

# Norfolk County Council

Date: Monday 23 November 2020

Time: 10.00 a.m

Venue: Teams Meeting – [Click here to view the meeting.](#)

## Supplementary Agenda 1

12 Norfolk County Council submission in response to the Page B2

### **Local Government Boundary Commission for England consultation**

Report by the Executive Director of Strategy and Governance

The following revisions have been made to the previously  
published report:

- Paragraph 6.5 amended to read "Clenchwarton & King's Lynn South".
- Paragraph 6.11 amended.
- Paragraph 6.14 deleted and paragraph numbering updated accordingly.
- Table 6 replaced.
- Appendix 1 replaced.
- Appendix 3b deleted.
- King's Lynn & West Norfolk Proposed Divisions – Map replaced.
- King's Lynn & West Norfolk Ward Alignments – Map replaced.

Tom McCabe  
Head of Paid Service  
County Hall  
Martineau Lane  
Norwich  
NR1 2DH

Date Supplementary Agenda Published: 20 November 2020

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda  
please contact [committees@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:committees@norfolk.gov.uk)**

## County Council

Item 12

<b>Decision making report title:</b>	<b>Norfolk County Council submission in response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England consultation</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>23 November 2020</b>
<b>Responsible Cabinet Member:</b>	<b>Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader of the Council</b>
<b>Responsible Director:</b>	<b>Fiona McDiarmid, Executive Director of Strategy and Governance</b>

### **Introduction**

Council submitted its recommendations for the 84 County divisions in March 2020 to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). The LGBCE has considered submissions from across the county, has drawn up its proposals and is consulting on these proposals between 15 September 2020 and 23 November 2020.

The consultation is the opportunity for Council to make comments or representations in response to the LGBCE proposals. The Member Working Group (MWG) met to review these proposals in detail and make recommendations for council to consider. A full and detailed report with accompanying maps is attached.

### **Executive Summary**

Based on the assumption that of all the criteria that needed to be met in the LGBCE Technical Guide, the most important was to reduce electoral variance to as small as possible. The overarching aim and objective in the original NCC submission, therefore, was to ensure that no division had an electoral variance in 2025 of more than +/- 10%. The guiding advice from the LGBCE was interpreted to mean that no variance for any division would be accepted by them if it had a variance of more than 10%.

From the proposals put forward, it is evident that the LGBCE has been prepared to work to a greater number of higher variances. Therefore, using their local knowledge of communities to reflect the desires and wishes of local neighbourhoods, the MWG is recommending alternative division boundaries for King's Lynn & West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Norwich to those put forward by the LGBCE.

In addition, the MWG took the view that division names should reflect the area they represent rather than one particular town or village. Therefore, for some divisions in Breckland, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn & West Norfolk and North Norfolk the MWG recommends an alternative suggestion for the division name to those put forward by the LGBCE.

## **Recommendations**

- 1. To approve the Member Working Group report as the Council's submission in response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England consultation.**

### **1. Background and Purpose**

- 1.1. Periodic reviews of county council divisions take place to ensure that the divisions conform and uphold the three criteria laid down by the Local Government Boundary Commission of England (LGBCE):

- Elector equality
- Community identity
- Good governance

Where it appears that an area's electoral arrangements should be changed in order to provide for better representation of an area's electors, a review will give rise to recommendations for changes which then go before Parliament. Norfolk County Council is currently subject to such a review, the outcome of which will come into effect in 2025.

The purpose of this report is to seek agreement to submit the counter proposals of the MWG, as described in the attached report, as the Council's formal response to the LGBCE consultation.

### **2. Proposals**

- 2.1. On receipt of the Boundary Commission notice of its consultation a small team of officers and the MWG, which was first convened to oversee the original Council submission, met to review the content of the LGCBE proposals.

Following thorough consideration of the LGBCE proposals, the MWG has produced a report in response to the consultation. The report seeks changes to the LGBCE proposals in some areas of the county specifically (a) the composition of some divisions and (b) some division names proposed.

The full report of the MWG and the counter proposals made in response to the consultation are laid out in full in the attached paper. The consultation end date is 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2020.

### **3. Impact of the Proposal**

- 3.1. The MWG report makes proposals which may have an impact on individual parishes or communities in relation to which Division that parish or community should sit within and what some Divisions may be called in future.

#### **4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

- 4.1. The rationale for the counter proposals made is laid out in detail in the report.

#### **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1. There are no financial implications of the proposal.

#### **6. Resource Implications**

- 6.1. **Staff: N/A**

- 6.2. **Property: N/A**

- 6.3. **IT: N/A**

#### **7. Other Implications**

- 7.1. **Legal Implications N/A**

- 7.2. **Human Rights implications N/A**

- 7.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) N/A**

- 7.4. **Health and Safety implications (where appropriate) N/A**

- 7.5. **Sustainability implications (where appropriate) N/A**

- 7.6. **Any other implications**

#### **8. Risk Implications/Assessment**

- 8.1. If a Council response to the consultation is not made to the Boundary Commission, there is a risk that local factors will not be considered when the boundaries are drawn up.

#### **9. Select Committee comments**

- 9.1. The proposed response to the consultation has been signed off for recommendation by the Member Working Group.

#### **10. Recommendations**

- 10.1. **To approve the Member Working Group report as the Council's submission in response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England consultation.**

## 11. Background Papers

Boundary Review Report for Council 23 March 2020

(in 3 parts - please control & click on the links below to view)

[County Council Meeting 23 March 2020 Report part 1](#)

[County Council Meeting 23 March 2020 Report part 2](#)

[County Council Meeting 23 March 2020 Report part 3](#)

### Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

**Officer name:** Caroline Clarke

**Tel No.:** 01603 222949

**Email address:** [caroline.clarke@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.clarke@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

# **Norfolk County Council**

## **Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission of England**

### **Review of Electoral Arrangements in Norfolk**

#### **Consultation Response November 2020**

# Contents

(Please 'control and click' on the relevant heading below to go to that section)

	Page No.
<b><u>1.0 Introduction</u></b>	<b>3</b>
<b><u>2.0 Variances</u></b>	<b>4</b>
<b><u>3.0 Breckland</u></b>	<b>5</b>
<b><u>4.0 Broadland</u></b>	<b>5</b>
<b><u>5.0 Great Yarmouth</u></b>	<b>5</b>
<b><u>6.0 King's Lynn and West Norfolk</u></b>	<b>6</b>
<b><u>7.0 North Norfolk</u></b>	<b>9</b>
<b><u>8.0 Norwich</u></b>	<b>13</b>
<b><u>9.0 South Norfolk</u></b>	<b>14</b>
<b><u>10.0 Summary</u></b>	<b>14</b>
<b><u>Appendix 1 - List of Polling Districts in King's Lynn and West Norfolk District</u></b>	<b>16</b>
<b><u>Appendix 2 - List of Polling Districts in North Norfolk District</u></b>	<b>22</b>
<b><u>Appendix 3a - Response to Member – Long Stratton Division</u></b>	<b>27</b>
<b><u>Appendix 3b - King's Lynn and West Norfolk District Divisions</u></b>	<b>29</b>

## 1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Members Working Group (MWG), which provided leadership and guidance for the initial submission, met several times to consider the response on behalf of Norfolk County Council (NCC).

