Nicola Tullock

From: Framingham Earl Parish Council <framinghamearlpc@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 20 October 2017 11:34
To: Julia Tovee
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Community Governance Review - Second phase of consultation - Framingham Earl Parish Councils Response

Importance: High

Good Morning Julia,

With reference to your e-mail below please see attached Framingham Earl Parish Councils response with regard to the second phase of the consultation re the Community Governance Review. Our response documentation comprises of a covering letter and a detailed response. Due to the importance of these documents please can you confirm receipt of both attachments by e-mailing confirmation to myself, the Chairman and Vice-Chair at the email addresses as follows:

Kind Regards

Yvonne Wonnacott
Parish Clerk to Framingham Earl Parish Council

From: Julia Tovee <JTovee@S-NORFOLK.GOV.UK> on behalf of Review <Review@S-NORFOLK.GOV.UK>
Sent: 06 October 2017 15:53
To: Review; Bunwell Parish Council; Carleton Rode Parish Council; Diss Town Council; Roydon Parish Council; Earsham Parish Council; East Carleton with Ketteringham Parish Council; Swardeston Parish Council; Framingham Earl Parish Council; Poringland Parish Council; Ashby St Mary Parish Council; Thurton Parish Council; Long Stratton Parish Council; Wymondham Town Council
20th October 2017

Electoral Services Team
South Norfolk District Council
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton
NR15 2XE

Dear Review Team

Community Governance Review - Response to the provisional recommendation to merge Framingham Earl and Poringland Parish Councils

We write further to our letter of 18th August 2017 to Julia Tovee-Galey. In that letter we outlined our deep disappointment that the Electoral Arrangements Review Committee had been swayed by the representations of Poringland Parish Council and seen fit to recommend a merger of the two councils. This decision was contrary to the informal preliminary views presented to the committee and, more importantly in our view, the unanimous responses from the residents of Framingham Earl who took the time to participate in the first phase of consultation.

As you may be aware, we had not been informed that Poringland Parish Council would put forward such proposals to the committee meeting. As a consequence, we had no opportunity to present our own proposals, nor to contest some of the arguments promulgated by our neighbouring parish. We welcome this opportunity to redress the balance as part of the second phase of the consultation process.

Our response to the proposed merger is outlined in the attached document. We hope that the officers of the council and the members of the review committee will consider the arguments in full and how we have tried to frame these within the terms of reference of the Community Governance Review. After this rigorous analysis of the proposal we remain strongly opposed to a merger of the two councils.

We should also mention that, as part of our deliberations as to how our parish could operate in the future, we did consider whether to merge with our neighbouring parish of Framingham Pigot. We share a parish boundary twice as long as the one we have with Poringland and we are similarly named. The size of our parishes is almost identical and we are both predominantly rural in nature. We consulted with Framingham Pigot and after a mature and
considered debate at a specially convened meeting, they decided to maintain their independence. We respect their decision and we have therefore elected not to propose it to the committee without the crucial democratic support of their residents.

As a long-standing and independent parish council we accept that we are open to the accusation that we have a subjective bias in protecting the status quo. Whilst we are confident that our arguments provide a rigorous and detailed counterpoint to those presented by Poringland Parish Council, we would hope that the review committee will place even more importance to the views of the current residents of this parish. If local democracy is to thrive, we believe this aspect should be given paramount consideration in the committee’s deliberations. Our conviction is that only if there is a compelling and credible political, social or financial rationale to override those wishes, should the committee pursue an alternative approach. We do not believe such overriding considerations apply in this case.

Framingham Earl Parish Council is more than happy to discuss the matter further with the review team and members of the committee if there is anything which is unclear or where further information might prove informative.

Yours faithfully

Yvonne Wonnacott

Yvonne Wonnacott
Clerk to Framingham Earl Parish Council
Framingham Earl Parish Council

Response to the proposal to merge the Parish Councils of Framingham Earl and Poringland

October 2017

Following the publication of the minutes of the SNDC Electoral Arrangements Review Committee and the information now available on the South Norfolk District Council website, we have had, for the first time, the opportunity to review the proposals put forward by Poringland Parish Council (PPC) for a merger with Framingham Earl Parish Council (FEPC).

