbourn division and neighbouring wards. (but particularly the current Bardwell ward) . I have been the County Councillor for this area for almost 29 years and I also supported my husband who was the Borough Councillor for the Pakenham and Troston (RAF Honington) Ward for 12 years until 2015</p> <p>Quite specifically I wish to record an objection to your proposal to split RAF Honington across two different wards and to separate Barnham away from Euston and link it to Risby and Icklingham.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>In the case of RAF Honington to split the camp residential areas between two wards divided by only a narrow road when the community facilities are on both sides of the road seems divisive and confusing. The actual camp and airfield covers 4 parishes and all have been consulted and all feel that the whole camp should remain as at present. For the record, until about 15 years ago it was split between Honington and Troston parishes and after due process with the Boundary Commission and the Borough it was all brought in to the Pakenham/Troston ward. All parishes involved meet regularly with the Station Commander and senior RAF managers (RAF Honington Parish Liaison Committee) and County and Borough Councillors also attend.</p> <p>In the case of Barnham the concerns relate mostly to splitting the village away from Euston (and also the Euston Estate). Barnham and Euston share many things including clergy, school, village hall, Over 60s Club, British Legion, Women's Institute. The villages are 0.7 miles apart. But there is also bewilderment to link Barnham to a village as far as Risby which is 11 miles away and there is absolutely no connection between any of the communities proposed for that ward.</p> <p>Since the consultation was launched there have been a series of parish council meetings (Troston, Honington, Barnham, Euston, Fakenham Magna) who all share these concerns. Councillor Andrew Smith, Councillor Simon Brown and I have also had a meeting with the chairmen of Honington and Troston parish councils together with RAF Honington who are important in all this. County Councillor Rebecca Hopfensperger and I both agree on this response</p> <p>None of us want to just oppose your consultation proposals unless we can put forward an alternative that works with your numbers criteria. Nor are we aware of any contrary views likely to come forward before the end of the consultation. This is as follows :</p> <p>Bardwell Ward (to remain as present) Bardwell 628, Barnham 476, Coney Weston 308, Euston 99, Fakenham Magna 128, Honington (Village) 254, Sapiston 141 - 2034</p> <p>Pakenham Ward (to remain as present) Pakenham 680, Troston 572, Honington (Station) 439, Great Livermere 178, Ampton 49, Timworth 48, Little Livermere 28 - 1994</p> <p>Risby Ward (from data in consultation) Delete Barnham – minus 476 but add Ingham 355 – 2023</p> <p>Ixworth/Ixworth Thorpe (1902) Barningham (2211) and Stanton (2234) wards to also remain as at present</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeps existing communities together. • Ward electorates are in-line with SEBC electorate target (2,055 + or – 10%). • Barnham remains in Bardwell ward. • Avoids splitting RAF Honington across 2 wards • Supported by the RAF (MOD) • Supported by Barnham, Euston, Fakenham, Honington/Sapiston and Troston Parish Councils • Keeps Barnham and Euston together (they have mostly joint organisations and services). • Keeps Euston Estate all in the same ward. • Ingham much closer aligned to Risby Ward than Barnham • Allows for projected population growth in Ixworth • Avoids 2 member rural wards • Has the support of two SCC Councillors and 3 Borough Councillors.