1.2 They were pleased to note that the LGBCE (Local Government Boundary Commission for England) have adopted many of the proposals contained within the original submission by NCC. It was noted that in Breckland, Broadland, Great Yarmouth and South Norfolk there were only minor changes, which NCC accepts.

1.3 There were several questions raised by Members regarding the proposed arrangements and these have been answered further on in the response.

1.4 In the cases of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Norwich, it was felt that some of the new boundaries cut across the existing community interests and did not recognise 'local' boundaries. This was likely to cause confusion at election time e.g. electors having to go to a new polling station and break the previously strong ties with neighbouring communities and villages in rural areas.

1.5 The overarching aim and objective in the original NCC submission was to ensure that no division had an electoral variance in 2025 of more than +/- 10%. The guiding advice from the LGBCE was interpreted that no variance for any division would be accepted by them if it had a variance of more than 10%. Based on the assumption that, of all the criteria that needed to be met in the LGBCE Technical Guide, the most important was to reduce variance to as small as possible.

1.6 The second principle has been to try and maintain the borders of the current divisions as much as possible. The rationale for this is that electors are familiar with their existing divisions i.e. where to go to vote and who they should contact about local issues.

1.7 On the other side of the coin, Members get to know their local areas, e.g. local parish clerks, and know with whom they need to communicate to disseminate news and information. This role is further strengthened as some Members are also District Councillors as well. This dual role increases and their knowledge and expertise and is therefore of advantage to those whom they represent.

1.8 There are 43 'Twin Hatters' i.e. members who represent County and District, which equates to just over half of the total number of county Members. A member serves for four years but in Norfolk there are 46 Members (55% of the total number of Members), who have served more than one term. The longest serving member has currently represented the same division for 32 years. This provides empirical evidence of the body of knowledge and experience that Members bring to the role.

1.9 The third guiding principle has been, wherever possible, to align electoral divisions for the County with those of the new District ward boundaries. It is noted that the LGBCE has conducted a recent review of the ward boundaries in Norfolk and these have been carried out with the assistance and knowledge of District officers, local people and councillors. These individuals have detailed knowledge



about their local communities; for example, which villages tend to gravitate towards each other.

1.10 There are many reasons for these traditional ties; it could they are part of an old country estate or are joined together in a church benefice or historically one village had an enterprise, which drew in workers from other villages. In all cases many of these ties often go back hundreds of years.

1.11 It is also true that people often relate and have a strong affinity to their locality. In Norfolk there is a strong and very positive connection to brand 'Norfolk' and this also filters down to more local areas such as the Broads, Fens and City (Norwich).

1.12 Finally, it was noted that one of the differences between urban and rural divisions, is that urban divisions tend to have fewer parish councils and they are geographically much closer together. Conversely rural divisions tend to have many more parish councils and they are much further apart.

1.13 It was suggested that, in order to even up the workloads of Members, urban divisions should where possible have positive variances and rural divisions negative variances.

## 2.0 Variances

2.1 The impact of variance was key in the drawing up of the individual divisions. Table 1 below compares the NCC submission with the LGBCE draft proposal.

**Table 1**

Variance	NCC Submission		NCC Submission		LGBCE Proposal	
	2019		2025		2025	
	Divisions	%	Divisions	%	Divisions	%
Over 20%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%
Over 10%	11	13%	0	0%	0	0%
Over 5%	17	20%	37	44%	39	46%
0.5% to 5%	49	58%	41	49%	41	49%
Zero (<0.5%)	5	6%	6	7%	4	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>

2.2 This data shows that the LGBCE are prepared to work to a greater number of higher variances in their draft proposal.

2.3 Based on this knowledge and more detailed local knowledge of communities, it has been decided to redraw the divisions for King's Lynn & West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Norwich to reflect the desires and wishes of local neighbourhoods. Details of these proposals are provided below together with maps.

### 3.0 Breckland

3.1 The minor changes to Breckland that the LGBCE recommended compared to the NCC submission were agreed. Following further discussion, it was decided that the name 'Thetford East' did not truly represent the two distinct parts of the Division. It was therefore decided to recommend it should be called 'Heathlands and Thetford East' as shown in table 2 and Appendix 4, Map 1.

**Table 2**

Current Name	LGBCE Proposal	NCC Revised Submission
Thetford East	Thetford East	Heathlands and Thetford East

### 4.0 Broadland

4.1 It was noted that there were no changes to the original NCC submission and so the LGBCE draft proposal for Broadland was agreed (Appendix 4, Map 2).

### 5.0 Great Yarmouth

5.1 It was noted that the LGBCE had accepted the NCC submission for six of the divisions. Acknowledging that the geography of the District had made it very difficult to achieve good variances, there was some concern about any significant increases in variance.

5.2 Table 3 shows a comparison of the three divisions where the boundaries have changed compared to the NCC submission especially around Polling District (PD) BS1 Bradwell.

**Table 3**

Division Number	Division Name	Number of Councillors	LGBCE Variance in 2025	NCC Submission Variance in 2025	Difference
26	Breydon	1	-6%	-7%	Better
29	Lothingland	1	-3%	-7%	Better
30	Magdalen	1	-3%	2%	Worse

5.3 Based on this evidence it was agreed to accept and not challenge these minor modifications. The MWG accepted the other minor modifications the LGBCE had made in their draft proposal.

5.4 Further consideration was given to the suitability of the Great Yarmouth Division names to ensure that they reflected appropriately the area which represented the electors. It was decided to propose the alternative names shown in table 4 and Appendix 4, Map 3.

**Table 4**

<b>Current Name</b>	<b>LGBCE Proposal</b>	<b>NCC Revised Submission</b>
East Flegg	North Flegg	The Fleggs
Caister-on-Sea	Bure	South Caister and Bure

## **6.0 King's Lynn and West Norfolk**

6.1 The LGBCE's draft proposal for the top half of the District followed the NCC submission, but it was felt that the bottom half needed to be redrawn to reflect more clearly the identity of local communities. The exception was the Downham Market division, which encompasses the only urban area. This leaves seven divisions, which have been redrawn to better reflect local ties.

6.2 The area is unique in that it has two geographical features in the form of the River Nene complex, which runs broadly north/south and the River Wissey/Cut-Off Channel, which runs east/west from Denver Sluice and then turns south.