We have chosen not to offer up a line by line critique of the document submitted by PPC but will happily do so if the officers of the council or the Review Committee would find this helpful. Instead, we have tried to summarise the arguments into broad headings. It should be remembered that the document submitted by PPC proposed a much wider council as their first preference (to be called Henstead) and, as an alternative, they offered up a merger with Framingham Earl and Framingham Pigot. It may be that they will re-submit a proposal based on this diluted option but they have so far, not chosen to share this with us.

We do not have the same resources as PPC, so please accept our apologies if our response does not match the professionalism of theirs. There may also be some small discrepancies in data but the underlying sentiments and rationale will still be valid even allowing for these small variances.

A: The argument that the two parishes are “conjoined” or “effectively one village”

It is true that FEPC and PPC share a boundary. The length of that shared boundary is around 3.6 km. However this represents only just over one quarter (27%) of the PPC parish boundary. It has boundaries of 3.2 km with Howe and a similar amount with Stoke Holy Cross. The remaining quarter of its boundary is shared between five other parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish boundary</th>
<th>Length of shared boundary</th>
<th>Approximate % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with Framingham Earl</td>
<td>3.6 km</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Howe</td>
<td>3.2 km</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>3.2 km</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>1.1 km</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Alpington</td>
<td>1.1 km</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Brooke</td>
<td>0.58 km</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Shotsesham</td>
<td>0.48 km</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Bixley</td>
<td>0.15 km</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We do not believe that this data supports the view that our two parishes are "effectively one village". It might be of interest to point out that our border with Framingham Pigot is 5.5 km, half as long again as the one we share with Poringland.

Nor is the population density of the two parishes similar. Using data from the website www.norfolkinsight.org.uk the estimated population in 2015 (all residents) of Framingham Earl was 923 and the equivalent figure was 4116 for Poringland. This produces a population density of 362 people per square km in Framingham Earl compared to 651 people per square km in Poringland. Therefore, the density ratio of Poringland is nearly double that of Framingham Earl’s. We believe that this disparity is likely to increase in the near future as more housing to the west of the B1332 nears completion.

**B: The argument that the parish council boundaries are confusing**

PPC have put forward evidence, using photographs, of houses which are close to one another but are in different parishes. We would contend that wherever there are no natural boundary divisions such as rivers, there will often be examples where properties that are physically close will span more than one administrative area. We would also submit that the residents of those properties are in no doubt as to which parish they reside.

The focus of the PPC proposal was the border with Framingham Earl but we would argue that similar anomalies can be found on the western boundary of Poringland. In the following photograph the house on the left is in Poringland and the property on the right in Stoke Holy Cross. In addition, the picture was taken from within the boundary of Caistor St Edmund.

![Photograph of houses](image)

The conclusion from our analysis is that, whilst there will often be anomalies at boundaries, these are no greater than might be expected when a large parish such as Poringland is an enclave with eight smaller neighbours. We do not believe attempting to remove these merits the upheaval consequent upon of an expensive re-drawing of the boundaries. This would simply risk moving those anomalies to wherever the new boundary happened to be drawn.

PPC argue that recent issues with Anglian Water have demonstrated that problems impact on residents across parish boundaries. This is undeniably true, but they fail to make the
case as to why this impact was made any worse as a consequence of the current parish arrangements. Given that Anglian Water are replacing over 11 km of water mains in this scheme it would be extraordinary if their work did not cut across any number of parishes.

Finally, and most importantly, since the last boundary review in 2002, no new houses have been built close to the boundary between Poringland and Framingham Earl and none are planned. All housing schemes in the intervening period have been entirely contained within a parish boundary (such as Summer Close and Earlsmead in Framingham Earl) or to the west of the B1332 and closer to the boundaries of Stoke Holy Cross and Caistor St Edmund (such as Mulberry Park and The Ridings in Poringland).

C: That there is financial merit in merging the two councils

PPC argue that a combined council would remove duplicated costs but do not quantify the extent of these. They say that such duplicated costs would embrace “senior staff, administration (e.g. insurance) and other costs” but fail to provide figures.