Email	Parish Council	Stoke by Clare	Rural	<p>I am the clerk to Stoke by Clare Parish Council and have been instructed to contact you with our observations on the proposed area change.</p> <p>Currently we are in the Hundon Ward the proposal is to move us away from our neighbours to Kedington where we have no links whatsoever. We feel that it is completely unnecessary, bureaucratic for the sake of it, achieve little and cause division between neighbouring communities. It appears that we have just been put into the Kedington ward as we have the right number of electors, regardless of having little or nothing to do with them. We will be on</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>the outskirts of the area and feel we will be largely forgotten. Our main road flows nowhere near Kedington and any Highway issues that we have will be overlooked.</p> <p>We wish to remain where we are.</p>
Email	Parish Council	Poslingford	Rural	<p>I am writing on behalf of Poslingford Parish Council for whom I am the Parish Clerk.</p> <p>They have asked me to contact you with their comments on the proposed move from the Cavendish Ward to Clare. Currently they are with a number of small villages whereas if they are moved to Clare it is felt that as a small village attached to a "town" any problems they encounter are likely to be pushed to the back of the queue instead of being dealt with equally with their much larger neighbour. Consequently they would wish to remain where they are currently.</p>
Email	Resident	Lackford	Rural	<p>Just reviewing the proposed changes to the Lackford parish. There are three main things that are of significant concern to me.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Doctors, schools, dentists etc. The family is well integrated into all these in Bury St. Edmunds, we have an established, long history of great, trusted care from our surgeries for example. Changes to any of this will cause significant risks to family health along with unnecessary distress. 2. Given that Lackford is significantly closer to Risby, while Icklingham is significantly closer to Mildenhall should indicate the subsequent village relationships. Lackford have regular activities with both Risby and Flempton, as well as West Stow and Culford. We regularly have church social events to raise funds etc. Changes in the parish boundary will weaken these ties and break down relationships. 3. Dramatically increased transportation - all our travel is between Lackford and Bury St. Edmunds which allows us to incorporate many things into one trip. We never go out to Mildenhall. Changing ward will require significant increases in car use by the whole family, especially given the lack of public transport. <p>The (<i>name removed</i>) family is strongly against these proposed changes.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Kentford & Moulton	Rural	<p>Yes, the proposed ward for us in Gazeley seems appropriate as we are very close to the other villages included in the proposed ward, and we maintain good relationships with these villages. It also makes sense because we often have similar issues so try to work together.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Kentford & Moulton	Rural	<p>I agree that the 4 parishes which will comprise this ward (Gazeley, Higham, Moulton and Kentford) form a logical grouping. They are linked by a network of roads and footpaths and their communities already have close ties. The residents of the smaller villages (Gazeley and Higham) make use of the facilities in the larger and better served villages of Moulton and Kentford. These parishes also represent 4 out of the 5 in the ecclesiastical benefice of Dalham (the other being Dalham itself). Ideally, Dalham would be included in this ward but it is appreciated that the combined populations would then exceed the target figure by well over 10%. I have no comment to make on the suggested ward name.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Worlington	Rural	<p>We are not concerned with the joining together of the 6 parishes into the new Manor Ward, and believe that this will strengthen communication and the relationship between the villages. The ward should remain named as the Manor Ward.</p> <p>We do have concerns regarding one member now being responsible for 6 parishes, instead of 3, and the constraints upon his time as a result of this. We would seek reassurance that we as an individual parish would still receive the personal touch and the good communication and response that we already receive from our District Councillor.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Tuddenham	Rural	<p>It is hoped that joining Tuddenham with the other 5 villages will strengthen communication and the relationship between the villages and help to have our voice heard as a unified group of parishes. The ward should remain named as the Manor Ward.</p> <p>We do have concerns regarding one member now being responsible for 6 parishes, instead of 3, and the constraints upon their time as a result of this. We would seek reassurance that we as an individual parish would still receive the personal touch and the good communication and response that we already receive from our District Councillor.</p>
Online feedback form	Parish Council	Denston and Cavendish	Rural	<p>Retain the 18single c;llor</p>
