To: Electoral Arrangements Review Committee
Re: Community Governance Review
From: [Name redacted]

I object to the proposed boundary change between Carleton Rode and Bunwell parish.

I own land and properties in Carleton Rode and do not want to change to Bunwell. I have not been informed or consulted by SNDC of the proposed change. I understand that stakeholders should be.
I understand that some residents were informed of the proposed changes, but this came out of the blue after the first stage and they had not been consulted. This caused a great community upset and the review is supposed to have a positive impact on community cohesion.

The boundary existed in 1779 as evidenced by the enclosure map for Carleton Rode. It goes back a long way in time and reflects the local history. There is a strong Carleton Rode History group which takes a keen interest in this. Much research has been done, including field walks and to lose this part would upset the group.

Carleton Rode ploughing association regularly holds its annual ploughing match on the fields which would change into Bunwell and this would adversely affect the viability of the event. It needs to stay in Carleton Rode.

The strength of the local residents' reaction to the proposal was shown by the huge number of about 50 at the Carleton Rode parish council meeting in September. Everyone had the chance to speak and ask questions. A vote was taken and one person was for the proposed change and everyone else was against.

The survey on the SNDC website shows that more Carleton Rode residents are happy with the existing arrangements—two want to keep the boundary and one wants to change it. So why is a change proposed?
For Bunwell the survey shows three responses in the section for residents. Only two of these are residents, one is the clerk of Bunwell Parish council. Of the two residents, one wants change and the other does not. So why is a change proposed?

I object to the letter from Bunwell Parish council as it is fallacious. I was at their AGM where people spoke both for and against any boundary change. No proposal was made and no vote was taken. At their October meeting, the council could not
justify that the 8 or 9 properties referred to in their letter of 4 July 2017 wanted to move into Bunwell. On the contrary, the residents had not been consulted but the clerk had simply counted how many houses were in the area Bunwell Parish council wanted to move from Carleton Rode into Bunwell. I consider their letter should be discounted as it does not reflect the views of local residents.

On the other hand Carleton Rode parish council have written to all of the residents in the properties that would be moved to Bunwell parish and spoken to as many as possible. They have consulted the residents affected whereas Bunwell Parish council have not. There is a strong resistance from the majority to any change.
Re. Boundary Changes

I was born and brought up on Carleton Road.
My husband and I are very happy to live here, if we had wanted to live elsewhere we would not have purchased property on Carleton Road.
We are aging and if boundary changes we will lose community car fuel allowance etc.
We keep having these discussions with Parish Council and have made our feelings clear - LEAVE US ALONE!
We hope our concerns will be noted although we very much doubt it.
From 2 very angry residents
26th September 2017

Dear members of the Parish Council

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend this meeting but wish to make my views known regarding the proposed boundary changes.

Having studied the South Norfolk Council website I am concerned on the following issues :-

1) There is an email from Bunwell Parish Council regarding the boundaries dated 4th July 2017 which states residents strongly requested that the properties be moved into Bunwell Parish. However, it does not state, if these were residents that would be affected by the change or, if they were residents who already live in Bunwell. Surely some evidence is needed.

2) Why were Carleton Rode Parish Council not represented at the meeting at South Norfolk Council when other Parish Councils were?

3) Why the proposal was agreed by somebody from Tacolneston Parish Council at the above meeting who, I am led to believe is a Clerk and not a Parish Councillor. Correct me if I am wrong but Clerks are not allowed to vote on such issues they can only have an opinion.

4) Are Bunwell Council quorate? On their website, they only have 4 Councillors when they should have 9. If they are not quorate this governance review is a bit of a joke as they do not have enough Councillors to govern the parish they already have let alone wanting it to be larger.

I bought my property within the Parish of Carleton Rode because this is where I wished to live. If I had wanted to live in Bunwell I would have bought an alternative property. My Husband was born in this village and his Mother and Father also live here. Both my children attend Carleton Rode VA Primary School.