Given the disparity in the two council’s precepts it is difficult to see that any such duplicated costs would amount to very much. The 2017/18 precept for Framingham Earl is £7,927. This compares to a figure of £142,829 for Poringland - an amount which is eighteen times higher. Two parishes of a similar size and with similar requirements may well remove duplicated costs following a merger but when one parish council is so much bigger than the other, any such cost removal is far more diluted.

FEPC does not have any senior staff to remove. It is very effectively and efficiently run by a part-time clerk. The clerk also works for other parish councils in South Norfolk and this means that overheads such as training are already shared.

Even if we look at one specific area mentioned - insurance - it is difficult to see much of a saving. The current insurance cost for FEPC is £320. The allowance in the 2017/18 budget for PPC is £4500. Even if the FEPC insurance requirement was entirely eliminated (and assuming the PPC cost did not rise as a consequence) this results in a saving to a Band D council tax payer of the combined parish of around 12p per year.

D: That the merged council would be more efficient

This is, by its nature, a more difficult aspect to quantify. PPC point out in their proposal that it has “reduced levels of bureaucracy and become more transparent and open to residents.” It is to be commended for such achievements. FEPC would hope to merit a similar accolade and would offer, by way of tangible evidence, the comments made by parishioners during the first phase of the Community Governance Review.

“The parish runs a very efficient and effective council with all the councillors fully involved.”

“In its existing state, the parish council is run in both an effective and efficient manner meeting the needs of all parties, including the residents.”

“A well-run parish where the local councillors are easy to contact and they are approachable.”
"The parish has been well run and managed since the last review was done in 2002 when it was noted as sustainable and reflects the interests of the community and no need for change was needed."

"They know the local community and have the village interests at heart and can be easily contacted."

"It is a small parish but the councillors know their area very well and the problems and resolutions are dealt with quickly."

"The parish council is small and reflects the size of the parish. It is able to react to parishioners concerns quickly."

In the interests of balance, we looked to find comments made about Poringland during the same phase of the review. Despite a population more than four times greater than FEPC, there were only two responses to the survey and only one made a comment which was that "It is currently working well ensuring services are also beneficial to surrounding communities."

If efficiency and reduced bureaucracy were to be quantified by the management of the parish precept, FEPC would also contend that it is striving to meet the needs of parishioners especially given the current economic environment. The following is a table showing the precepts for FEPC and PPC over the last three years. These are based on a Band D property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tax Year</th>
<th>Framingham Earl</th>
<th>Poringland</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>£22.40</td>
<td>£79.24</td>
<td>£56.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>£21.65</td>
<td>£82.88</td>
<td>£61.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>£19.06</td>
<td>£84.36</td>
<td>£65.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that over this three year period, the precept for FEPC has reduced by 15% and that of PPC has increased by 6.5%. Despite the reduction in precept we have not reduced services but have looked to find cheaper suppliers (e.g. IT), share services where mutually beneficial (grass cutting) and channeled the goodwill of our parishioners (voluntary litter collection).

E: That the residents of Framingham Earl do not contribute fairly to services provided by Poringland

PPC say that "with so many of the services offered through the Poringland precept being used by residents of the Framinghams (sic), it seems fair to spread the cost across the communities. These services include things like bus shelters, the Community Centre, play areas, the burial ground and much more."
It is self-evident that parishioners do not constrain their use of services to those provided by the parish they happen to reside in. This is true whether considering parish, district, county or national boundaries.

Residents in all parishes that border Poringland are just as likely to use these facilities, given the distances involved and their populations. For example, residents in The Cedars on Gull Lane live in Framingham Earl but are 2.4 km (in a direct line) from the Poringland community centre. A circle with a similar radius from the community centre would encompass residents in Stoke Holy Cross, Caistor St Edmund, Bixley, Framingham Pigot, Alpington, Yelverton, Brooke and Howe as well as those in Framingham Earl. The combined population of these neighbouring parishes is 4415 – over four times the population of Framingham Earl.