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Pakenham	Rural	<p>Please note for the record my opposition to the proposed Boundary changes for Pakenham Ward. I can also confirm that Troston Parish Council and likewise RAF Honington are in opposition to these changes. I understand the RAF Honington Station Commander has issued a letter raising their opposition also to the proposed changes.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>Along with this, it makes logical and practical sense to for Ingham to be part of Risby and Barnham to be kept within its current Ward.</p> <p>I understand Cllr Andrew Smith has provided a proposal for the boundaries, which I very much support and the reasons given. I trust this will be given due consideration and any final decision respects and values the wishes of the respective villages, communities, Parish Councils, Borough and County Councillors, as well RAF Honington.</p>
Email	Parish Council	Rougham	Rural	<p>Introduction It is proposed that Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council will be replaced with a new West Suffolk Council; the order to create the new Council is due in Parliament soon. New council wards will be needed for the new Council, in line with guidance that the number of Councillors should be reduced from 72 to 64. The two existing Councils have presented a number of initial options for the ward boundaries which are open for consultation before submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) in April 2018. Local groups, councils and the public are being encouraged to comment on the options and are invited to put forward further suggestions. The LGBCE will hold its own consultation over the summer and make the final decision.</p> <p>Background Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish is currently part of Rougham Ward, together with Bradfield Combust with Stanningfield, Bradfield St Clare and Bradfield St George. The existing Ward is represented by one Councillor on St Edmundsbury Borough Council. The Community Governance Review (CGR) examined parish electoral arrangements in 2015-2016 and this led to some changes in Parish boundaries in 2017. As a result of this, and in line with the Parish Council submission, Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish now extends to the railway line in the north, and to Lady Miriam Way and the A43 in the west. The Parish will be divided into North and South Wards. It has been confirmed that the current warding review will not affect the external boundaries of West Suffolk or the existing boundaries of any Parish or Town Council. Current Parish and Town Council boundaries will be the building blocks to create district-level wards. It is intended that each Councillor on the new Council will represent a similar number of electors, approximately 2,055 people (± 10%). In some cases, this will be achieved through larger two-Councillor wards. It is estimated that the number of electors within Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish will increase by 577 by 2023 and this figure needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Council proposals The two proposals affecting Rushbrooke with Rougham put forward by Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A: Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council North Ward would be included in the redrawn Moreton Hall East Ward and represented by two Councillors on the new combined Council. Rushbrooke with Rougham South Ward would be incorporated into a single-Councillor Rougham Ward comprising also Bradfield Combust, Bradfield St George and Bradfield St Clare and possibly Stanningfield (Option A for Rural Wards and Option E for Bury St Edmunds and surrounding Parishes). It should be pointed out that there are significant inaccuracies in the proposal for Option A as the text (List of Rural Wards – Ward 6 Rougham) does not state that this includes only the South Ward; therefore if a Rushbrooke with Rougham elector was reading this without consulting the map or looking at Option E and F1 (Bury St Edmunds and surrounding Parishes), they would assume that the whole of the Parish was included. Also the number of electors specified on the maps relating to Options A and B for this Parish does not

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>differ, even though the North Ward is excluded from Option A</p> <p>Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council proposal Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council does not believe that either of these proposals meets the needs of this rural Parish with a distinct identity and recognisable boundaries. Option A is considered particularly unsuitable as it destroys the integrity of the Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council. Moreover it is inappropriate for part of a large and mainly rural Parish to be included as part of a suburban Ward within Bury St Edmunds Town Council. The effect of Option A would be that the Parish's electorate would be represented by two Councillors from Moreton Hall East Ward and one from Rougham Ward. It would be incumbent on the Moreton Hall East Councillors to report to the Parish Council on what the new combined West Suffolk Council is achieving for that area.</p> <p>There is a very strong local view that the Bury St Edmunds town boundary should not move any further east and a fear that the Parish could lose its identity by being absorbed into Bury St Edmunds. The Parish Council is also concerned about the practical aspects of being included in a two-Councillor Ward.</p> <p>Within Options A and B, there is no other Parish that is split with the electors of one part being represented by another Ward representing more than one Parish or Town Council such as that proposed within Option A.