ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Electoral Arrangements Review Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on 15 August 2017 at 2:00pm.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: C Kemp (Chairman), C Easton, J Fuller, K Kiddie and T Lewis

Apologies: Councillor: J Mooney

Substitute Members: Councillor: L Hornby

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors: Y Bendle, D Bills, M Edney, D Fulcher, M Gray, J Overton, T Palmer, R Savage and K Worsley

Officers in Attendance: The Electoral Services Manager (J Tovee-Galey) and the Electoral Services Officer (N Tullock)

Public Speaking:

Hilary Elias – Clerk to Costessey Town Council
Cllr Patrick O’Conner – Costessey Town Council
Cllr Nigel Frankland – Chairman of Burston and Shimpling Parish Council
Cllr Charles Bussey – Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council
Cllr Dick Mitchell – Chairman of Heywood Parish
Catherine Moore – Clerk to Poringland Parish Council
Stephen Ward – On behalf of Spooner Row, Suton and Wattlefield Residents
Cllr David Skedge – Chairman of Bergh Apton Parish Council
John Pennell – Clerk to Tacolneston Parish Council
Cllr Terrance Blacker – Chairman of Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council
Bobbie Bennett – Clerk to Long Stratton Parish Council
Deborah Sarson – Clerk to Diss Town Council

20 members of the public were also in attendance
25. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor L Hornby</td>
<td>Other Interest – Wymondham Town Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor C Kemp</td>
<td>Other Interest – Was present at parish council meetings where the Community Governance Review had been discussed but gave procedural advice only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kiddie</td>
<td>Other Interest – County Councillor for Diss and Roydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Lewis</td>
<td>Other Interest – Presented information at parish council meetings but no advice was given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Easton</td>
<td>Other Interest – Present at Parish Council meetings where the Community Governance Review had been discussed but no advice was given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. **MINUTES**

Subject to a minor amendment, the minutes of the Electoral Arrangements Review Committee held on 7 February 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27. **COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

The Electoral Services Manager presented her report which sought to confirm the draft proposals following the first phase of consultation to the 2017-2018 South Norfolk Community Governance Review. She highlighted that the number of responses had been considerable with 631 representations received. Members noted that any further changes proposed following the second phase of consultation would need to be approved, in certain circumstances, by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

The Chairman advised that the District boundary review had already taken place ahead of the Community Governance Review and that any proposed parish boundary changes would be required to respect current County, District and Parliamentary boundaries. Members noted that the timing of these reviews had caused a significant knock-on effect on the Council’s ability to change some parish boundaries and expressed their disappointment regarding the limited scope for changes which could be made. However, it was suggested and agreed that, during its deliberations, where the Committee strongly felt that a change would be beneficial but would require the permission of the Boundary Commission, this should be noted and that the Council would consider making a submission to the Commission for its consideration and final decision.
Members noted that an informal members’ working group of the Committee had recently considered the responses received following the first phase of consultation and had made provisional recommendations, which were summarised in Appendix 2 of the report.

The Committee considered each parish in turn and made its proposals, as detailed in Appendix 1 of these minutes. Where changes were considered, details of the discussions are given below:

**Beck Vale, Dickleburgh and Scole**
The Chairman of Dickleburgh & Rushall Parish Council addressed the Committee and suggested a minor boundary change between Burston & Shimpling and Dickleburgh & Rushall. Members discussed the proposed change and agreed that, although it had the support of both parish councils, it would involve changes to the district boundary so would require approval by the Boundary Commission. (See Map 1, as appended to these minutes).

The Committee considered the proposed merger of Tivetshall St Margaret with Tivetshall St Mary and it was agreed that these would be merged to create Tivetshall Parish Council, with 7 Councillors, as recommended in Appendix 2 of the report. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Pulham Market should remain as 9, and the number for Scole should remain as 11. (See Map 1, as appended to these minutes).

**Bressingham and Burston**
The Chairman of Heywood Parish Meeting addressed the Committee and raised concerns to the proposed changes, as detailed in the report. He advised members that all the neighbouring parish councils agreed that the changes were unnecessary and suggested that the recommendations did not adhere to Community Governance Review Guidelines. The Chairman of Burston & Shimpling Parish Council echoed these views and asked the Committee to reconsider the proposed changes. Following a brief discussion, it was agreed that these changes were unnecessary and that the existing boundaries should be maintained. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Bressingham should be reduced to 7, and that the number for Gissing should remain as 5.