Notwithstanding the obvious inequity of Framingham Earl sharing costs not only of Poringland but those larger neighbours within a similar radius, we will nonetheless try to unpick the argument that FEPC are not making an equitable contribution.

a. The community centre. People using the centre do so on a fee-paying basis. This is being run as a going concern and the Chairman of PPC reported in April that it “had seen great success in 2016/17, with more than a 20% increase in income in 12 months, meaning that the Centre was nearly at break even on running costs.” There is no communal area within the centre which is not supported by a commercial enterprise, such as the café.

FEPC voluntarily contributed from its own precept to the development of the community centre and stopped contributions once the facility was generating its own income.

b. The burial ground. PPC already have a differential pricing for burials. Framingham Earl parishioners pay twice as much to be buried in the burial ground compared to a resident in Poringland, even though they may have lived nearer the burial plot before their death.

c. Bus shelters. We accept that the residents of Framingham Earl are likely to use the bus shelter at the “Fiveways” roundabout. We have tried to understand the cost of provision but we are also aware that funding was provided by the Parish Partnership scheme and we cannot ascertain the net cost to Poringland residents. FEPC would be happy to consider a pro rata contribution when presented with a summary of these net costs.

d. Play areas. These are spread out throughout all neighbouring parishes and we note that PPC do not provide any evidence that their use is disproportionately borne by their own precept payers.

e. “Much more”. We do not know what this encompasses. It would have been helpful and, presumably straightforward, to list some of them given their apparent number.
So far, we have been conscious that our document has concerned itself primarily with dealing with the arguments that PPC has put forward to justify a merger of the two councils. We hope that we have provided a perspective which demonstrates why those arguments lack substance or simply run a considerable risk of generating inequity elsewhere. Now we want to conclude by revisiting the purpose of the review in creating outcomes that result in “improved community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and convenient delivery of local services”

F: Improved community engagement

FEPC will rely on the testimony of residents during the first phase of the review to demonstrate that, given the size and nature of the parish, the community feels well served. It may well be that this will also be demonstrated during this current stage of the review process but we will not be able to judge this until the survey results are published in November. We see no substance or detail behind any assertion that a merger of the two parishes will increase engagement. Judging by the comments of Framingham Earl residents, it may actually damage it. Nor have we seen any evidence presented that engagement from Poringland residents will improve as a consequence of a merger.

G: More cohesive communities

Our response here is similar to the one above as cohesion and engagement are inevitably strongly linked. The proposal from PPC provided no tangible evidence of how cohesion would improve following a merger. We have seen a statement in a proposed letter to the Community Governance Review team that “many residents do not realise that the parishes are served by two different bodies.” Not surprisingly, we disagree, but we mention it as an example of a sweeping statement made by PPC without any quantitative evidence to back it up.

H: Better local democracy

We note that the proposal from PPC would see the number of FEPC councillors reduce from 7 to 4 (3 if Framingham Pigot were included). Given that the initial recommendation to the committee was that the number of councillors for FEPC should stay the same, this is a dramatic reduction in representation. As well as the loss of a number of long-standing and experienced parish councillors, the burden on those who may choose to remain would be considerably increased. They would have to represent the interest of a greater number of residents, attend far more frequent meetings and be distracted by the demands of governance emanating from a larger council.

I: More effective and convenient delivery of local services

PPC advance no arguments, so far as we can determine, that local services will become more effective and convenient as a consequence of a merger. There is reference to opening-up possibilities for in-house arrangements for grounds contracts with the implication that this might be cheaper or more effective. Sadly, there is no evidence provided to support this.
It should also be pointed out that we do already share contracted services for verge maintenance with PPC. It is difficult to see that a merged council would have achieved a different outcome to the one already delivered by sensible cooperation on cross-boundary opportunities such as this.

Conclusion

We have done our best to challenge assumptions made in the proposal by PPC and argue that a merger of the two councils would not deliver the outcome the terms of reference of the Community Governance Review seeks to achieve.

Quite rightly, we firmly believe that "the wishes of local inhabitants are primary considerations in this review" in accordance with the terms of reference. Based on the evidence of all those parishioners who commented during the first phase of the review, it is clear that they approve of the current arrangements and have no appetite for change. We find no compelling argument in the PPC proposal to justify overriding their wishes.

