

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent: 12 October 2017 09:50

To: [REDACTED]
Review

Subject: Community Governance Review - Framingham Pigot Parish Meeting

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to record that I am very strongly opposed to and can see no benefit of Framingham Pigot Parish Meeting merging with Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Councils.

I am also strongly opposed to the suggestion of residents of Framingham Pigot on the north side of the A146 becoming part of Kirby Bedon.

Framingham Pigot Parish Meeting is a close knit community who work together on all Parish matters and fully support our Chairman, Ben Du Brow when he puts forward his submission on refusal of this suggestion of merging boundaries.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Nicola Tullock

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2017 11:25
To: Review
Subject: Community Governance Review - Framingham Pigot Parish Meeting

Importance: High

Dear Sir/Madam

I write to you as Chairman of Framingham Pigot Parish Meeting to state that we held a Parish Meeting on Thursday 5 October 2017. At this meeting I was instructed to write to you with the decision of the members, comprising well over a third of the population of Framingham Pigot. Many other parishioners had read the Governance Review prepared by Councillor Lewis and/or the recent submission by Poringland Parish Council to yourselves and asked that their total rejection of the proposals be recorded at our Parish Meeting.

The main purpose of this meeting was to consider the submission made by Poringland Parish Council many weeks ago. Our Meeting considered fully the submission made under the Community Governance Review by Poringland and following extensive discussion and debate upon the proposal, there was a unanimous decision made that Framingham Pigot rejects completely the proposal and without exception, every member wished to retain the present arrangements. They felt very strongly that a great number of the items mentioned in the Poringland submission were totally incorrect and indeed were misleading to a major extent. Such items include the statement that there has been a period of consultation with ourselves and this is totally incorrect. In 3.3. of their submission, they state that our Parish is an anomaly and further in 4.7 we have a democratic deficit. We totally reject the statement and indeed the even more outlandish beliefs further listed under this paragraph.

We have a fully enabled population who hold regular meetings as and when needed and we have an extensive consultation process by emails and letters as and when items occur together with appropriate committees to consider items such as planning applications.

You will have no doubt seen the responses written direct to you from the Parishioners to the north of the A146 pointing out that they totally reject the suggestion that they be joined in with Kirby Bedon and indeed they point out that their houses are further away from Kirby Bedon than they are from the centre of Framingham Pigot and they all wish unanimously to remain part of the existing arrangements and indeed are backed unanimously by the village as a whole.

We are aware that there have been suggestions lately that Framingham Earl should be the only Parish that should be joined with Poringland and we are well aware from direct contact with them that they likewise object strongly to this suggestion and like ourselves they had not been consulted or involved in the proposal being put forward to South Norfolk Council.

It is believed that a considerable number of our Parishioners are writing to you direct but should you wish to see individual evidence/indications of people's abhorrence to the proposal submitted to you, we can readily make these available should you wish to see them.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature block]

Tel: Office [Redacted]
Home : [Redacted]
Cell : [Redacted]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2017 10:31
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW . "Moving" of Framingham Pigot to Kirby Bedon

>> This Consultation Response is a consolidated response on behalf of those listed below who would be directly affected by this proposal.
>> >> POTENTIAL FRAMINGHAM PIGOT BOUNDARY CHANGE
>> >> Poringland Parish Council have put forward a wide-ranging proposal as part of the Community Governance Review. Amongst other matters (Paras 4.6 to 4.9) it suggests that "for the purposes of completeness, Framingham Pigot's boundaries and features have been explored". It concludes that 6 houses on the north side of the A146 should be moved to the administrative area of Kirby Bedon.
>> >> We, the residents of Framingham Pigot on the north side of the A146, would like to comment specifically on the paragraphs 4.6-4.9.
>> >> 1. the total number of houses affected is 15, not 6 as stated. This is an illustration of the lack of diligence and "exploration" in this Proposal.
>> >> 2. assuming 2 voters per household this equates to 30 voters, almost 25% of the total of 129 voters in Framingham Pigot, a significant change.
>> >> 3. no rational justification, is provided to support this proposal. The Parish Boundaries have been in existence for decades. To our knowledge, their ability to support their residents has never been questioned.
>> >> 4. no consultation has been carried out by Poringland Parish Council on this proposal. It appears that they feel that they can just ride rough shod over the wishes of local residents. Perhaps local politicians can do that in an expanding village of 6,000+, but the smaller community of Framingham Pigot does not wish to be part of such a process. We prefer real local democracy in which people genuinely participate.
>> >> 5. no real and meaningful benefits, economic or political, to those affected by the A146 change, have been put forward. To a larger population like Poringland a Parish Meeting is inappropriate. To a smaller community like Framingham Pigot it is well attended and more than adequately addresses matters noted such as planning applications etc.