6.3 These rivers do have a number of bridges allowing interaction between the two sides of the river, but these bridges are sparse. In the case of the River Nene complex, the sense of isolation is further increased by the inclusion of tall flood banks.

6.4 Above the River Wissey complex and to the right of the River of the River Nene; i.e. the top right corner, the landscape is similar to the rest of Norfolk with gentle hills, woods and villages fairly close to each other.

6.5 In contrast, the rest of the area is very flat with sparsely situated settlements and no wooded areas. Additionally, the top right area looks towards Swaffham and King's Lynn. Likewise, most of Marshland North and Clenchwarton & King's Lynn South look towards King's Lynn at its centre. The bottom section of the District, see Downham Market, Ely, Peterborough or Wisbech as their centre for shopping, work and entertainment.

6.6 The revised submission attempts, within the constraints of the LGBCE guidelines, to build and reflect these underlying factors. The starting point in all Division reviews is to keep as much of the existing boundaries as possible because the local community are aware of who their member is and the Member has detailed knowledge about the local area.

6.7 The process of review commenced with the Marshlands working round in an anticlockwise direction because the only opportunity to change any division boundaries lay in the centre. Marshland North in the NCC Submission follows the boundaries of the existing division with the exception that PD SV2 Tilney All Saints, which has moved into Watlington & Wiggenhall. This was done for two reasons; a) to reduce the variance and b) it that all three Tilneys were now in the same electoral division. The boundaries also encompassed two whole wards viz: - Terrington and Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole with the exception of PD TG7 Walsoken.

Unfortunately adding this PD to Marshland North would create an unacceptable variance of 14%.

6.8 Marshland South is broadly a triangle with two of its boundaries fixed viz: the County boundary and the physical boundary of the River Nene and railway. The NCC submission embraces these facts and includes all of Emneth ward and the majority of Upwell & Delph ward. The only practical change would be to add PD WW6 Stow Bardolph to the Division, but this would create a variance of 11%.

6.9 Feltwell is shaped a bit like a parallelogram with three sides fixed and only the top can be amended. The original aim was to achieve the lowest possible variance, which was 0%. Presented with more flexibility, it is better to make the division up of the three full wards of Feltwell, Methwold and Denver, which gives a variance of -3%. This would allow PDs WH6, WJ6, WK6, & WL6 to join WB6 to join and thus complete the Wissey ward. WN6 West Dereham would move into the Feltwell Division.

6.10 The primary feature running through the Airfield Division is the River Nar running through the top half of the Division. Moving the Wissey ward into the Division together with the Airfield ward suggests that the name 'Airfield' is inappropriate, and the suggestion is to call the current Gayton & Nar Valley Division, 'Nar & Wissey Valleys.'

6.11 In the LGBCE draft proposal it was noted that they had kept the same boundary as the NCC submission for Clenchwarton & King's Lynn South, with the exception that they had added PD SS2 West Winch (Setchey village) into the Division.

Initially it was felt that this move should be opposed on grounds that it increased electoral inequality and that the workload of the Member would invariably go up. However, after local representation, it was noted that West Winch village had strong local ties with Setchey and that these should be acknowledged and maintained. It was therefore agreed to accept the LGBCE recommendation for this Division.

6.12 At the bottom of the Division it is better to try and keep the wards complete and this can be achieved by PDs WN6 West Dereham to Feltwell Division and WJ6 Stoke Ferry and WL6 Wereham to the Nar & Wissey Valleys Division.

6.13 Unfortunately it is not possible to keep the whole of the Airfield ward coterminous because it would produce a variance of over 10%. Therefore, it was agreed to accept the LGBCE proposal for the boundaries of the Watlington & Wiggenshall Division (with the exception of PD WT6 Downham West), especially as there are two road bridges straddling the Division. Some thought was given to the name of the new division, which represents an area rather than just one village or urban area. In this respect a more appropriate name would be 'Watlington and the Fens.'

6.14 In summary it is proposed to keep the boundaries as the NCC Submission for Downham Market, Marshland North and Marshland South. It is proposed to accept the LGBCE boundaries for Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South and for the Watlington and Wiggenshall Division less Downham West.

The boundary of the Feltwell Division is realigned to keep the wards coterminous and the Middleton Division is realigned with the Feltwell Division and some polling districts are moved to ensure that there is electoral equality.

**Table 5**

<b>Current Name</b>	<b>LGBCE Proposal</b>	<b>NCC Revised Submission</b>
Fincham	Watlington & Wiggshall	Watlington and the Fens
Gayton & Nar Valley	Airfield	Nar and Wissey Valleys

**6.15** The proposed name changes for King's Lynn and West Norfolk are shown in table 5 above. The new proposed boundaries including how the new proposed boundaries align with the current ward boundaries are in Appendix 4, Maps 4 & 5. The new variances are shown in table 6 below. The list of polling districts is detailed in Appendix 1.

**Table 6**

<b>Division Number</b>	<b>Division Name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>LGBCE Variance in 2025</b>	<b>NCC Submission Variance in 2025</b>	<b>Difference</b>
35	Airfield	1	-6%	6%	Same
36	Clenchwarton & King's Lynn South	1	3%	9%	Worse
37	Dersingham	1	6%	6%	Same
38	Docking	1	5%	5%	Same
39	Downham Market	1	3%	3%	Same
40	Feltwell	1	9%	-2%	Better
41	Freebridge Lynn	1	2%	2%	Same
42	Gaywood North & Central	1	9%	2% (1)	Same
43	Gaywood South	1	6%	-2% (1)	Same
44	King's Lynn North & Central	1	-3%	5% (1)	Same
45	Marshland North	1	-2%	0%	Better
46	Marshland South	1	4%	5%	Worse
47	North Coast	1	2%	2%	Same
48	Watlington & Wiggshall	1	7%	5%	Better

(1) The LGBCE have in their draft proposal, redrawn part of the PD boundaries of these three adjacent divisions, which accounts for the slight difference in percentages between them and the NCC revised submission. The NCC revised submission is based on the original published figures from the LGBCE website.

## 7.0 North Norfolk

7.1 The LGBCE draft proposal has more changes in North Norfolk, compared to any other District. Table 7 shows a comparison of the variances.

**Table 7**

<b>Division Number</b>	<b>Division Name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>LGBCE Variance in 2025</b>	<b>NCC Submission Variance in 2025</b>	<b>Difference</b>
49	Cromer	1	0%	0%	Same
50	Erpingham	1	-9%	-9%	Same
51	Fakenham	1	5%	5%	Same
52	Holt	1	-4%	-2%	Better
53	Hoveton	1	-3%	-3%	Same
54	North Walsham East	1	-9%	-3%	Better
55	North Walsham West & Mundesley	1	-7%	-3%	Better
56	Sheringham	1	4%	4%	Same
57	Stalham	1	1%	-5%	Worse
58	Wells	1	2%	-4%	Worse

7.2 Table 7 demonstrates that the NCC submission achieves better electoral equality, which is the primary purpose for carrying out an Electoral Review. It was agreed to accept the LGBCE boundaries for the divisions of Cromer and Sheringham because they were the same as the NCC submission and were both urban seaside communities.