Porringland are to be commended for looking at different options. We recognise that arguing for the status quo might be considered a lazy or complacent approach. We have attempted to be open-minded and fair but still cannot find merit in the Committee’s provisional recommendation. We believe that such a significant change to a long-established, well-run and efficient parish council such as FEPC needs to be justified and aligned to the aims of the review in that:

a. It should not result in additional costs to parish residents without a clear and credible financial case. This proposal would see a three-fold increase in the precept paid by Framingham Earl residents.

b. It should not reduce parish representation without clear safeguards or a compelling argument that the new arrangements improve local accountability. Reducing representation from 7 councillors to just 4, despite an increasing population in the parish, will diminish accountability and result in the loss of considerable local experience.

c. It should not extend or complicate parish administration without good reason. FEPC, and other neighbouring parishes, already cooperate when it is of mutual benefit to do so. We would, in particular, draw the committee’s attention to the work of the “Six Strategic Group” which meets regularly and allows for the discussion of issues and developments that impact across the wider community. It also facilitates discussion with agencies that represent cross-boundary concerns such as policing, transport, education and utilities in an efficient and effective way. There are more local aspects where we have recently worked successfully and informally with PPC such as the annual village fete and the maintenance of the “Fiveways” roundabout. None of this has required expensive or disruptive changes to our local governance. It can be achieved just as effectively with common sense and a willingness to collaborate when of mutual benefit.
d. It should not go against the wishes of the residents without an over-arching political or social justification. Whatever their many motivations may be, it seems clear to us that our parishioners have expressed a consistent and unwavering support for the current arrangements. It would significantly damage their faith in the democratic credentials of South Norfolk District Council if those wishes were given no weight in the current review.

Our final comment is simply to draw the attention of committee members to the government guidance to councils undertaking a boundary review. It clearly states that it "believes that the abolition of parishes should not be undertaken unless justified and clearly supported". We hope that we have advanced persuasive arguments to show that there is no justified and clear support to the (effective) abolition of the Framingham Earl Parish council in its current form. Our past record shows that we have reflected the interests of our residents and delivered a service which they value and wish to preserve. We would earnestly like to continue this tradition as an independent parish and in a way which makes our residents proud to say they live in Framingham Earl.
Dear Review Team

Proposal to merge Poringland Parish Council and Framingham Earl Parish Council

I write on behalf of Poringland Parish Council who wish to support the proposal to merge the two above parishes into one administrative area. Poringland Parish Council put forward this proposal and is pleased to see it being taken forward, as the two parishes are completely conjoined. This merger will create greater equality of cost sharing, as currently residents of Framingham Earl enjoy the benefits of services within Poringland without contributing towards the precept. There is no clear definition between the two communities, and many residents do not realise that the two parishes are served by different bodies.

Poringland Parish Council welcomes the proposal for a warding arrangement, as they feel that both parishes must retain an identity, and any distinct interests should be represented by the ward councillors for the area. Proportional seats on the new Council, calculated by the number of electors, would ensure that each area is fairly represented.

In August 2017 the Electoral Arrangements Review Committee recognised that Poringland Parish Council had put forward a compelling argument for the merging of the two parishes into one combined Parish Council. This argument continues to remain valid, and I enclose the relevant information which was presented in the original submission made to Stage 1 of the consultation.

Poringland Parish Council also welcomes the inclusion of the development to the immediate north of the parish boundary, taking this space out of Bixley parish. With the current parish boundary cutting the development into two, with one third in Poringland and two thirds in Bixley, it is unlikely that those new residents will identify with the community of Arminghall, as they will directly join Poringland at The Ramblers.

Poringland Parish Council remains happy to discuss this matter further with members of the Committee, and welcomes the proposals put forward in this stage of the Review.