**Brooke**
The Chairman of Bergh Apton Parish Council advised the Committee that he was pleased with the recommendations contained in the report. The Committee agreed that, as the majority of responses did not seek any changes, the boundary would remain unchanged. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Brooke should remain as 9, and that the number for Mundham should remain as 11.
**Bunwell**
The Tacolneston Parish Clerk 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. The Committee agreed that these changes should be implemented. (See Map 3, as appended to these minutes).

Cllr Easton highlighted that there would be difficulties in merging Carleton Rode and Bunwell as the two Council’s precepts were different, and members agreed that there was insufficient justification for this change.

**Cringleford**
The Electoral Services Manager advised that, although the changes suggested by Cringleford Parish Council to boundaries between Keswick & Intwood and Caistor St Edmund would be possible, they would be difficult to justify due to a lack of evidence bought forward following the first phase of consultation. After discussion, the Committee suggested that changes between Keswick & Intwood and Caistor St Edmund would be considered further and, if agreed, would be proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission. (See Map 4, as appended to these minutes).

**Diss and Roydon**
The Diss Town Clerk advised the Committee that Diss Town Council was seeking to create a sensible boundary between Diss and Roydon and highlighted that, although this was a sensitive issue, there needed to be a clear defined boundary. She stated that the recommendations made in the report had gone further than the representations which had been submitted. The Electoral Services Manager advised that the proposed changes would affect around 300 electors and, following discussion, it was agreed that changes proposed to the boundary between Diss and Roydon should be approved, subject to the comments of Roydon Parish Council. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Diss should be increased to 14, as recommended in the report. (See Map 5, as appended to these minutes).

It was also agreed that there was no justification for a merger between Roydon and Bressingham and that the number of Councillors for Roydon remain as 9, as recommended.

**Ditchingham and Earsham**
Cllr Gray addressed the Committee and suggested that the boundary be changed to move one house from Wortwell into Alburgh. The Electoral Services Manager advised that this change would need approval by the Boundary Commission as it would affect a ward boundary. After debate, it was suggested that this be further considered and, if agreed, proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission. (See Map 6, as appended to these minutes).
The Committee considered the changes, proposed by the parish council, to the boundary between Denton and Earsham and agreed that these changes should be made (Map 6). It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Ellingham should remain as 5, and the number for Kirby Cane should remain as 4, as recommended in the report.

**Easton**
After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Parish Councillors for Easton be increased to 10, as recommended.

**Forncett**
After consideration, it was agreed that there was no justification to separate Tharston and Hapton, or to merge Tacolneston with Forncett, as proposed during the consultation.

**Harleston**
For Wortwell, please see Ditchingham and Earsham, above. (See Map 7, as appended to these minutes).

After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Parish Councillors for Redenhall with Harleston remain as 11.

**Hempnall**
An amendment was noted that the current number of Councillors for Tasburgh Parish Council should be listed as 9.
After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Parish Councillors for Hempnall should be reduced to 8 and that the number of Councillors for Morningthorpe and Fritton should remain as 5.

**Hethersett**
Members discussed the current boundary, its relationship to the A47, and how Lodge Farm residents felt that they were part of Old Costessey. After consideration, it was agreed to propose that Lodge Farm be moved from Bawburgh into Old Costessey but noted that these changes would need approval by the Boundary Commission. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Bawburgh should be reduced to 5.

The Committee discussed a minor boundary change which had been proposed between Bawburgh and Little Melton and it was suggested that this change be considered further and, if agreed, would be proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission. (See Map 8, as appended to these minutes)

It was discussed and agreed that the changes suggested between Little Melton & Hethersett were approved. (See Map 8, as appended to these minutes)

Members did not support a proposed boundary change between Little Melton and Colney as it would mean warding a small area. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Hethersett should be increased to 14.
**Hingham and Deopham**
After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Councillors for Hingham Town should remain at 9.