7.3 North Norfolk is geographically unique and can be split into three types of area. First, there are the urban areas of Fakenham, Holt, Cromer Sheringham and North Walsham. Secondly, there is the coastal and seaside region, which contains settlements that tend to focus on the sea and tourism. Finally, there is the rest of the District, which is characterised by small settlements and farming.

7.4 It was noted that there were a number of submissions from a Council, political groups and councillors. Unfortunately, parts of the LGBCE draft proposal do not fully encompass the different needs of the three types of communities. Thus, it was decided to review division boundaries.

7.5 The review commenced in the left-hand side of the District with Fakenham. Fakenham already has a variance of 5% and contains three complete wards. Any increase means that either the Stibbard or the Walsingham wards would have to be split so the decision is to keep the boundaries as the existing ones. It was agreed that the Division should be named, 'Fakenham and the Raynhams,' to reflect that the Division covers a significant rural based geographical area as well as the town.

7.6 There was considerable discussion regarding the layout of the Wells, Holt and Erpingham divisions. It was observed that these are very rural divisions with only one town; Holt and two main villages; Briston and Wells-Next-The-Sea (Wells). It was acknowledged that the communities inland did not see Wells as a centre and that these communities tended to look towards, Fakenham, King's Lynn, Aylsham, North Walsham and even Norwich as centres for jobs, entertainment and activities.

7.7 It was also argued that naming these divisions should be focused around the area they represented rather than on one particular village. It was therefore agreed that Wells should be called, 'Greenhoe' and that Erpingham should be named, 'Eynsford.' As Holt is a town and has a significant number of electors in the town and neighbouring PDs it was agreed that it should remain as 'Holt.'

7.8 After meeting the criteria of electoral equality, the next objective was to try and reduce the number of PD's in the Greenhoe division, because it covers a very large area. There was a deliberate attempt to produce a division with the minimum number of electors and still meet the criteria of less than -10%. In total three different layouts were considered, and it was acknowledged that none were perfect due to the distribution of electors.

7.9 The Greenhoe Division contains three full wards and two part wards. They have been split in part because of the numbers and a desire to reduce the overall number of electors. But also in the two split wards, the local communities tend to look towards other centres rather than Wells.

7.10 It was found that PD BR1 Briston had to be part of the Eynsford division to ensure that there were sufficient numbers to reach an adequate electoral total. This left Holt, which was sandwiched into between Eynsford and Greenhoe.

7.11 Two options were considered, the first one centred on Holt and then spreading south west to include a largely rural area. The second one again centred on Holt and spread due north to include a coastal strip of villages. The MWG decided that the version based on Holt including the coastal villages and then spreading South was the best one. This included as far as possible all of the immediate rural settlements, which look towards Holt as their centre. The B1110 also provides good access from the more outlying villages to Holt.

7.12 Eynsford consists of three full wards viz: - Briston, Erpingham, and Roughton and two part wards viz: - Gresham and Stody. Parishes on the left side of the Gresham Ward are adjacent and have a strong affinity to Holt and so have been included in the Holt Division. PD STO3 Corpusty and Saxthorpe is included in the Eynsford Division in part to ensure that there is good electoral variance, but in common with other nearby local villages tend to see Aylsham as their centre, albeit the town is situated in the Broadland District.

7.13 It then left the last four divisions situated around the town of North Walsham to redraw. This area was always going to involve significant changes because the District lost one seat as a result of a smaller increase in population compared to the other Districts in the County.

7.14 Starting with the Hoveton division, which in the LGBCE draft proposal, had the village of Stalham in another division, it was felt that these two villages should be in the same division. These two villages are very similar and are only 7-8 miles apart. They have strong ties, e.g. tourism, associated with The Broads. The plan was to join the wards of Hoveton and Tunstead with Stalham to create one division.

7.15 Unfortunately, in order to create an acceptable variance for the Stalham division, it was necessary to add PD STA1 Catfield. This in turn created an unfavourable variance for Hoveton so PD WO1 Scottow was added to the division to give a variance of 0%. It should be noted that Scottow is currently in the Hoveton and Stalham division and so there is already community cohesion. As Stalham village is now in the Division the proposal is keep the current name i.e. 'Hoveton and Stalham.'

7.16 The next division redrawn was Stalham, which contains a mix of coastal and Broads parishes. This included the Happisburgh, Hickling and St Benet wards and had to extend into the Bacton ward in order to achieve a suitable variance. PDs BA3 Walcott and BA4 Wilton were added and share some similarities and interests with other parishes in the Stalham division. It is suggested that the Division is called, 'Happing,' to reflect the whole area. The LGBCE name would be inappropriate because Stalham is not in the Division.

7.17 This left two divisions left to redraw viz: - North Walsham East and North Walsham West and Mundesley. The town of North Walsham is too large to be contained within one division and has to be split. Currently PD NWW1 North Walsham (West) is part of the Mundesley division and thus it is logical to keep it in the same division. On this basis the wards of North Walsham East, North Walsham Market Cross and Worstead were added together to give a division with a variance of -1%.

7.18 Finally, the North Walsham West and Mundesley division is made up made up of the wards of Mundesley, North Walsham West, Trunch and part of Bacton ward (PDs BA1 Bacton and BA2 Paston.) This gives a variance of just 1%. It is also proposed that in order to make it clearer and avoid confusion for electors that the Division is named, 'Mundesley and North Walsham West'.

7.19 Table 8 below compares the LGBCE Draft Proposal against the NCC revised submission in respect of elector equality.

**Table 8**

<b>Division Number</b>	<b>Division Name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>LGBCE Variance in 2025</b>	<b>NCC REVISED Submission Variance in 2025</b>	<b>Difference</b>
49	Cromer	1	0%	0%	Same
50	Erpingham	1	-9%	-2%	Better
51	Fakenham	1	5%	5%	Same
52	Holt	1	-4%	-3%	Better
53	Hoveton	1	-3%	0%	Better



54	North Walsham East	1	-9%	-1%	Better
55	North Walsham West & Mundesley	1	-7%	1%	Better
56	Sheringham	1	4%	-1%	Better
57	Stalham	1	1%	-8%	Worse
58	Wells	1	2%	-9%	Worse

7.20 This arrangement provides much better elector equality than the LGBCE draft proposal and more closely fulfils the primary objective of elector equality. Three of the divisions contain full wards and where possible complete wards have been used to build on community cohesion to produce the proposed Divisions.