</p> <p>Consequently, the Parish Council is proposing a new option, namely a single-Councillor Ward with an electorate of 1986, based largely on the current Ward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This new Ward would include all of the Parish of Rushbrooke with Rougham, together with the Parishes of Bradfield St Clare and Bradfield St George (Appendix A) <p>Rationale for new proposal The electorate of the Parish would be represented by one Councillor, which would increase democracy and empower the residents, giving them a greater say in local affairs. If the Parish's North Ward were combined with the Moreton Hall East Ward, the North Ward electors would comprise only 14.5% of the total electorate of that Ward and would therefore have little influence in local issues affecting them. Although the Parish will be divided into two Wards from 2019, this is intended to ensure that residents north of the A14 will be fully represented on the Parish Council and should not be regarded as a precedent for split representation on the new West Suffolk Council. In connection with this, residents were asked their opinions about proposals to divide the Parish between Wards and there was overwhelming support for maintaining the Parish as a single entity on the West Suffolk Council. (see Appendix B for 90+ responses).</p> <p>In the Parish Council's submission for the Community Governance Review, it was emphasised that there was a real fear that the Parish of Rushbrooke with Rougham could be absorbed into Bury St Edmunds and therefore lose its distinctive identity and long history. The Parish boundary was moved eastwards with the previous expansion of Moreton Hall and there is a strong feeling that there should be no further eastward movement.</p> <p>The Parish Council accepts that emotion cannot be the only argument against dividing the Parish. The practical reasons why the area of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council should be maintained as one unit under the new combined Council are set out below.</p> <p>The residents of the Parish are proud of the long history of Rougham and Rushbrooke villages with some families tracing their histories back for centuries. The most recent history of this whole area is inextricably linked with the WW2 United States Army Air Force (USAAF) Rougham Airfield.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>The Parish boundary with Bury St Edmunds runs along Lady Miriam Way and along the escarpment to the north of Lady Miriam Way to the Railway line. The Parish Council proposes that the boundary for the new Ward should reflect these distinct borders and not split the Parish into two parts.</p> <p>The proposed Ward would be a distinct and recognisable community, as shown by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The northern part of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish has an incontrovertible link with Rougham, because of the history of the USAAF airbase at Rougham • The roads in Lark Grange (the Taylor Wimpey development to the north of the Parish) are named either after US airmen who served with distinction or after the aircraft flown from Rougham airfield during the Second World War. A plaque will be placed on each road sign explaining how the name originated, thus encouraging a feeling of connection to the past history of Rougham • It is logical to maintain the existing links with Bradfield St Clare and Bradfield St George, since these are rural Parishes, with similar issues and challenges • The road layout also reinforces the natural affinity between these villages, as Junction 45 of the A14 serves all of them • Many residents of all these villages use facilities in Rougham, specifically Rougham shop and Post Office • The Bennet Arms in Rougham is the last remaining public house in the proposed Ward since the closure of the Fox and Hounds in Bradfield St George • Bradfield and Rougham Baptist Church is on the boundary of Rougham and Bradfield St George and offers a wide range of community activities to residents of all three villages <p>If our submission is accepted then the entire electorate of these interconnected villages will be represented by one Councillor. This would increase democracy and empower the residents, giving them a greater say in local affairs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option B: The whole of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish along with Bradfield Combust, Bradfield St George, Bradfield St Clare, Stanningfield, Great and Little Whelnetham, Horringer, Ickworth and Nowton would form a two-Councillor Ward (Option B for Rural Wards and Option E1 and F for Bury St Edmunds and surrounding Parishes) <p>Conclusions</p> <p>For the reasons listed above, Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council strongly believes that the Parish should be represented on the new West Suffolk Council by a single Councillor with experience and knowledge of rural matters. It is proposed that the Ward should consist of Rushbrooke with Rougham, Bradfield St Clare and Bradfield St George, thus maintaining the integrity of the Parish as a whole and continuing the links with two other rural Parishes that face similar issues and challenges.</p> <p>Although the Parish will be divided two Wards, the reason for this was to ensure that the electorate living north of the A14 had a full and inclusive representative voice on the Parish Council and hence to bring the Parish closer together and ensure all areas had a voice.</p> <p>The Parish Council is totally opposed to splitting the Parish into two as proposed under Option A (Rural Wards) because this is divisive for a Parish with a clear and defined rural identity. It would destroy the integrity of this Parish and result in rural residents being subsumed into Bury St Edmunds Town Council, when Rushbrooke with Rougham is a rural Parish which should be represented by a rural Councillor.</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