**Loddon and Chedgrave**
After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Parish Councillors for Chedgrave remain at 9, and for Loddon remain as 11, as recommended. It was also agreed that there was insufficient justification for a merger of Hales and Heckingham with Raveningham & Stockton.

**Mulbarton and Stoke Holy Cross**
Cllr Bussey from Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council addressed the Committee and spoke of his concerns regarding the parish boundary. The Committee advised that, although understandable, Cllr Bussey’s proposal would mean that one property would need to be warded separately, due to the district boundaries already in place, and suggested that the issue might be reviewed at the next opportunity.

After consideration of the proposals in the report, it was agreed that approximately 20 houses be moved from East Carleton to Swardeston, although it was noted that this would be subject to representations received following the second phase of consultation. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Bracon Ash Parish Council would be decreased from 9 to 7. Members agreed that no changes would be made to the current boundaries between Fundenhall and Ashwellthorpe and between Bracon Ash and Flordon, due to lack of justification received during the first phase of consultation, and that changes proposed for Wreningham were not justified as this would involve the warding of small areas.

**Newton Flotman**
After consideration, it was agreed that there was no justification for changes to be made to the boundary between Saxlingham Nethergate and Shotesham. It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Saxlingham Nethergate Parish Council should remain at 9, the number for Newton Flotman should remain as 7, and that the proposed boundary change between Howe and Shotesham would not be approved due to the crossing of ward boundaries.

**Old Costessey and New Costessey**
The Costessey Town Clerk addressed the Committee and expressed the council’s views regarding the boundaries. She advised that both Bawburgh Parish Council and Costessey Town Council both supported the proposed recommendations to maintain the current boundaries, and read out a statement from Bawburgh Parish Council to confirm their opinion. The Electoral Services Manager advised that the changes originally proposed to move boundaries in the North of Costessey would not be possible as they were out of the South Norfolk District, and that the other boundary changes would require consent from Boundary Commission.
It was noted that the changes proposed to the boundary around Lodge Farm would move part of Bawburgh into Old Costessey, as discussed earlier for Bawburgh. (See Map 10, as appended to these minutes)

**Poringland, The Framinghams and Trowse**
The Poringland Parish Clerk addressed the Committee and spoke of the proposals for the merger of Poringland and Framingham Earl. She suggested that the residents of Framingham Earl already enjoyed the facilities of Poringland and that a merger of the two would be sensible as the current boundary was confusing for residents. The Committee heard a statement from Framingham Earl Parish Council, who was not represented at the meeting, which stated that Framingham Earl did not feel that a merger or any changes would be of benefit to the community. Members were generally supportive of a merger between Poringland and Framingham Earl but expressed some concerns that residents of Framingham Earl and their parish council had not supported the proposal. The Committee also considered the proposal that part of Bixley be moved into Poringland, as detailed in the report, (See Map 11, as appended to these minutes) and were in agreement with this suggestion. After consideration, it was agreed to recommend that Poringland and Framingham Earl combine and become two wards, ‘Poringland Ward’ and ‘Framingham Earl Ward’, with a joint parish council, ‘Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council’. It was agreed that the current number of Councillors would remain unchanged.

Members considered and agreed the proposal that the remainder of Bixley be merged with Caistor St Edmund to form Caistor St Edmund and Bixley Parish Council. (See Map 12, as appended to these minutes). It was also agreed that the number of Councillors for Trowse Newton would remain as 9.

**Rockland**
After consideration, it was agreed that Ashby St Mary form a joint parish with Thurton to be named Ashby St Mary and Thurton Parish Council, and that that Ashby St Mary Ward have 4 Councillors and Thurton Ward have 5 Councillors. (See Map 13, as appended to these minutes)

It was agreed that other suggested changes were not made as there was no justification for any further changes.

**Stratton**
The Long Stratton Parish Clerk addressed the Committee and expressed the Council’s support for the proposed changes, as detailed in the report. Cllr Fulcher stated that he did not agree with the recommendations and instead suggested that Long Stratton be merged with Tharston and Hapton. Cllr Worsley spoke in support of the views of the Parish Council and stressed the importance that the number of Councillors for Long Stratton be increased to 13, due to the planned future growth in the area.