Yours sincerely

Catherine Moore
Clerk to Poringland Parish Council
Information from Poringland Report into Community Governance Review Proposals – taken from original submission and revised to reflect new proposals

Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council

1.1 Framingham Earl and Poringland are effectively one community divided by the B1332. The High School, serving a much wider area, and the One Stop and Post Office, are in Framingham Earl. The Community Centre, Budgens, the Memorial Playing Field, Cemetery, the Well Pharmacy, the Primary School, several shops, a dentist, optician, garage and both Doctors Surgeries are in Poringland. The Railway Tavern is in Framingham Earl. The Royal Oak and Zaks are in Poringland. But all these facilities are shared by residents of Poringland and Framingham Earl and the wider area. The image below shows the close nature of the boundary, with Poringland on the left of the B1332, and Framingham Earl on the right, until Tulip Tree Drive:

![Map showing the boundary between Poringland and Framingham Earl](image)

1.2 It can be seen that the area is completely conjoined, without even the use of the natural boundary of Long Lane being used to draw the line. The nature of both parishes has changed enormously since the last review, mainly due to the additional house building.

1.3 There is no clear divide between the two parishes in the areas between Long Road and Rectory Lane. St Mary’s Road, All Saints Road and St Anne’s Road adjoin but are currently in different parishes. In Burgate Lane, one side of the road is in Poringland, the other in Framingham Earl. The same applies for Norwich Road (B1332). No clear boundary between them exists. The images below show just how undefined the boundaries are.
The white house on the left is in Framingham Earl, the lamppost on the right is in Poringland.

The same junction with the white house behind the tree. The grey car is parked in Poringland.

1.4 The "Fiveways" roundabout is effectively shared between the two parishes and recent concerns about the state of the roundabout have required a special sub committee to be set up with a potential for disagreement as to how costs should be borne.

The boundary of the parishes is directly down the middle of this roundabout.

On All Saints Road, the boundary is at the edge of the grass next to the blue car on the left, and at the wall just the other side of the silver car on the left. The property the other side of the house in the foreground on the right pays a different level of council tax to a different authority, despite broadly enjoying the same services.

In Burgate Lane, the red house on the left is in Framingham Earl and the cream house on the right is in Poringland.

1.5 This would bring together Poringland and Framingham Earl into one administrative area.

1.6 There is financial merit in merging these areas into one Parish Council. Performing a simple calculation to add the precepts of the two areas together, then divide by the sum total of the tax base results in an
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indicative Band D precept of £69.57. This is a considerable increase for Framingham Earl but a reduction for Poringland. However with so many of the services offered through the Poringland precept being used by residents of Framingham Earl, it seems fair to spread the cost across the communities. These services include things like bus shelters, the Community Centre, play areas, the burial ground, and much more.

1.7 This merger would result in Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council having responsibility for a population of around 5,190, electorate of approx 4,340 and a tax base of around 2,173.

1.8 It would be proposed that Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council would be made up of 13 councillors:
- Poringland – 80% - 9 councillors
- Framingham Earl – 20% - 4 councillors

1.9 Poringland Parish Council has made significant changes over the past couple of years. It has reduced levels of bureaucracy and become more transparent and open to residents. It has become more strategic in the way it operates. The Council has achieved Foundation Award Status under the Local Council Award Scheme and is working towards achieving the Quality Award Status, with a view to applying when the electoral mandate requirements have been met.

1.10 Poringland Parish Council already has a full time clerk and a part time assistant clerk, who also manages the Community Centre. Poringland has caretaking staff (1 employed, together with an outsourced arrangement for relief caretaking), an administrator, and a street cleaner. Poringland has numerous contractors looking after existing areas within the parish. Any new Council would need a new governance structure, to administrate the needs of the larger working area. There could, for example, be opportunities to create in-house arrangements for grounds contracts, if the area covered was widened. The reduction in duplicated costs such as senior staff, administration (eg insurance) and other costs would result in financial savings and increased efficiency.

1.11 There is a great deal of sense in creating a larger administrative area. Recent issues with Anglian Water, who are replacing much of the local water supply, have demonstrated that problems impact on residents across existing parishes. If The Street and Norwich Road are dug up, it affects residents on one side of the road in Framingham Earl and Poringland on the other. This is just one example of many, demonstrating why it would be preferable to create a new Parish Council for the wider area of Poringland and Framingham Earl.