

| Number | Name | Your feedback |
|--------|----------------|--|
| 1 | jennie wardlaw | i do not agree with the 2 authority proposal for suffolk. suffolk county council has been solely responsible for the main 2 areas that effect our every day lives - education & social welfare. the current authority is established & should be given the opportunity to continue. i do not believe these 2 huge services could be carried out any more efficiently or effectively by 2 authorities. we are in a difficult position in suffolk to have any confidence in the local politicians as the liberal democrats criticise any decisions made by the conservative county councillors; however they work in partnership with the conservatives at ipswich borough council. the new council needs to provide the services it is statutorily obliged to do & drop the egotistical elements that the councillors seem more interested in. |
| 2 | Brian Knights | I do not want my parish to be engulfed by a greater Ipswich. My preference is for an East Suffolk unitary council. |
| 3 | Susan Knights | I do not want my parish engulfed by a greater Ipswich. I want my parish to be part of an East Suffolk unitary council. |
| 4 | Mervyn Peckham | I find the draft Proposal for Suffolk made by the boundaries Committee completely unacceptable. As far as I can ascertain boundary changes did not appear in any manifesto and have not been requested by the general public. This seems to be another burden forced upon us by an unelected quango who have no local knowledge whatsoever. In my opinion and that of many others change is neither wanted nor necessary! |
| 5 | Alan Fletcher | I remain to be convinced that any change to the current structure of local government in Suffolk is necessary and resent the edict from a Secretary of State with a seat in the Manchester area, who has probably never visited Suffolk, that what we need is Unitary Local Government. I have seen no persuasive evidence to show that the upheaval involved will result in increased efficiency and/or accountability. I live in an area where the district council earns regular praise from the independent auditors, as does the county council for the work they do. Why therefore interfere with the way they operate now? If, and I stress if, change is unavoidable then I strongly believe that the only viable option is a Unitary County with maximum devolvement of operational matters to some form of sub-structure. As the County Council currently provides around 80% of the services we receive, such a structure should minimise interference with those services and MAY produce economies of scale for the services currently provided by the districts. Separating Ipswich from the rest of the county seems wholly inappropriate. The county town should remain the hub around which the whole county develops and it should not be hived off to satisfy party politics. The current review was started by a handful of Ipswich Borough councillors with personal ambitions that I believe have blurred their judgement. They claim their motivation is meeting the desires and needs of Ipswich people although their true motivation is transparent. Ipswich is part of Suffolk and should remain so for ceremonial and governmental purposes. |

| | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| 6 | Peter Rayment | As a resident, I have no desire to become part of any unitary council formed by expanding the boundary of Ipswich. We have been very well served by Suffolk Coastal over many years and see no benefit in making any changes to its boundaries. As a pensioner on a fixed income, it would be very difficult for my wife and I to pay more in council tax that would result in joining with Ipswich with absolutely no perceived benefits to us. |
| 7 | Alister Gourlay | <p>The concept of two unitary authorities is wasteful given that the County Council is unique in providing effective and efficient services.</p> <p>I therefore support wholeheartedly the "fall-back" proposal of ONE SUFFOLK</p> |
| 8 | Cathryn Fisher | The proposal accepts, rightly in my opinion, that Waveney does not work as a District. There is little in common between Lowestoft and the coastal villages to the north and the market towns and their rural hinterlands to the south. Because Lowestoft has the highest population density it has a louder voice on the council to the detriment of the rest of Waveney and there is a definite feeling in rural Waveney that the District Council spends so much time and money on Lowestoft that the rest of the District loses out. In the proposed authority of Suffolk, less Ipswich, Felixstowe, and Lowestoft, the market towns of Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth, Southwold, and their rural hinterlands, would have far more in common with the rest of the area which should mean less conflict between different social structures and lead to a better understanding of their needs and consequently provide the services they require. |
| 9 | sue barnard | <p>The idea of moving Lowestoft into Norfolk does not make economic or any sense at all. Gt Yarmouth, part of Norfolk, has the 4th most socially deprived ward in England and Norfolk County Council has not provided the support to change that situation. If Lowestoft were to be placed into Norfolk it would not see funding or support to increase its economic position, if the current position of Great Yarmouth is anything to go by. Also if you put two towns with economic development needs into one council then that council has to provide for both whereas if Lowestoft remains in Suffolk then the councils there with their economic strengths based on the Felixstowe docks, the A14 corridor, the effects in the west of the county of the Cambridge economy and the closeness of Ipswich to London with its spin offs, have more to offer Lowestoft than being included in a council that lacks such economic strengths.</p> <p>Further it has been suggested in the local media that one of the largest employers in Lowestoft could re-locate if the Waveney Campus is not built and that depends on current councils developing this site with this employer i.e Cefas.</p> <p>I can see nothing positive in moving Lowestoft into Norfolk.</p> |