I can see no reason to want to change the boundary which, has been in place for many years especially, as it is not reflecting the interest and identity of myself or my family. I can only assume that it would be for monetary gain for the Parish of Bunwell.

If you need me to inform anybody else of my views (I have already completed the form on the South Norfolk Council website) or, I can assist in any other way please do not hesitate to ask.

Yours sincerely
Electoral Services,
South Norfolk Council,
Cygnet Court,
Long Stratton,
Norwich,
NR15 2XE

RE- CG Review: PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES BUNWELL/ CARLETON RODE

I have recorded my views already online at https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/CGReview, but had trouble with my internet so I thought I would also send in a hard copy. Please see below:

I strongly object to the proposed boundary changes which would see my property moved from the parish of Carleton Rode into Bunwell. I also am concerned that we were not consulted during the initial EARC survey. As a resident of over 30 years who’s property would be moved into a different parish, I should have been consulted earlier. The letter I received addressed to the Resident did not state that my property is to be moved. I am also concerned that on the south-norfolk.gov.uk/cgreview webpage there is no mention of a Carleton Rode parish boundary change. This is very misleading, it wasn’t until I checked the category for Bunwell that Carleton Rode is mentioned. I was shocked on checking Map 3 boundary amendment to find that my property would be moved. I have been in contact with Carleton Rode Parish council and they too have not been informed of the proposals. This is clearly a huge mistake and other residents not as computer literate as myself, will be unaware that their property may be affected, and their views not represented.

As a founder member of the Carleton Rode History Group I feel very strongly that the historical boundary of the parish still has meaning and should not be interfered with. I am happy with Carleton Rode Parish council, they represent my views and consult me as a home owner. In the initial feedback there is no mention of Carleton Rode Parish views, simply something from the Bunwell Parish Clerk stating that 9 residents want to be moved.

I have no wish to be moved and strongly object to the proposals.

Yours Faithfully
Electoral Services,  
South Norfolk Council,  
South Norfolk House,  
Cygnet Court,  
Long Stratton,  
Norfolk,  
NR15 2XE

20th September, 2017

Dear Sirs,

Ref: Parish Boundary Review Bunwell/Carleton Rode

It has been brought to our attention, that a boundary change has been proposed which would absorb an area of Carleton Rode into the parish of Bunwell and that our properties (see below), would be affected. We understand that the proposal was made at a recent meeting of the South Norfolk Council, where Bunwell, but not Carleton Rode parish council were represented. As such our views were not sought and therefore have not been taken into account.

The majority of us have lived here for over 20 years and want to remain part of the Carleton Rode community. It is unfair for us to take on the expense of changing addresses on driving licenses, passports, vehicle registrations, stationery, in addition to the time spent on updating information for hospital records, doctors, relatives and friends etc.

We feel that there is no benefit to us in the proposed changes and as such will be ensuring that our disapproval is voiced to the Carleton Rode parish council in the strongest terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See attached comments. Original document to be given to Carleton Rode parish council.

----------- Forwarded message -----------
From: [Redacted]
Date: Sep 20, 2017 8:24 AM
Subject: CGR for Bunwell
To: <review@norfolk.gov.uk>
Cc: <carletonrode.pc@tiscali.co.uk>

Please see attached comments. Original document to be given to parish council.
26/9/2017

M/s Julia Tovee-Galer
Electoral Services Manager
South Norfolk Council
NR15 2XE

Dear Electoral Services,

Re Boundary Review, Carleton Rode/ Bunwell

I wish to strongly object to the proposed changes to the Bunwell/Carleton Rode boundary on the following grounds:-

1. No evidence to support a change

2. Erroneous information, (or erroneous recording) given to the Boundary Review Committee meeting on 15/8/2017 at South Norfolk Council. Tacolneston Parish Council clerk, Mr John Pennell, was actually speaking as a member of Bunwell Parish Council. The B1113 road, which the proposed new boundary is recorded as following, is 1.5 mls away, and has no relevance to this boundary whatsoever. The Bunwell Parish clerk’s letter to the Committee stated that 8 or 9 properties would be involved. It would be 20, (approx. 40 electors) the vast majority of whom do not support any change.