Members voted and it was unanimously agreed that there would be no changes to the boundary for Long Stratton, the number of Councillors would be increased to 13, and that the Council would support Long Stratton in its arrangements for the parish council to become a town council.

JR / EARC
**Wicklewood**
After consideration, it was agreed that the number of Councillors for Kimberley would remain as 5, the number for Barford would remain as 5 and for Wramplingham would remain as 2.

**Wymondham**
Stephen Ward, representing the residents of Spooner Row, Suton and Wattlefield, addressed the Committee to advise members of the residents’ proposals to form a boundary between Wymondham Town and Spooner Row. He stressed that the views were overwhelming and he presented members with proposals for boundary changes, indicating how the polling district line seemed a natural boundary.

Cllr Savage provided the Committee with a verbal statement and expressed his views that Spooner Row should not be separated from Wymondham Town. Cllr Savage advised members that the Town Council had not submitted a representation as they had been unaware of Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton’s intentions until recently. The Electoral Services Manager confirmed that all town and parish councils had been asked to make representation even if they did not propose any changes.

Members raised concerns that some parish and town councils struggled to maintain a full council and find it difficult to function, due to the lack of commitment. In response, Stephen Ward stated he was already aware of four people who would be keen to join the Community Council and he therefore did not foresee this being an issue.

The Chairman read a statement from Cllr J Hornby who was unable to attend the meeting. The statement explained his overall view that Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton would be better served if they continued to be served by Wymondham Town Council and expressed concerns that residents were not fully aware of the implications of the split.

After consideration, it was felt that there was sufficient evidence for the proposals to be put forward to the second phase of consultation with the recommendations for Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton to be separated from Wymondham Town Council and Spooner Row Community Council be formed (See Map 14, as appended to these minutes). It was also recommended that Spooner Row Community Council have 7 Councillors.
The Committee suggested that, where towns and parishes wished to hold community meetings or open days, they could request that a member of the Electoral Arrangements Review Committee attend but that parish councils and community groups should take overall responsibility for arranging such meetings. Officers agreed that, where changes were suggested which affected a small number of properties, the residents would be consulted. It was suggested and agreed that the Electoral Services Manager contact the Boundary Commission to obtain an opinion on the small changes suggested by the Committee that may have an effect on District or County boundaries, and that she would consult with Cllrs Kemp, Kiddie and Lewis regarding the wording for a press release, the process to determine the apportionment of assets and liabilities, and other issues during the lead up to the start of the second phase of consultation, which would commence on 31 August 2017.

The Chairman thanked officers for their work and it was then **RESOLVED** to agree that:

1. the proposals, as above and as noted within the Appendix 1 to these minutes, be put forward to the second phase of consultation;

2. where changes were suggested which affect a small number of properties, the residents would be consulted by officers;

3. the Electoral Services Manager contact the Boundary Commission to obtain an opinion on the small changes suggested by the Committee, that may have an effect on District or County boundaries;

   and

4. the Electoral Services Manager consult with Cllrs Kemp, Kiddie and Lewis regarding the wording for a press release, the process to determine the apportionment of assets and liabilities, and other issues during the lead up to the start of the second phase of consultation, which would commence on 31 August 2017.

(The meeting closed at 6:35 pm)