| | | |
|----|------------------------|--|
| 10 | Pauline Howard | I have no great interest in politics but feel moved to fill in this form. I believe that the Suffolk/ unitary Ipswich proposal is a catastrophe in planning. Apart from the fact that I am sure most people do not want to be 'pulled' into Ipswich, the fact is that the county would be split in a disunited one. Ipswich Borough would have to undergo a massive expansion to cope with all the extra people and services and this would obviously impact on the Council Tax. Suffolk County Council already outsource their IT and HR function to a BT/SCC unit. Suffolk County Council used to run the District IT before the splits in the 1990's. Suffolk Council County are in a much stronger position to take on a One-Suffolk authority. PLEASE DON'T CREATE AN IPSWICH & FELIXSTOWE UA !!!!! |
| 11 | Mr G Hodson | Dear Sir/Madam,I am very much against a single unitary council for Ipswich/Suffolk. I most strongly object to this centralisation which will remove local accountability. I would have thought that the exact opposite is required with more local representation and accountability these days - large may be cheap, but it is definitely not beautiful. I have no intension of living under a larger Ipswich. The record of Ipswich council is abysmal and would not wish to be associated with such an administration in any shape or form. I was originally born in Heywood Lancashire and have first-hand knowledge of how single larger authorities perform. Heywood council was included in a greater Rochdale many years ago. The result was that Heywood was starved of money and resources. The local people have no power to change the situation and feel totally disconnected from decisions that affect their local community.The same arguments made against amalgamating police forces apply, ie we need more local accountability not less, more local representation not less. We pay for these services and it should be our decision - not yours.Yours faithfullyMr G Hodson |
| 12 | Sharon Lee Cuthbert | <p>The current arrangements with Suffolk Coastal work very effectively and ensure that the identity of this area as distinct from mid and West Suffolk is maintained. There are many local issues such as sea defences that will be pushed low down the priority list by the reorganisation proposals.</p> <p>This constant reorganisation in local governement and the knock-on effect on statutory services has a major impact on the effectiveness of services during the change period and is an extraordinary waste of money.</p> <p>The idea of one large council for 'the rest' of Suffolk is inappropriate.</p> |
| 13 | M&B Shout | We would like to see the abolition of Suffolk Coastal District Council which is too entrenched in its' objectives and support the setting up of 'One Council for Suffolk' less Lowestoft. |
| 14 | Charles Desmond Sutton | I feel very strongly that the rural village of Nacton should NOT, repeat NOT become part of an Ipswich unitary authority. It would be much better if Ipswich retained it's current boundray as a unitary authority and the rest of Suffolk was divided into two rural unitary authorities. |