3. Community Governance Guidance document, p.22, para 67 under the section Impact on Community cohesion requires a positive impact. Community cohesion is already being damaged by this proposal.

4. “A discrete cross-section, or small part of the community” of Bunwell has requested a boundary change. This does not reflect the interests of the local community as a whole. (CGR guidance p.23, para 23)

5. Other local stakeholders affected by these proposed changes have not been consulted(CGR guidance p.28, para 99), specifically landowners and property owners involved, Carleton Rode and Bunwell schools, and the historic Fuel Charities and Carleton Rode Ploughing Association.

6. Upset of historic traditions and ancient boundaries (CGR p.36, para.125)

7. “Community Governance within the area under review will be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area, and is effective and convenient” Carleton Rode Parish Council has consistently maintained its quota of 7 councillors to represent 634 on the electoral roll. Bunwell Parish Council should have 9 councillors to represent their 866 electorate, but have several long-standing vacancies, and recently have struggled to be quorate.
Under the proposed boundary change, one might query whether an additional 40 affected electors might be effectively represented.

8. No advice given as to the individual or local council costs of implementing proposed boundary change.

In summary, there are no reasons within the terms and requirements of the Community Governance Review to justify or support any change.

Yours faithfully, [signature]

cc. Cllr. C. Kemp, Chair of Review Committee

Cllr B. Spratt, County Councillor

Cllr C. Easton, District Councillor
Electoral Services Team, S. Norfolk Council.

Considering all aspects of a proposed boundary change in Carlton Rode, Burnwell (North of Hunt's Green to Namondhain Road, South of Drity Lane) other than the inclusion of an efficient level of local government, the control of rural urbanisation, and the residents' awareness, I find any change to existing boundaries of little value and a waste of further thought to this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

(The odd bits of the boundary are the fabric of the place)
2nd October 2017

Dear sirs,

Community Governance Review

Please find enclosed my email to you which for some reason failed to be delivered electronically to you.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
To: reviews@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Cc: carletonrode.pc@tiscali.co.uk

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes between Carleton Rode and Bunwell under the Community Governance Review.

I have read your terms of reference and the grounds on which I object to this change are as follows.

There is no justification for any changes to the existing boundaries between Carleton Rode and Bunwell. Those people affected clearly identify and have interests in Carleton Rode and their input into the life of that village.

The community you are seeking to remove from Carleton Rode has its roots within that village even though geographically the properties apart from No 1 and No 2 Hunts Green are in Bunwell Street. There would be no greater community cohesion with Bunwell after the change and people would be left feeling resentful and ignored if the proposed boundary change was to go ahead.

I have checked the levels of population in your documents. I note that the boundary can be changed under the review to reflect changes in population and the present day identities and interests of the community.

The population of Bunwell is recorded as 866 with an estimated growth in 2022 to 910. That of Carleton Rode is recorded at 634 with a projected growth in 2022 at 652. The boundary changes will reduce the population of Carleton Rode to the benefit of Bunwell. If there were more people in Carleton Rode than in Bunwell I would expect some boundary changes to take place to reflect this but this is not the case. It would be to the detriment and cohesion and unity and identity of Carleton Rode to lose a large area land and population to Bunwell.

I see no justification for redrawing the boundary. These are ancient lines demarcating people over time who have lived within the existing boundaries for may hundreds and perhaps more than a thousand years. The people you want to move have alliances with the parish where they live and not the neighbouring parish. I certainly do not want to be moved out of Carleton Rode into Bunwell parish by the push of a pen. I contribute my time and efforts to help the parish of Carleton Rode. I knew I was moving to Carleton Rode when I moved to the house 18 years ago. The house has stood for at least 350 years in Carleton Rode and should not be moved into a different parish. Your terms of reference at 15.1 state that parishioners should clearly identify with the parish in which they are resident which lends strength and legitimacy to the existing parish structure creating a common interest in parish affairs and encourages participation in elections to parish council.