____________________
Chairman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Summary of boundary changes requested</th>
<th>Preliminary findings</th>
<th>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Brockdish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Dickleburgh and Rushall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 9.</td>
<td>1. A minor boundary change between Burston and Shimpling and Dickleburgh and Rushall to be considered and, if agreed, proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission, as the district boundary would be affected. (See Map 1) 2. No further changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 9.</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Merge with Pulham Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that no changes are made as there is no evidence of substantial local support for a merge</td>
<td>No changes proposed as there is no evidence of substantial local support for a merge with Pulham Market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Scole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 11</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Starston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Tivetshall St Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recommend that the joint parish is merged into one single parish, “Tivetshall Parish Council”</td>
<td>Agreed to merge and remove wards to create Tivetshall Parish Council with 7 Councillors. (See Map 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Tivetshall St Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommend that number of Councillors for the new parish be 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beck Vale, Dickleburgh &amp; Scole</td>
<td>Tivetshall St Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed to merge and remove wards to create Tivetshall Parish Council with 7 Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Bressingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be reduced to 7</td>
<td>Agreed to reduce to the number of Councillors to 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Burston &amp; Shimpling</td>
<td>Existing parish council merge with Gissing - Separate parish council for Shimpling - and changes to boundary between Heywood and Burston &amp; Shimpling</td>
<td>1. Recommend that the changes suggested which cross Ward boundaries are not approved as this would involved warding small areas. 2. Recommend that changes to Heywood and Burston &amp; Shimpling are considered (as per map) subject to comments from residents.</td>
<td>1. Agreed that the changes suggested which cross Ward boundaries are not approved as this would involved warding small areas. 2. Agreed that the changes proposed to Heywood and Burston &amp; Shimpling be refused and existing boundaries be maintained as the changes were deemed unnecessary. 3. Please see Map 2 for changes as a result of a request from Dickleburgh and Rushall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Gissing</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 5</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Heywood</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Shelfanger</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Tibenham</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bressingham &amp; Burston</td>
<td>Winfarthing</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Bergh Apton</td>
<td>Merge with Alpington &amp; Yelverton / Thurton</td>
<td>Recommend that no change is necessary or required by the majority of residents responding</td>
<td>Agreed that no change is necessary or required by the majority of residents responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 9.</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Kirstead</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Mundsham</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be kept at 5</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Seething</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Alpington</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Yelverton</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td>Aslacton</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary of boundary changes requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preliminary findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td>Boundary change between Carleton Rode and Bunwell</td>
<td>Recommend changes to Bunwell and Carleton Road (as per map), subject to comments from residents</td>
<td>Agreed that boundary changes be made to Bunwell and Carleton Road (as per Map 3), subject to comments from residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td>Carleton Rode</td>
<td>Merge with Bunwell</td>
<td>Recommend no to merger as there is insufficient justification for the proposed changes to be made</td>
<td>1. Agree that no merger take place as there is insufficient justification for the proposed changes to be made 2. Agreed that boundary changes be made to Bunwell and Carleton Road (as per Map 3), subject to comments from residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bunwell</td>
<td>Great Moulton</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cringleford</td>
<td>Colney</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cringleford</td>
<td>Cringleford</td>
<td>Boundary change along the A47 (Southern Bypass)</td>
<td>1. Recommend that the changes suggested by Cringleford Parish Council are not approved as they cross Ward boundaries 2. Recommend that the number of Councillors be kept as 11</td>
<td>1. Agreed that the changes between Keswick &amp; Intwood and Caistor St Edmund would be considered further and, if agreed, would be proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission, as the district boundary would be affected. (See Map 4) 2. No further changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cringleford</td>
<td>Keswick &amp; Intwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Diss &amp; Roydon</td>
<td>Diss Town</td>
<td>Increase to no. of councillors to 14 and boundary change</td>
<td>1. As Diss Town above 2. Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 9 . 3. Recommend no merger as there is insufficient justification for the proposed changes to be made</td>
<td>1. Agree changes to boundary between Diss and Roydon (as per Map 5), subject to comments from Roydon Parish Council. 2. Agree that number of Councillors remain as 9. 3. Agree there is no justification for a merger between Roydon and Bressingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Diss &amp; Roydon</td>
<td>Roydon</td>
<td>Consider merge with Bressingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Alburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Bedingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Broome</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>Boundary change between Denton and Earsham</td>