7.21 In some cases it has not been possible to include a complete ward, either because of the need to add one or two PDs to achieve an adequate variance for a Division or in other cases wards are geographically very large and the local communities may look in several directions towards their local centre. The Coastal Ward is a good example where the left hand looks towards Wells as a centre whereas the parishes on the right look towards Holt as their centre and probably rarely ever travel to Wells.

**7.22 Appendix 5, Maps 6 & 7 show the new revised proposed North Norfolk Divisions for submission and demonstrate the match between wards and the new proposed divisions. Appendix 2 details the list of polling districts. Proposed name changes are shown on table 9 below.**

**Table 9**

<b>Current Name(s)</b>	<b>LGBCE Proposal</b>	<b>NCC Revised Submission</b>
Fakenham	Fakenham	Fakenham and the Raynhams
Melton Constable	Erpingham	Eynsford
Hoveton and Stalham	Hoveton	Hoveton and Stalham
Mundesley/North Walsham West and Erpingham	North Walsham West and Mundesley	Mundesley and North Walsham West
South Smallburgh	Stalham	Happing
Wells	Wells	Greenhoe

## 8.0 Norwich

8.1 Table 10 below compares the LGBCE Draft Proposal against the NCC Submission in respect of elector equality.

**Table 10**

<b>Division Number</b>	<b>Division Name</b>	<b>Number of Councillors</b>	<b>LGBCE Variance in 2025</b>	<b>NCC Submission Variance in 2025</b>	<b>Difference</b>
59	Bowthorpe	1	4%	4%	Same
60	Catton Grove	1	-4%	-4%	Same
61	Crome	1	-4%	-4%	Same
62	Eaton	1	-7%	-1%	Worse
63	Lakenham	1	-9%	0%	Worse
64	Mancroft	1	8%	2%	Worse
65	Mile Cross	1	-6%	-7%	Better
66	Nelson	1	3%	-2%	Worse
67	Sewell	1	-7%	-7%	Same
68	Thorpe Hamlet	1	-1%	-1%	Same
69	Town Close	1	-3%	3%	Same
70	University	1	9%	3%	Worse
71	Wensum	1	5%	0%	Worse

8.2 The results show that the LGBCE Draft Proposal demonstrates that only one division has a better variance but six are worse, which represents 46% of the District. In some cases the inequality has increased by 9%.

8.3 It was noted that LGBCE draft proposal matched five of the Division boundaries as submitted by NCC viz: - Bowthorpe, Catton Grove, Crome, Sewell and Thorpe Hamlet. However, there are some significant changes in the south and City centre. The MWG raised several concerns about these changes, which created significant electoral variances for 2025. Of the eight divisions redrawn by the LGBCE six (75%) have a worse equality variance.

8.4 It was also observed that these divisions, which were different to the NCC submission, followed the boundary lines of the new wards, which came into being in 2019. It was felt therefore that, as these divisions conformed to the knowledge and experience of local people and District officers, the LGBCE proposal should be accepted despite the increase in elector inequality.

8.5 It was then pointed out that the principal purpose of all Electoral Reviews was to ensure that there was electoral equality throughout the County, District etc. It was also noted that it is far easier to create electoral equality in urban areas because the PDs are much closer together geographically, when compared to rural ones, which are often much more spread out.

8.6 There was also the issue of equality and fairness of workload for Members. In rural areas, Members could be expected to look after 20+ parishes and spend much more time travelling along rural roads; often having to use their own vehicles as other forms of transport such as buses are only available in urban areas.

8.7 It was felt that, in light of this information, as the primary objective is to achieve electoral equality across the County, variances of -9% for a geographically compact division could not be justified and was therefore unacceptable.

**8.8 The decision was taken to propose that the original submission for Norwich should be re-submitted (Appendix 5, Map 8)**

## 9.0 South Norfolk

9.1 The Member for Long Stratton raised several questions relating to why the new proposed division had changed from the existing one. The response to Cllr A. Thomas is given in Appendix 3.

**9.2 As there were no other changes to the NCC submission, the MWG accepted the LGBCE proposal for South Norfolk (Appendix 5, Map 9).**

## 10.0 Summary

10.1 The MWG was pleased to note that the LGBCE accepted much of the NCC submission for the County and supports their draft proposal for Breckland, Broadland, Great Yarmouth, and South Norfolk, with the amendments proposed.

10.2 The Council has clearly explained how it has followed the LGBCE requirements and the additional criteria it has used to produce divisions that reflect local ties and communities. In the case of the LGBCE proposals for King's Lynn and West Norfolk, North Norfolk and Norwich Districts, they do not reflect these local and long held community ties and for this reason a revised submission is proposed.

10.3 Table 11 shows the new electoral equality variances in the NCC revised submission.

**Table 11**

Variance	NCC Submission		LGBCE Draft Proposal		REVISED NCC Submission	
	2025		2025		2025	
	Divisions	%	Divisions	%	Divisions	%
Over 20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Over 10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Over 5%	37	44%	39	46%	31	37%
0.5% to 5%	41	49%	41	49%	45	54%
Zero (<0.5%)	6	7%	4	5%	8	9%

<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>

10.4 This demonstrates that in the primary objective of creating electoral equality, the revised submission achieves better electoral equality for Norfolk with nearly two – thirds (63%) of the Divisions having a variance of 5% or less. This is significantly better than the LGBCE draft proposal, which offers just over half (54%).

## Appendix 1 – List of Polling Districts in King's Lynn and West Norfolk District

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
PG1	West Winch CP	South & West Lynn Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	2,289	2,619
PH1		South & West Lynn Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	1,295	1,439
PK1		Gaywood Chase Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	890	919
SS1		West Winch Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	2,101	2,579
SS2		West Winch Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	177	177
ST1		Clenchwarton Ward	Clenchwarton and King's Lynn South ED	1,825	1,955
RD6	Anmer CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	46	46
RE1	Dersingham CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	4,046	4,094
RF1	Ingoldisthorpe CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	690	706
RG6	Shernborne CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	51	51
RX6	Sandringham CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	251	251
RX7	Flitcham with Appleton CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	11	11
RY6	Sandringham CP	Dersingham Ward	Dersingham ED	97	97
SA1	Flitcham with Appleton CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	157	157
SB1	Great Massingham CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	779	805
SB7	Little Massingham CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	80	80
SC1	Harpley CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	274	274
SD6	Hillington CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	274	274
SE7	Congham CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Dersingham ED	211	211
SG1	Gayton CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Dersingham ED	1,172	1,316
SG2	Gayton CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Dersingham ED	69	69
SJ6	Castle Acre CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	721	759
SM6	West Acre CP	Massingham with Castle Acre Ward	Dersingham ED	169	169