If any boundary alterations were to be made by the Community Governance Review in Bunwell Street it should be to remove the one property in Bunwell Street which is not in Carleton Rode. This would tidy up the boundary at the western edge of Bunwell Street.

I attended a meeting at Carleton Rode village hall last week where common interests in parish affairs and a healthy robust parish council were evident by the wishes of those affected by the proposed changes to remain in Carleton Rode. Even though Carleton Rode has a smaller population than Bunwell all seven council seats are taken and all parish councillors attend meetings. Any attempt to change the status quo will result in a significant blow being dealt to Carleton Rode and this cannot be democratic or fair.

I hope the committee will take into account my feelings on the matter.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted]
Dear Electoral Services Team,

As a happy resident of Carleton Rode for the past 32 years I strongly object to the proposals made by Bunwell Parish Council to annex my property into Bunwell. The Carleton Rode resident(s) along Bunwell Street who are apparently unhappy with their lot have gone through Bunwell Parish Council and their parish clerk to propose boundary changes along Bunwell Street. At no point does Carleton Rode Parish Council seem to have had this proposal mentioned to them or been in any way consulted. The proposed change is, in my view, substantial and not restricted to properties along Bunwell Street. My property is to be directly affected and I live on [Redacted].

According to the letter submitted by the Bunwell Parish Clerk she had been approached (at the Bunwell Parish Council AGM- looking at the minutes for this online there is no mention of what was said only that ‘The views received from the public will be considered by the Parish Council and their recommendations will be given to the District Council in due course’) by Carleton Rode residents along Bunwell Street requesting change to Bunwell. She stated that this affected 8 or 9 properties as outlined on a map she had submitted. This cannot be the same map that I have viewed online, Map 3, as the proposed boundary change on that map affects nearly 20 properties.

According to the minutes of your review meeting John Pennel, clerk to Tacolneston Parish Council (no mention made of him being a councillor on Bunwell Parish Council as well) “advised that he was in agreement with the proposed changes to Bunwell and Carleton Rode, as detailed in the report, and confirmed that the boundary would run along the B1113 road rather than the stream it currently followed.”

I am really at rather a loss to see how he was able to confirm this unless he was looking at a different map entirely. The proposed change is along Hunts Green, Old Hall Road and Wymondham Road, all at least 1.5 miles from the B1113. I don’t know where he was referring to but it certainly wasn’t the area outlined in yellow on Map 3.

Did nobody bother to look at the map at the time? If they had they might have noticed the significant discrepancy between Mr Pennel’s statement and the actual proposed route.

Needless to say I am opposed to the suggested boundary change. I do not wish to be a resident of Bunwell, if I wanted to be I would have bought a property in Bunwell. I do not see why I should be made to change parish because someone else has a grievance. They too could have moved to Bunwell if that’s what they prefer, after all when they purchased their properties they did so knowing that they were in the parish of Carleton Rode.
Although I received a letter from South Norfolk Council to tell me about the boundary change, as my property is directly affected, I was very surprised to find that the Carleton Rode Parish Council knew nothing of it. They had received no notification when surely they are also directly affected by the change as it will mean a direct loss of income and numbers on electoral role, without any apparent compensation from Bunwell. Furthermore those with land affected, but not property, have not been notified either. Surely they had as much right to be informed too.

Carleton Rode School could also suffer loss if the proposed changes are made. 20 properties being taken out of a parish is a significant number when it comes to school catchment areas for small village schools.

Finally, just to bring to your attention the fact that the maps you have online showing proposed changes do not in fact show those details if opened on an iPad. It may be true of other tablets and mobile devices. I was only able to see the yellow outline if I viewed it on a PC, otherwise all it showed was a map of Carleton Rode and Bunwell with the current boundary in black.