<td>Recommend no changes as there is insufficient justification for the proposed changes to be made</td>
<td>Agreed to amend the boundary between Denton and Earsham, as per the parish council's request (See Map 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Ditchingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that the number of Councillors be reduced to 9</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Earsham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed to amend the boundary between Denton and Earsham, as per the parish council's request (See Map 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Geldeston</td>
<td>Possible boundary changes between Mundham / Seething</td>
<td>Recommend that the changes suggested are not approved as they cross Ward boundaries</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Hedenham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Ellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors be remain as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Kirby Cane</td>
<td>Reduction in the no. of councillors (Kirby Cane)</td>
<td>Recommend that the number of Councillors remains as 4</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors be remain as 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Thwaite St Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditchingham &amp; Earsham</td>
<td>Woodton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors be increased to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Great Melton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Marlingford and Colton</td>
<td>Suggested boundary change would be out of South Norfolk district boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornsett</td>
<td>Fornsett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornsett</td>
<td>Tacolneston</td>
<td>Merge with Fornsett</td>
<td>Recommend no changes to be made as insufficient justification for changes</td>
<td>Agreed that there was insufficient justification to merge Tacolneston with Fornsett.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Forncett</td>
<td>Tharston and Hapton</td>
<td>Separate Tharston and Hapton. Working group to be set up between Long Stratton, Wacton and Tharston &amp; Hapton to agree.</td>
<td>Recommend no changes to be made as insufficient justification for changes.</td>
<td>Agreed that there was insufficient justification to separate Tharston and Hapton, as proposed during the consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Forncett</td>
<td>Wacton</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Harleston</td>
<td>Needham</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Harleston</td>
<td>Redenhall with Harleston Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that the number of Councillors remains as 11</td>
<td>No change, number of Councillors to remain as 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Harleston</td>
<td>Wortwell</td>
<td>Boundary change between Alburgh and Wortwell / merge with Redenhall</td>
<td>Recommend that the changes suggested are not approved as they cross Ward boundaries</td>
<td>Agreed that the changes suggested by Cllr Gray to move one house from Wortwell to Alburgh be further considered and, if agreed, proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission, as the district boundary would be affected. (See Map 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Hempnall</td>
<td>Hempnall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be reduced to 8</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be reduced to 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Hempnall</td>
<td>Morningthorpe and Fritton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be increased to 7</td>
<td>No change keep as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Hempnall</td>
<td>Hardwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Hempnall</td>
<td>Shelton and Hardwick see Hardwick</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Hempnall</td>
<td>Tasburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 9</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Hempnall</td>
<td>Topcroft</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Hethersett</td>
<td>Bawburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Agreed to propose that Lodge Farm be moved into Old Costessey but noted that these changes would need approval by the Boundary Commission. 2. Reduce number of Councillors to 5. 3. Recommend that a minor boundary changes between Bawburgh and Little Melton be considered further and, if agreed, would be proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission. (See Map 8 for details)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hethersett        | Hethersett      | Merge with Wymondham                   | 1. Recommend changes are not approved as they cross Ward boundaries.  
2. Recommend that number of Councillors be increased to 14.                      | 1. Agree changes are not approved as not feasible and they cross Ward boundaries.  
2. Agree that number of Councillors be increased to 14.                           |
| Hethersett        | Little Melton   | Boundary change                        | 1. Recommend that the changes suggested between Little Melton & Hethersett are approved (see map).  
2. Recommend that changes suggested between Little Melton and Bawburgh Parish are not approved as Bawburgh Parish was warded by the LGBCE during the District Boundary Review and there is no significant justification to change this.  
3. Recommend that boundary change between Colney and Little Melton is not approved as this would mean warding a small area. | 1. Agree that the changes suggested between Little Melton & Hethersett are approved (see map 8).  
2. Recommend that number of Councillors remain at 7.  
3. Recommend that a minor boundary change between Bawburgh and Little Melton be considered further and, if agreed, would be proposed in a submission to the Boundary Commission.  
4. The boundary change between Little Melton and Colney would not be approved as it would mean warding a small area. (See Map 8 for details) |
<p>| Hingham &amp; Deopham | Deopham         |                                        | No change                                                                            | Agree that number of Councillors remain at 11.                                   |