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Existing Ward</b>	<b>Proposed Division</b>	<b>Electorate 2020</b>	<b>Electorate 2025</b>
PU1	Heacham CP	Heacham Ward	Docking ED	4,040	4,258
PW1	Snettisham CP	Snettisham Ward	Docking ED	2,289	2,289
RA1	Docking CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	Docking ED	720	896
RA8	Docking CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	Docking ED	111	111
RB6	Fring CP	Heacham Ward	Docking ED	53	53
RC1	Sedgeford CP	Heacham Ward	Docking ED	461	493
RP7	Bagthorpe with Barmer CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	Docking ED	46	46
RR6	Bircham CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	Docking ED	384	410
RS6	East Rudham CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	Docking ED	491	507
RS7	West Rudham CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	Docking ED	180	180
RT6	Houghton CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	Docking ED	65	65
WA1	Downham Market CP	Downham Old Town Ward	Downham Market ED	2,372	2,372
WA2	Downham Market CP	North Downham Ward	Downham Market ED	2,195	2,214
WA3	Downham Market CP	East Downham Ward	Downham Market ED	2,166	2,245
WA4	Downham Market CP	South Downham Ward	Downham Market ED	2,080	2,251
WA6	Ryston CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	41	41
WM1	Denver CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	765	765
WM6	Fordham CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	63	63
WM7	Ryston CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	49	49
WN6	West Dereham CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	374	374
XA6	Hilgay CP	Denver Ward	Feltwell ED	769	796
XB6	Hilgay CP	Feltwell Ward	Feltwell ED	338	338
XC1	Southery CP	Feltwell Ward	Feltwell ED	1,108	1,130
XH1	Feltwell CP	Feltwell Ward	Feltwell ED	1,744	1,838
XJ6	Feltwell CP	Feltwell Ward	Feltwell ED	64	64
XK1	Hockwold cum Wilton CP	Feltwell Ward	Feltwell ED	927	927
XL1	Methwold CP	Methwold Ward	Feltwell ED	1,150	1,312
XM6	Methwold CP	Methwold Ward	Feltwell ED	22	22
XN1	Northwold CP	Methwold Ward	Feltwell ED	719	719
XP1	Northwold CP	Methwold Ward	Feltwell ED	189	200
RU1	South Wootton CP	The Woottons Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	3,545	4,132

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
RV6	Castle Rising CP	The Woottons Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	185	273
RW1	North Wootton CP	The Woottons Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	1,968	1,968
SE1	Grimston CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	718	718
SF1	Grimston CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	927	954
SF2	Roydon CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	304	304
SH6	Leziate CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	536	536
SH7	Bawsey CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Freebridge Lynn ED	175	175
PA1		Springwood Ward	Gaywood North and Central ED	1,525	1,525
PA2		Springwood Ward	Gaywood North and Central ED	607	823
PC1		Gaywood North Bank Ward	Gaywood North and Central ED	3,646	3,716
PC2		Gaywood North Bank Ward	Gaywood North and Central ED	2,850	2,850
PC3		Gaywood North Bank Ward	Gaywood North and Central ED	134	134
PB1		Gaywood Clock Ward	Gaywood South ED	1,702	2,334
PB2		Gaywood Clock Ward	Gaywood South ED	579	579
PD1		Fairstead Ward	Gaywood South ED	4,456	4,456
PD2		Fairstead Ward	Gaywood South ED	88	88
PL1		Gaywood Chase Ward	Gaywood South ED	847	847
PL2		Gaywood Chase Ward	Gaywood South ED	359	359
PE1		North Lynn Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	2,163	2,346
PF1		North Lynn Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	2,196	2,333
PJ1		St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	2,253	2,770
PJ2		St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	319	319
PJ3		St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	300	300
PM1		St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas Ward	King's Lynn North and Central ED	1,162	1,224
SU1	Terrington St. Clement CP	Terrington Ward	Marshland North ED	3,544	3,611

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Existing Ward</b>	<b>Proposed Division</b>	<b>Electorate 2020</b>	<b>Electorate 2025</b>
SW6	Terrington St. John CP	Terrington Ward	Marshland North ED	757	871
TA6	Walpole CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland North ED	348	348
TB6	Walpole Cross Keys CP	Terrington Ward	Marshland North ED	451	459
TC6	Walpole Highway CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland North ED	637	637
TD6	Walpole CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland North ED	1,156	1,172
TE1	West Walton CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland North ED	1,482	1,597
TG7	Walsoken CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland North ED	175	175
TG6	Walsoken CP	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole Ward	Marshland South ED	1,057	1,201
TH6	Emneth CP	Emneth & Outwell Ward	Marshland South ED	2,312	2,587
TJ1	Outwell CP	Emneth & Outwell Ward	Marshland South ED	1,815	1,943
TK6	Upwell CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	1,748	1,775
TL6	Upwell CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	444	444
TM6	Upwell CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	259	259
WT6	Downham West CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	247	247
WT7	Denver CP	Denver Ward	Marshland South ED	0	0
WU6	Nordelph CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	365	365
WV6	Welney CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Marshland South ED	450	477
SK6	East Walton CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	64	64
SL6	Pentney CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	466	466
SN1	East Winch CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	594	604
SN2	East Winch CP	Gayton & Grimston Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	104	104
SP1	Middleton CP	West Winch Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	1,258	1,258
SR1	North Runcton CP	West Winch Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	371	453
SS6	North Runcton CP	West Winch Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	151	871
WB6	Barton Bendish CP	Wissey Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	178	178



<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Existing Ward</b>	<b>Proposed Division</b>	<b>Electorate 2020</b>	<b>Electorate 2025</b>
WC6	Fincham CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	436	436
WC7	Stradsett CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	57	57
WD6	Marham CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	768	813
WE1	Marham CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	755	755
WF6	Shouldham CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	476	476
WF7	Shouldham Thorpe CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	129	129
WG6	Wormegay CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	308	308
WH6	Boughton CP	Wissey Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	196	196
WJ6	Stoke Ferry CP	Wissey Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	962	1,079
WK6	Wereham CP	Wissey Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	553	564
WL6	Wretton CP	Wissey Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	333	333
WP6	Crimplesham CP	Airfield Ward	Nar and Wissey Valleys ED	219	219
PN1	Hunstanton CP	Hunstanton Ward	North Coast ED	3,841	4,390
PP1	Old Hunstanton CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	363	363
PQ1	Brancaster CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	458	471
PQ7	Titchwell CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	75	75
PR6	Brancaster CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	354	354
PS1	Holme Next the Sea CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	223	223
PT6	Thornham CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	356	356
PV1	Ringstead CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	264	264
RA7	Choseley CP	Brancaster Ward	North Coast ED	19	19
RH6	Burnham Market CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	696	696
RH7	Burnham Norton CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	71	71
RJ6	Burnham Overy CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	246	246
RK6	Burnham Thorpe CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	125	125
RL1	North Creak CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	North Coast ED	302	302
RM1	South Creak CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	North Coast ED	441	441
RN6	Stanhoe CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	162	162
RN7	Barwick CP	Burnham Market & Docking Ward	North Coast ED	47	47
RP6	Syderstone CP	Bircham with Rudhams Ward	North Coast ED	393	393
SV2	Tilney All Saints CP	Clenchwarton Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	491	491