Yours sincerely
Dear Sirs,

I understand that a plan to transfer a group of houses from Carleton Rode into the parish of Bunwell. I do not approve of this and hope that our boundaries may remain as they are, please.

Yours faithfully,
Dear South Norfolk Council

As a concerned person at the Parish meeting I wish to query the boundary of Corleton, Rode and Brinswell to remain as it is no change. Thank you.
Dear Sir/Madam/committee,

1. The boundary changes proposed in the Governance Review, to be completed in Feb 2018, between Carleton Rode and Bunwell would see the removal and displacement of ancient lanes and footpaths. These ancient lanes and walk routes, which allowed access across the great common and the whole year enclosures, were in place well before the enclosure act, which took place for this parish in 1779. For historians and landscape archaeologists these field patterns, ancient routes and roads are vital to preserving any historic context which is applicable to a parish. One only has to look at the enclosure map or indeed the current ordnance survey map to see the outline of ancient fields held in the various manors, the early intakes as opposed to the straight patterns produced by the enclosures. The parishes in this part of Norfolk are of an ancient landscape unlike areas of the west of this county which demonstrate field patterns brought about due to the whole scale enclosure of land. . . . parishioners of Carleton Rode still beat the bounds!

From the schedule, set out by the surveyors for the enclosure of Carleton Rode in 1779:

".... one other road leading from Bunwell to Wymondham beginning at Bunwell street and going in a west direction over the great common of Carleton Rode aforesaid to the corner of Pullyins plantation where it joins the road hereby set out from New Buckenham to Wymondham ....".

This is Mile road, long, straight and wide which indicates it was a new road created across the common and set out by the surveyors of the 1779 Enclosure.

".... one other road branching out of the said fourth hereby set out at the corner of Flaxlands and going in a North direction across the said great common to an ancient gate at the South East corner of the meadow belonging to Charles Harrison, and from there along an ancient lane to Hunts green and across the said green to the corner of an orchard belonging to John Cann in the occupation of John Cheney and then in an East direction along an ancient lane leading to Bunwell green...."

This is Hall Road, an ancient path at the edge of the common meeting with the ancient lane half way along Hall road and then into Hunts green - a smaller common amidst the whole year fields.
“one other road branching out of the said fourteenth road . . set out at or near the corner of a farmhouse belonging to the said [redacted] and going in a west direction along an ancient lane to the great common and from there in a north direction on the west side of several old furlongs belonging to the said [redacted] and [redacted] respectively and going nearly in the same direction till it enters the bound of Bunwell.........”  NRO

This is the very northern end of the road now called Hall road.

All these roads would be included in the proposal for the boundary change as such robbing our parish of important historical elements of its history.

2. I can find no rationale whatsoever within your review to necessitate such a change in the boundary line of Carleton Rode. Especially one that could destroy so much for the sake of so very little.

3. There has been overwhelming objection to these proposals both in the parish council meeting of 26th September and on the ground with parishioners who will be directly affected by the ‘removal’ to another parish.

4. Over the decades there has been a gradual ‘nibbling away’ of the boundary of Carleton Rode in the favour of Bunwell, particularly towards the northern boundary - why do you feel it must continue?

I remain yours sincerely

[redacted]

Sent from’ Windows Mail
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am unhappy that as one of those parishioners effected by the changes, I only found out about the review at stage 2.

To my knowledge our house has been in Carleton Rode since 1911 and I wish it to stay that way. We do not have the same facilities as Bunwell residents but would have to pay a premium. There would also be a cost to changing our address (driving licence, passport, utilities, bank accounts etc).

In order to save time and money I vote strongly that this proposal does not go ahead.

Yours, 
From: Eforms@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Sent: 22 October 2017 22:01
To: Council<s-norfolk.gov.uk>
Subject: New enquiry via the South Norfolk website (#web-enquiry-32457)

New enquiry via the South Norfolk website (#web-enquiry-32457)

Online feedback
23rd Oct 2017
Dear Electoral Services Team,

Re: Community Governance Review (Boundary Change).