| Hingham &amp; Deopham | Hingham Town    |                                        | Recommend that number of Councillors be kept as 11                                    | Agree that number of Councillors remain at 11.                                   |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Chedgrave       | Reduce number councillors               | Recommend that number of Councillors be kept as 9                                     | Agree that number of Councillors remain at 9                                     |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Hales           | Merge Hales &amp; Heckingham with Raveningham &amp; Stockton | Recommend no changes to be made as insufficient justification for changes            | Agree that there is no justification for a merger of Hales &amp; Heckingham with Raveningham &amp; Stockton |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Heckingham      |                                        | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Langley with Hardley |                                    | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Loddon          |                                        | Recommend that number of Councillors be kept as 11                                    | Agree that number of Councillors remain at 11.                                   |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Norton Subcourse|                                        | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Raveningham     |                                        | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Stockton       |                                        | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |
| Loddon &amp; Chedgrave| Sisland         |                                        | No change                                                                            |                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Summary of boundary changes requested</th>
<th>Preliminary findings</th>
<th>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Bracon Ash</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be decreased to 7</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors be decreased to 7</td>
<td>Agree changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per Map 9) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>East Carleton</td>
<td>Boundary change to move Lower East Carleton to join Swardston</td>
<td>1. Recommend changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per map) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td>Agree changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per Map 9) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Flordon</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Mulbarton</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Swardeston</td>
<td>Agree changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per map) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td>Agree changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per Map 9) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td>Agree changes to boundary to move approx 20 houses from East Carleton to Swardston (as per Map 9) and subject to comments from parish council and residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Ashwellthorpe</td>
<td>Recommend that no changes are made as there is no significant justification to make changes</td>
<td>Recommend that no changes are made as there is no significant justification to make changes</td>
<td>Agree that there is no justification for the separation of Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Ketteringham</td>
<td>See East Carleton</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Mulbarton &amp; Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>Wreningham</td>
<td>1. Recommend that the changes suggested which cross Ward boundaries are not approved as this would involved warding small areas. 2. Recommend that changes suggested between Bracon Ash and Flordon Parish are not approved as there is no significant justification to change this.</td>
<td>1. Agree that no changes be made to Bracon Ash and Flordon, due to lack of justification received during the first phase of consultation. 2. Agree that the changes proposed for Wreningham were not justified as this would involve the warding of small areas.</td>
<td>1. Agree that no changes be made to Bracon Ash and Flordon, due to lack of justification received during the first phase of consultation. 2. Agree that the changes proposed for Wreningham were not justified as this would involve the warding of small areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 7</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 7</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Saxlingham Nethergate</td>
<td>Boundary change between Saxlingham Nethergate &amp; Shotesham</td>
<td>1. Recommend that no changes are made as there is no significant justification to make changes 2. Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 9</td>
<td>1. Agree that no changes be made to the boundary between Saxlingham Nethergate and Shotesham due to a lack of justification to make changes. 2. Agree that number of Councillors remains as 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Shotesham</td>
<td>Boundary change between Howe</td>
<td>Recommend that the change suggested is not approved as it would cross ward boundaries</td>
<td>Agree that the proposed boundary change between Howe and Shotesham is not approved due to the crossing of ward boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Newton Flotman</td>
<td>Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>Separate Queens Hills and amend Costessey /Bawburgh boundaries to match District Boundaries agreed by LGBCE. Also boundary changes with Norwich (which are across district boundaries)</td>
<td>Recommend not to approve any changes as suggested boundary changes are not possible as they are out of the South Norfolk district area, and the other boundary changes would require consent from LGBCE</td>
<td>1. Agree not to approve any changes as suggested boundary changes are not possible as they are out of the South Norfolk District, and the other boundary changes would require consent from the Boundary Commission 2. Agree to propose that Lodge Farm be moved into Old Costessey but noted that these changes would need approval by the Boundary Commission. (See Map 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Old Costessey &amp; New Costessey</td>
<td>Costessey</td>
<td>Combined Community council with Poringland and others - combine with Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Recommend to make changes to the north of Poringland (as per map)</td>
<td>Agree to make changes to the north of Poringland (as per Map 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Poringland, Framingham &amp; Trowse</td>
<td>Bixley</td>
<td>Merge with Bixley or Armingahall</td>
<td>Recommend that Bixley merges with Caistor St Edmund to form &quot;Caistor St Edmund and Bixley Parish Council&quot;</td>
<td>Agree that Bixley merges with Caistor St Edmund to form &quot;Caistor St Edmund and Bixley Parish Council&quot; (See Map 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Poringland, Framingham &amp; Trowse</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund</td>