Email	Community group	Bardwell & Troston	Rural	<p>I am writing to the council to present the view of RAF Honington with regards to the future ward structure required for "single council" elections in May 2019. The proposed changes would split the RAF station into two halves. The northern part in the civil parish of Honington (about 400 voters) going in a new ward with Bardwell and Honington village and the southern part (about 260 voters) in the civil parish of Troston staying in the Pakenham ward.</p> <p>This reverses the changes made about 15 years ago by the Boundary Commission and the borough to keep Honington camp as one. In my view, this is not ideal. I would prefer that Honington service personnel and families to be kept within one ward boundary and viewed as one entity, with one borough councillor. Keeping the "camp" together has proven to provide us with more effective local government and reflects the realities of our community on the ground.</p> <p>The proposition below has been put forward by the Parish Councils (Barnham, Honington & Sapiston, Fakenham Magna, Euston and Troston), SCC Cllrs Joanna Spicer, Rebecca Hopfensperger and the Borough Councillors Simon Brown, Susan Glossop and Andrew Smith. The station supports this proposal as it keeps our personnel within one ward boundary.</p> <p>Bardwell ward (to remain as present) Bardwell, Barnham, Coney Weston, Euston, Fakenham Magna, Honington (Village), Sapiston - 2034</p> <p>Pakenham ward (to remain as present) Pakenham, Troston, Honington (Station), Great Livermere, Ampton, Timworth, Little Livermere - 1994</p> <p>Risby ward (from data in consultation) Delete Barnham but add Ingham - 2023</p> <p>I look forward to the outcome in due course.</p>
Email	Resident	Wixoe	Rural	<p>I have only just been made aware of the proposed boundary changes for the present Hundon Ward. I live in Wixoe and wish to remain along with Stoke by Clare, Hundon and Stradishall in the Hundon Ward. We are much more aligned with Stoke by Clare and Clare and I would like to remain within the County Council Clare Division. I support our Cllr Mary Evans in this as we do not want to break the link between the communities on A1092.</p> <p>Please ensure my view is included in the Public Consultation due to take place in July and August.</p>
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	Withersfield	Rural	<p>Please do not think I am a dyed in the wool stickler for the status quo – I realise that rewording is an exercise which has to happen from time to time. However, I hope you will take into account the views of local councillors "at the coal face".</p> <p>When I was first elected to Suffolk County Council in 1997 I represented Risbridge Division, 8 years on there was a countywide boundary review and I then represented Clare Division for the next 8 years. The Boundary changes were carried out after lengthy consultation with all concerned and, in my case, worked very well indeed. This was a huge change both geographically and in terms of parliamentary constituencies but individual wards remained, importantly to my mind, in the same parliamentary constituencies.</p> <p>I looked with horror at the proposal for a two member ward to include Withersfield and Wickhambrook. This simply would not work in a large rural area with such disparate parishes.</p> <p>Incidentally – Barnardiston is spelt with an "r" after the second "a". This same typo was made ages ago on road signs and cost quite a lot to get them replaced with the correct spelling.</p>
Email	Borough/ District Cllr	South wards	Rural	<p>Thank you for this. I do appreciate your efforts. Not sure that my suggestion take things much further forward. Having looked at this in close detail, I think the ward sizes should be bigger at about 2,750 and the number of councillors should be reduced to 50. However, on the 2,055 basis for wards here are suggestions are</p> <p>Hundon + Kedington Two Member ward Barnardiston (111) Hundon (858) Kedington (1584) Great Wratting (159)</p>

How responded	Category	Wards or Parishes	Options	Comments on boundary options
				<p>Little Wrattling (105) Withersfield (641) Thurlow (160) Little Thurlow (196) Total Electorate 3,814</p> <p>Stour Valley – two member award Clare (1825) Cavendish (847) Stoke by Clare (410) Wixoe (122) Poslingford (167) Stansfield (177) Stradishall (363) Denston (99) Total Electorate 4,010</p> <p>Wickhambrook Ward – one member Wickhambrook (1026) Cowlinge (232) Great Bradley (302) Little Bradley (44) Lidgate (181) Ousden (209) Dalham (177) Total Electorate 2,171</p> <p>I appreciate this impacts on Chedburgh and Chevington ward but Lidgate (181), Ousden (209) Dalham (177) don't belong in Chedburgh/Chevington as they focus more Newmarket rather than Bury. Instead I would add Hawkedon (100), Rede (116) Brockley (274) to Chedburgh/Chevington Ward</p> <p>Chedburgh/Chevington One member Hargrave (234) Depden (172) Chedburgh (516) Chevington (505) Hawkedon (100) Rede (116) Brockley (274) Total Electorate 1,917</p>