I am a resident of Carleton Rode living at the above address. I also own two properties that are affected by the proposed boundary change. I have spoken to my tenants and they, as well as myself, do not want to be moved into Burwell.

I am also the owner of 42 acres of farmland that is affected by the boundary change. I can see no reason for the change and I am opposed to the proposal.

This farmland has been in Carleton Rode for hundreds of years and is recorded on the Enclosure maps of 1779. It has historical significance to Carleton Rode and has been the site of a local history group study. It is also the regular venue for Carleton Rode Ploughing Association drawing matches. I know I am not alone in my opposition to this proposal as it is causing unrest within our community, which I believe is in contrast to the principles of this review, which is supposed to encourage community cohesion.

I also believe that the information presented to your committee on 11/08/2017 was incorrect and misleading, there was not a majority of residents in favour of a change, in fact it was a minority.

Please take my views into account as I am an affected property owner.

Yours Sincerely,
Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached letter.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Dear Electoral Services Team,

Re: Community Governance Review (Boundary Change).

I am a resident of Carleton Rode living at the above address. I also own two properties, [redacted] that are affected by the proposed boundary change. I have spoken to my tenants and they, as well as myself, do not want to be moved into Bunwell.

I am also the owner of 42 acres of farmland that is affected by the boundary change, I can see no reason for the change and I am opposed to the proposal.

This farmland has been in Carleton Rode for hundreds of years and is recorded on the Enclosure maps of 1779. It has historical significance to Carleton Rode and has been the site of a local history group study. It is also the regular venue for Carleton Rode Ploughing Association drawing matches.

I know I am not alone in my opposition to this proposal as it is causing unrest within our community, which I believe is in contrast to the principles of this review, which is supposed to encourage community cohesion.

I also believe that the information presented to your committee on 11/08/2017 was incorrect and misleading, there was not a majority of residents in favour of a change, in fact it was a minority.

Please take my views into account as I am an affected property owner.

Yours Sincerely,
Hello,

Please find attached my letter as part of the second consultation phase of the Community Governance Review in relation to the prosed changes of Bunwell Parish boundary.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Electoral Services Team,

I have happily lived in Carleton Rode my whole life and am horrified to hear of the proposals made by Bunwell Parish Council to alter the boundary of the village, resulting in my becoming a Bunwell resident. I am writing this letter to formally state my objection to this proposed boundary change, and to highlight some of the points that I think need to be considered by the Council.

The Carleton Rode resident(s) along Bunwell Street who requested the boundary change did so via Bunwell Parish Council and their parish clerk, and at no point does Carleton Rode Parish Council seem to have had this proposal mentioned to them or been in any way consulted. My understanding is that the first Carleton Rode Parish Council heard about the proposals was via a resident that had received a letter from South Norfolk Council at the start of the second consultation phase. I was also shocked to hear that it was only those with properties affected that had been informed by the Council, and that landowners affected were completely overlooked.

My main issue with the proposed boundary change is the extent of it. I understand if there are some people on Bunwell Street that feel it would make sense for the boundary to change slightly along Bunwell Street. What I do not understand is why the proposed new boundary encompasses some houses on Hunts Green (including mine) which are across a field from the presumably unhappy Carleton Rode resident(s) on Bunwell Street. As far as I am aware no residents on Hunts Green have ever shown any desire to become residents of Bunwell so I question who drew this new boundary line and why it included Hunts Green.

According to the letter submitted by the Bunwell Parish Clerk she had been approached at the Bunwell Parish Council AGM by Carleton Rode residents along Bunwell Street requesting change to Bunwell. She stated that this affected 8 or 9 properties as outlined on a map she had submitted. This cannot be the same map that is provided online with the Community Governance Review documents (map 3) as the proposed boundary change on that map affects nearly 20 properties. This again raises my question as to who came up with this proposed boundary and why.