<td>Possible boundary change / merge with Framingham Pigot</td>
<td>1. Recommend that no changes are made as there is no significant justification to make changes 2. Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 7</td>
<td>Agree to recommend that Poringland and Framingham Earl combine and become two wards, ‘Poringland Ward’ and ‘Framingham Earl Ward’, with a joint parish council, ‘Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council’. (See Map 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poringland, Framingham Earl</td>
<td>Poringland pigot</td>
<td>Merge options with various PC's Bixley, Framlingham Earl, Framingham Pigot, Caistor St Edmund &amp; Upper Stoke</td>
<td>1. Recommend suggested changes are not approved as insufficient reason for changes</td>
<td>Agree to recommend that Poringland and Framingham Earl combine and become two wards, 'Poringland Ward' and 'Framingham Earl Ward', with a joint parish council, 'Poringland and Framingham Earl Parish Council'. (See Map 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trowse with Newton</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors remain as 9</td>
<td>1. Agree that Ashby St Mary form a joint parish with Thurton to be named <em>Ashby St Mary and Thurton Parish Council</em> 2. Recommend that Ashby have 4 Councillors and Thurton have 5 Councillors 3. Recommend that other suggested changes are not made as there is insufficient justification for changes</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trowse with Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Agree that Ashby St Mary form a joint parish with Thurton to be named <em>Ashby St Mary and Thurton Parish Council</em> (See Map 13) 2. Agree that Ashby have 4 Councillors and Thurton have 5 Councillors 3. Agree that there is insufficient justification for any other proposed changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton St Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Agree that there is insufficient justification for any other proposed changes 2. Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claxton</td>
<td>Merge with Carleton St Peter</td>
<td>1. Agree that there is insufficient justification for any other proposed changes 2. Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holverston</td>
<td>Possible boundary changes between Kirby Bedon &amp; Trowse</td>
<td>Recommend that the changes suggested which cross Ward boundaries are not approved as there is insufficient justification</td>
<td>Agree that changes suggested which cross ward boundaries are not approved as there is insufficient justification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirby Bedon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockland St Mary</td>
<td>Recommend that number of Councillors remains as 6</td>
<td>1. Agree that Ashby St Mary form a joint parish with Thurton to be named &quot;Ashby St Mary and Thurton Parish Council&quot; 2. Agree that Ashby have 4 Councillors and Thurton have 5 Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hellington</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Agree that there is insufficient justification for any other proposed changes 2. Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surlingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Agree that there is insufficient justification for any other proposed changes 2. Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>See Ashby St Mary</td>
<td>1. Agree that Ashby St Mary form a joint parish with Thurton to be named &quot;Ashby St Mary and Thurton Parish Council&quot; 2. Agree that Ashby have 4 Councillors and Thurton have 5 Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Summary of boundary changes requested</td>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>Proposals agreed at EARC 15 August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td>Merge with Hapton and Tharston - become a Town council and increase the number of councillors</td>
<td>1. Recommend that no changes are made to the boundary due to the future growth of Long Stratton</td>
<td>1. Agree that no changes are made to the boundary due to the future growth of Long Stratton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Stratton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommend that Long Stratton make arrangements for the parish council to be changed to a town council</td>
<td>2. Recommend that Long Stratton make arrangements for the parish council to be changed to a town council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Recommend that the number of Councillors be increased to 13</td>
<td>3. Recommend that the number of Councillors be increased to 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Aideby</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Haddiscoe</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Burgh St Peter</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Wheatacre</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Thurlton</td>
<td>Toft Monks</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Barnham Broom</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Brandon Parva, Coston, Runhall &amp; Welborne</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td>Recommend that the number of Councillors remain as 5</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Barford</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Wramplingham</td>
<td>Recommend that the number of Councillors remain as 2</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 2</td>
<td>Agree that the number of Councillors remains as 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Abbey see Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Cromwells see Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Northfields see Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Town see Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Rustens see Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td>See Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Districts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary of boundary changes requested</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | Wymondham | Separate Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton from Wymondham TC Boundary change would require consent from LGBCE | 1. Recommend that Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton be separated from Wymondham Town Council and Spooner Row Community Council be formed (as per map)  
2. Recommend that Spooner Row Community Council has 7 Councillors | 1. Recommend that Spooner Row, Wattlefield and Suton be separated from Wymondham Town Council and Spooner Row Community Council be formed (as per Map 14)  
2. Recommend that Spooner Row Community Council has 7 Councillors |