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
SX1	Tilney St. Lawrence CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	1,106	1,128
SY1	Tilney St. Lawrence CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	194	194
TF1	Marshland St. James CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	1,097	1,124
WG2	Tottenhill CP	Watlington Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	165	165
WR1	Wimbotsham CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	599	693
WS6	Stow Bardolph CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	305	305
WS7	Stow Bardolph CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	213	213
WW6	Stow Bardolph CP	Upwell & Delph Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	495	495
XD1	Runcton Holme CP	Airfield Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	600	616
XE1	Watlington CP	Watlington Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	2,062	2,113
XF1	Wiggenhall St. Germans CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	882	882
XF2	Wiggenhall St. Germans CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	222	222
XG6	Wiggenhall St. Mary Magdalen CP	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall Ward	Watlington and the Fens ED	619	619

---



---

120,305	127,939
---------	---------

## Appendix 2 – List of Polling Districts in North Norfolk District

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
CT1	Cromer Town East CP	Cromer Town	Cromer ED	1,264	1,264
CT2	Cromer Town West CP	Cromer Town	Cromer ED	1,729	1,754
CT3	Cromer Town South CP	Cromer Town	Cromer ED	1,101	1,193
PO1	Northrepps CP	Poppyland	Cromer ED	907	907
PO2	Overstrand CP	Poppyland	Cromer ED	864	877
PO3	Sidestrand CP	Poppyland	Cromer ED	82	82
PO4	Trimingham CP	Poppyland	Cromer ED	311	311
SP1	Suffield Park CP	Suffield Park	Cromer ED	2,267	2,432
BR1	Briston CP	Briston	Eynsford ED	2,037	2,105
ER1	Alby with Thwaite CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	197	197
ER2	Aldborough CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	490	497
ER3	Colby CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	409	409
ER4	Erpingham CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	497	504
ER5	Hanworth CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	134	134
ER6	Ingworth CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	84	84
ER7	Itteringham CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	115	115
ER8	Sustead CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	171	171
ER9	Wickmere CP	Erpingham	Eynsford ED	122	122
GR1	Aylmerton CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	392	392
GR10	West Beckham CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	200	200
GR4	East Beckham CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	30	30
GR5	Gresham CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	337	337
GR7	Little Barningham CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	106	106
GR8	Matlaske CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	144	144
GR9	Plumstead CP	Gresham	Eynsford ED	109	109
RO1	Felbrigg CP	Roughton	Eynsford ED	157	157

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
RO2	Gimingham CP	Roughton	Eynsford ED	366	366
RO3	Roughton CP	Roughton	Eynsford ED	815	860
RO4	Southrepps CP	Roughton	Eynsford ED	715	731
RO5	Thorpe Market CP	Roughton	Eynsford ED	265	265
STO3	Corpusty and Saxthorpe CP	Stody	Eynsford ED	590	603
LN1	Fakenham (North) CP	Lancaster North	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	1,910	2,544
LS1	Fakenham (South) CP	Lancaster South	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	4,390	4,452
RA1	Dunton CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	103	103
RA2	Helhoughton CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	331	331
RA3	Hempton CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	433	433
RA4	Pudding Norton CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	212	212
RA5	Raynham CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	299	440
RA6	Tattersett CP	The Raynhams	Fakenham and the Raynhams ED	791	791
CO1	Blakeney CP	Coastal	Greenhoe ED	603	603
CO4	Morston CP	Coastal	Greenhoe ED	74	74
CO6	Stiffkey CP	Coastal	Greenhoe ED	176	176
PR1	Gunthorpe (North) CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	86	86
PR2	Binham CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	249	249
PR3	Field Dalling & Saxlingham CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	245	245
PR4	Gunthorpe (South) CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	91	91
PR5	Hindringham CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	410	410
PR6	Langham CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	320	320
PR7	Thursford CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	173	173
PR8	Warham CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	160	160
PR9	Wighton CP	Priory	Greenhoe ED	181	181
ST1	Fulmodeston CP	Stibbard	Greenhoe ED	389	389
ST2	Great Ryburgh CP	Stibbard	Greenhoe ED	542	542
ST4	Kettlestone CP	Stibbard	Greenhoe ED	170	170
ST5	Little Ryburgh CP	Stibbard	Greenhoe ED	30	30

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Existing Ward</b>	<b>Proposed Division</b>	<b>Electorate 2020</b>	<b>Electorate 2025</b>
WA1	Barsham CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	198	198
WA2	Great Snoring CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	147	147
WA3	Great Walsingham CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	291	308
WA4	Little Snoring CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	481	518
WA5	Little Walsingham CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	364	364
WA6	Sculthorpe CP	Walsingham	Greenhoe ED	592	592
WH1	Holkham CP	Wells with Holkham	Greenhoe ED	180	180
WH2	Wells-Next-The-Sea CP	Wells with Holkham	Greenhoe ED	1,841	1,841
BA3	Walcott CP	Bacton	Happing ED	571	571
BA4	Witton CP	Bacton	Happing ED	274	274
HA1	Brumstead CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	47	47
HA2	East Ruston CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	446	446
HA3	Happisburgh CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	633	643
HA4	Honing CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	271	271
HA5	Ingham CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	304	304
HA6	Lessingham CP	Happisburgh	Happing ED	488	488
HI1	Hickling CP	Hickling	Happing ED	837	837
HI2	Horsey CP	Hickling	Happing ED	56	56
HI3	Potter Heigham CP	Hickling	Happing ED	895	895
HI4	Sea Palling with Waxham CP	Hickling	Happing ED	420	420
STA1	Catfield CP	Stalham	Happing ED	795	806
STB1	Horning CP	St. Benet's	Happing ED	960	979
STB2	Ludham CP	St. Benet's	Happing ED	1,089	1,107
CO2	Cley-Next-The-Sea CP	Coastal	Holt ED	360	360
CO3	Kelling CP	Coastal	Holt ED	131	131
CO5	Salthouse CP	Coastal	Holt ED	121	121
CO7	Weybourne CP	Coastal	Holt ED	442	445
CO8	Wiveton CP	Coastal	Holt ED	104	104
GR2	Baconsthorpe CP	Gresham	Holt ED	165	165