Another matter of confusion is the comments made by John Pennel (Clerk to Tacolneston Parish Council and Bunwell Parish Councillor) who confirmed (according to the minutes of your review meeting) that the boundary would run along the B1113 road rather than the stream it currently followed. However, the proposed change is along Hunts Green, Old Hall Road and Wymondham Road, all at least 1.5 miles from the B1113.

I would also like to raise the point that Carleton Rode Primary School could also suffer loss if the proposed changes are made. 20 properties being taken out of a
parish is a significant number when it comes to school catchment areas for small village schools.

Finally, as a lifelong resident of Carleton Rode and having attended the playgroup, kindergarten, primary school, youth club and more recently become involved in the community woodland, I feel a strong identity as a Carleton Rode resident and would be sad to be forced out of a friendly and welcoming community against my will.

Yours sincerely,
From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 27 October 2017 16:46  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: reference proposed changes to Carleton Rode parish Boundary

Dear sirs

The Governors and staff of Carleton Rode V.A. Church of England Primary School cannot and do not support the proposed changes to the parish boundary. We strongly object to the proposal.

Carleton Rode is a small rural community with a good and active social and community structure. There is no advantage to Carleton Rode in any such proposed change. What purpose is there for such a proposal that would remove houses from our parish? The houses are occupied by long time village residents and their children who identify with Carlton Rode, attend our school and church. We have been advised that the boundary change will have no effect upon our school catchment area at present however it could negatively affect any capital capitation calculations and the enduring viability of our church school in the future and that, for our community is unacceptable. We have brought this matter to the attention of The Diocese or Norwich.

We feel that removing houses clearly part of our vibrant community will have a significant adverse effect upon the established wellbeing of the community. At a recent parish meeting it was clear that our parish community are very upset by the proposed changes. They did not ask for them and believe there is no need for such changes. Both Carleton Rode and Bunwell are classified as service villages set in flat open countryside, by the nature of the landscape they are spread out and rural in character. There is no need or justification to upset the members of the parish and residents by changing historic boundaries especially given there is no justified reason and the residents do not want, and did not ask for any change.

signed...
From: E-mail address
Sent: 11 July 2017 17:34
To: Julia Tovee
Subject: Fw: Change of boundary

Please find below a letter from a resident concerning the boundary consultation which we would like considered in the Community Governance Review.

Bunwell Parish Council are in agreement with this change and support this resident.

Kind regards

Margaret Ridgwell
Parish Clerk
Bunwell Parish Council
01603 304646

From: E-mail address
Sent: 11 July 2017 16:50
To: bunwell-pc@live.com
Subject: Change of boundary

Dear Mrs Ridgwell,

I live at number [redacted] and currently fall under the parish of carleton rode but would like to be considered for our property to come under Bunwell parish council instead of carleton rode parish council. I have a number of reasons for this request but the main one being the inadequate way the parish council is run and in particular with the chairman. He is not a character assassination but for us in particular the chairman has made life very difficult. Our property share two boundaries with a field farmed and owned by [redacted] and over the past fifteen years we have had many disputes with him for various reasons. On this personal level we can handle his arrogant and bullish behaviour with no qualms what so ever but when it comes to a council matter he abuses his position as chairman and makes all our inquiries and particular a most recent planning application very difficult indeed. In fact the behaviour of himself and his fellow councillors done nothing but make a mockery of the whole planning system with its double standards and so called polices which when we approached the PC for a copy of said polices were denied and later told by the treasurer [redacted] that they actually don't exist. This council should be serving ALL the parish of carleton rode without any prejudice to where you are located or on a personal scale. I attended a PC meeting in January 2016 to put to the committee why they refused our application to convert a outbuilding into an annex for my elderly father and other family members to live in but was fobbed off again with lies and negativity. While at this meeting the treasurer read out some
correspondence from a concerned resident of bunwell street regarding the damage being caused to his property from lack of kerbing on the south side of the street addressed this letter by saying in a mocking tone "we will leave that for our rich neighbours Bunwell PC to deal with that one" which was met with jeering and clapping from the other members of the PC. This in my opinion is both disgusting and totally unprofessional and not serving the community as it should.

On the subject of kerbing or should I say the lack of it on the south side of the street due to Carleton Rhodes reluctance to spend the funds, our driveway is suffering the effects of rain and heavy traffic, I also notice the properties which have grass verges on the south side are being dramatically eroded. Another issue I have is the lack or non existence of information and correspondence regarding parish matters and activities that comes through our letter box but regularly receive said notices from Bunwell PC. To me it just makes sense graphically to be brought under Bunwell PC particularly as we are served by the main sewer in the street and benefit from the recent addition of pavements. I really do grudge paying Carlton Rode PC any part of my council tax and would much rather it goes to Bunwell where I can honestly say in the years we have lived here all the improvements have come from them. Not only that I would like to come under a council that I can feel happy to approach and even more happy in the knowledge that any grievances, concerns or any other matter will get approached and dealt with in the manner that is expected of a well run PC.

Regards

Sent from my iPad
Please find below a letter from a resident concerning the boundary consultation which we would like considered in the Community Governance Review.

Bunwell Parish Council are in agreement with this change and support this resident.

Kind regards

Margaret Ridgwell
Parish Clerk
Bunwell Parish Council
01603 304646

Dear Mrs Ridgwell

I live at 8 bunwell street. I wish to be considered for my property to come under Bunwell Parish Council because the number of my address is duplicated further up Bunwell Street and the sewer connection in Bunwell Street which has problems and is of no concern or help to me from CR PC – also it is difficult for visitors to find us because although we are situated in the Street the address is in Carleton Rode. I have taken up with Bunwell PC but not able to help as we are in Carleton Rode. Also because my road boundary is being eroded because of lack of kerbing on the CR side of the street.
I hope I can get some help because it is a ridiculous situation
From: Bunwell Parish Clerk <bunwell-pc@live.com>
Sent: 11 July 2017 17:35
To: Julia Tovee
Subject: Fw: Boundary Change

Please find below a letter from a resident concerning the boundary consultation which we would like considered in the Community Governance Review.

Bunwell Parish Council are in agreement with this change and support this resident.

Kind regards

Margaret Ridgwell
Parish Clerk
Bunwell Parish Council
01603 304646

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2017 14:40
To: bunwell-pc@live.com
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Boundary Change

Dear Mrs. Ridgeway

I am one of the three property owners on the south side of Bunwell Street who wish to have our homes transferred from Carleton Rode Parish Council to Bunwell Parish Council.

My present address is Boundary House, 1 [redacted].
From shortly after I bought this property in 1981 there have been problems associated with the fact that it is part of the parish of Carleton Rode. The house was built in the eighteen-sixties and the boundary literally runs through the middle of the main building, which is only seven meters from the edge of the main road through the village. In recent years it has seen a massive increase of traffic – much of it heavy vehicles. Because there is no kerb along my frontage, there has been a constant problem with mud and grit thrown onto the front of the house. Last year, in the course of resurfacing the road, a window of my living-room was smashed, which took me weeks to sort out.

Following the new arrangement whereby the county council and parish councils can share the cost of road improvements I had hoped that this would finally be sorted out. But no. Carleton Rode Parish Council, intent on maintaining a ridiculously low precept rather than carry out necessary work – especially what they choose to see as marginal cases on the parish boundary, refused to take part. This is the main reason for my application to be switched to Bunwell, which adopts a responsible attitude to its parishioners. But there is an additional issue. The stream which used to run along this section of the street, was effectively piped by my predecessor. My neighbour on the east side has an open ditch, but the gulleys taking the water off the road are not properly maintained, adding more mud to the situation.

Yours