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Existing Ward</b>	<b>Proposed Division</b>	<b>Electorate 2020</b>	<b>Electorate 2025</b>
GR3	Bodham CP	Gresham	Holt ED	397	397
GR6	Hempstead CP	Gresham	Holt ED	142	142
HO1	Holt CP	Holt	Holt ED	3,009	3,434
HO2	High Kelling CP	Holt	Holt ED	465	465
HO3	Letheringsett and Glandford CP	Holt	Holt ED	189	189
ST3	Hindolveston CP	Stibbard	Holt ED	440	440
ST6	Stibbard CP	Stibbard	Holt ED	298	298
ST7	Swanton Novers CP	Stibbard	Holt ED	183	183
ST8	Thurning CP	Stibbard	Holt ED	54	54
ST9	Wood Norton CP	Stibbard	Holt ED	183	183
STO1	Briningham CP	Stody	Holt ED	98	98
STO2	Brinton CP	Stody	Holt ED	183	183
STO4	Edgefield CP	Stody	Holt ED	341	374
STO5	Melton Constable CP	Stody	Holt ED	464	508
STO6	Stody CP	Stody	Holt ED	144	144
STO7	Thornage CP	Stody	Holt ED	151	151
HT1	Ashmanhaugh CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	149	149
HT2	Barton Turf CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	401	401
HT3	Dilham CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	281	281
HT4	Hoveton CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	1,797	1,817
HT5	Neatishead CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	488	488
HT6	Sioley CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	220	220
HT7	Smallburgh CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	434	434
HT8	Tunstead CP	Hoveton & Tunstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	598	598
STA2	Stalham CP	Stalham	Hoveton and Stalham ED	2,721	2,798
STA3	Sutton CP	Stalham	Hoveton and Stalham ED	955	955
WO1	Scottow CP	Worstead	Hoveton and Stalham ED	745	745
BA1	Bacton CP	Bacton	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	1,020	1,034
BA2	Paston CP	Bacton	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	202	202

Polling District	Parish	Existing Ward	Proposed Division	Electorate 2020	Electorate 2025
MU1	Mundesley CP	Mundesley	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	2,270	2,270
NWW1	North Walsham (West) CP	North Walsham West	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	2,959	3,186
TR1	Antingham CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	282	282
TR2	Felmingham CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	439	439
TR3	Knapton CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	323	344
TR4	Suffield CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	116	116
TR5	Swafield CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	239	239
TR6	Trunch CP	Trunch	Mundesley and North Walsham West ED	793	793
NWE1	North Walsham (East) CP	North Walsham East	North Walsham East ED	3,780	3,780
NWW2	North Walsham (North (f)) CP	North Walsham West	North Walsham East ED	1,395	1,395
NWX1	North Walsham (Town Centre East (g)) CP	North Walsham Market Cross	North Walsham East ED	1,375	1,375
NWX2	North Walsham (Town Centre West (h)) CP	North Walsham Market Cross	North Walsham East ED	797	797
WO2	Skeyton CP	Worstead	North Walsham East ED	189	189
WO3	Swanton Abbott CP	Worstead	North Walsham East ED	366	366
WO4	Westwick CP	Worstead	North Walsham East ED	72	72
WO5	Worstead CP	Worstead	North Walsham East ED	787	787
BE1	Beeston Regis CP	Beeston Regis & The Runtons	Sheringham ED	840	840
BE2	East Runton CP	Beeston Regis & The Runtons	Sheringham ED	626	626
BE3	West Runton CP	Beeston Regis & The Runtons	Sheringham ED	754	754
SN1	Sheringham (North) CP	Sheringham North	Sheringham ED	2,065	2,189
SS1	Sheringham (South) CP	Sheringham South	Sheringham ED	3,995	3,995
SS2	Upper Sheringham CP	Sheringham South	Sheringham ED	208	326

**Total**

**84,300 86,808**

## **Appendix 3a      Response to Member – Long Stratton Division**

### **1) Issues and Queries Summary**

- a) The presentation of the plans in March to members shows the parish of Wacton (Polling District (PD) SV1; 287 electors) was part of the Long Stratton division.
- b) In the submission to the LGBCE, Wacton was moved out of the Long Stratton division.
- c) The LGBCE proposal accepted the NCC submission and did not include Wacton in the Long Stratton division.
- d) Wacton strongly identifies with Long Stratton whereas Newton Flotman PD MF1; 1,115 electors), which has been included in the division, does not.
- e) The proposed division has 1,800 plus homes being built and will now have a +9% variance, which make the tasks of representing residents more difficult.
- f) The Member concerned should have been consulted of any changes to the Long Stratton division.

### **2) Response**

- a) The NCC submission states that the boundary for the Long Stratton division has been one of the most difficult to work out. This is because the current division is coterminous with six other divisions. Experience of the process has taught that one has to finalise the boundaries of divisions, which are coterminous with District boundaries because no division can cross a District boundary.
- b) In the case of the drawing out of South Norfolk, it was necessary to work out and finalise the divisions around Wymondham and Hethersett first, because there were very large increases in the number of electors. This meant that the proposed divisions of Forehoe, Hethersett and Hingham, all of which are coterminous with Long Stratton became a solid immovable border.
- c) Next, the five other divisions viz: - Henstead, Loddon, Waveney Valley (Clavering), East and West Depwade, all of which were coterminous with a District boundary had to be finalised. This left Long Stratton in the middle to use up what could not be included in the other divisions because it would increase their variances to over the permitted +10% variance.
- d) After the presentation to Members a number of changes were made to all of the Districts under the guidance of the Member Working Group (MWG). Members were made aware that no division could be under or over 10% and that any changes to one division would have an impact on other ones. Therefore the principle of the 'greatest overall good,' would be observed.
- e) No Members were formally notified of any changes after the Member presentation.
- f) It is the LGBCE who included Topcroft (PD FV1; 232 electors) in the proposal, which increased the Long Stratton variance. This was because Topcroft Parish Council wrote saying: -


'Topcroft Parish Council has resolved at the 13th January 2020 meeting that Topcroft would prefer to be in the Hempnall Ward, as the village has closer links to Hempnall than the Waveney Valley and children from Topcroft attend the Hempnall School.'




- g) Many Councillors will be faced with the task of representing many more electors because the overall population of Norfolk has risen significantly since the last Periodic Review of County Councillors. This rise is continuing and Broadland for example is expected to see a 10% increase from 2019 to 2025.
- h) The Member concerned has argued consistently during the process for the current Long Stratton division to remain as present without any changes. This is not possible because of the geographical and physical constraints mentioned above and there would also be an insufficient number of electors in the division.

Alistair Skipper  
Project Lead Boundary Review  
Date: - 21/09/2020

## 1) Breckland – Proposed Divisions




## 2) Broadland – Proposed Divisions






## 3) Great Yarmouth – Proposed Divisions






4) King's Lynn and West Norfolk – Proposed Divisions






5) King's Lynn and West Norfolk – Ward Alignments

Revised Proposed Electoral Divisions






**B39**




## 7) North Norfolk – Ward Alignments





# 8) Norwich – Proposed Divisions



## 9) South Norfolk – Proposed Divisions