| | | |
|----|---------------------|---|
| 15 | Mr and Mrs L Sapsed | We do NOT support the option that our locality becomes part of 'greater Ipswich'. Suffolk Coastal Council provides us with reliable services, approachable officers who are fully aware of the issues relating to our locality and are far more easily accessible than Ipswich. We feel much more closely linked to Woodbridge than to Ipswich. Ipswich is an urban environment, whereas our locality is still, despite considerable development, rural; Suffolk Coastal has always attempted to maintain as much green space and historical footpaths as possible and we dread the thought of becoming a dormitory of Ipswich. |
| 16 | Fiona Hay | I am unsure why we need to be a unitary authority i.e. what would the costs and benefits be to the people of Suffolk and it's flora and fauna. What are the problems at the moment which mean that becoming a unitary authority would be addressed? Why change something if it is working perfectly well as it is? I'm also concerned about Martlesham Heath being lumped in with Ipswich. The two areas are very different and I am sure we would always lose out to the main Town. It does not seem to make sense to carve up the County in the way suggested. And how much is this review costing? And how much will it cost for all the new signs and stationery? At the moment Suffolk Coastal DC are aware of the issues within its area and why not just leave well alone? If it is about cost savings then surely it should be one authority and that would make more sense. If there is two authorities with one being rural then people are going to have problems accessing their Council because it could be miles away from them and people running the authority will be spending a lot of time running around what will be a large area. This is not terribly "green" in terms of fuel. Surely the Ipswich and other major build up areas authority would be wealthier. The rural authority would always lose out. |
| 17 | Mr J Anstey | I am opposed to the proposals for a unitary Ipswich area including my area of chapel St Mary. Ipswich services are expensive and are rarely submitted to fair and open competition (hence the high cost and high council tax). I have no wish to be governed by a Greater Ipswich Council. I shop in Hadleigh and Colchester and have closer links with both of these towns. I wish to remain in Suffolk. The option to move Lowestoft into Norfolk makes no sense. My view is that if unitary government must take place it should be on the basis of a unitary Suffolk (including Lowestoft) which would be by far the cheapest option for the tax payers of Suffolk. having read the submissions and the report this must make sense. Please listen to the local people and do not make decisions on political grounds.J Anstey |
| 18 | Paul Tams | |
| 19 | P Parke | resubmission of document in PDF format detailing arguments against BC proposal and those in favour of an East/West Suffolk and Ipswich solution |

| | | |
|----|------------------|---|
| 20 | P Parke | I am AGAINST the proposal for Suffolk and IN FAVOUR of an East/West/Ipswich rearrangement. Docuemnt is attached giving reasons. |
| 21 | Michael Matthews | <p>I wish to make two points.</p> <p>Lessons should be learnt from the Humnberside fiasco in 1974 which sought to combine two communities which were suspicious of each other. Lowestoft is Suffolk and few there want to be part of Norfolk. If the move is forced there will be constant grumblings as with Humberside and the decision will require revisiting at considerable cost.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposal to allow Ipswich to take over a considerable rural area together with local towns is a poor one. Ipswich is already the hub; but the way of life in the surrounding villages and even in the towns is quite different.</p> <p>Suffolk is working. the best solution is to create a unitary authority for the whole county, including Waverney. At least the Suffolk CC unbderstands both urban and rural concerns.</p> |
| 22 | Trevor Lockwood | <p>Suffolk's had a chequered history, but probably felt most comfortable when split into two parts: West Suffolk with Bury St Edmunds as the county town, and East Suffolk with Ipswich. That worked extremely, particularly as the full county is 100 miles from east to west.</p> <p>The separation of Lowestoft from the county makes little sense. Improving the A12 and rail links would be more useful. We are the South Folk and have never easily worked with the North Folk. The tribal differences remain. The folk of Suffolk will regret the loss of Lowestoft ‘ and it will make untidy geography, and little economic sense.</p> <p>For Felixstowe either of the presented options is preferable to the present system. We have suffered considerably under Suffolk Coastal DC control, having acted as a cash cow to support the rural areas to our east, most of which are in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Although our peninsular (Colneis) is just as attractive the ANOB stops at Bawdsey and starts again on the other side of the River Orwell. We supply money to SCDC which they have spent on outside contractors: each of whom offer poor service, and ‘ importantly ‘ take money out of the town. The same condition exists at the port, a large container terminal but now owned by the Chinese. Local workers are wage slaves, and no profit remains in this area, it is all drained away.</p> <p>As a result Felixstowe is a town in decay. In the last sixty years it has been run down. Hotels demolished, with no replacements, a pier that stands idle, a beach destroyed by dredging.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>So, what of the options. Local politicians will favour the full county unitary. That will ensure it remains forever in Conservative control. That form of democracy turns to benign dictatorship, and we've had that under SCDC for many years. We are also a large county, it will need to be divided to provide services. It has an appeal in that services can be countywide and there will not be differences of service provision. For such a system to work the parish, and certainly the town councils will need to be given more power. Elected mayors, with a prescribed budget, local community panels not under political control would seem desirable. The big problem with British democracy is the power of the political parties. With the whip imposed they are dictatorial and subject to the whims of the local oligarchy. We have a Cabinet system here now, which allows the Leader and Deputy Leader absolute power " and they exercise that power.</p> <p>Combining Ipswich with Felixstowe and the other 19 parishes probably allows other political parties a chance. For Felixstowe it can't be much worse than now. We can hope that the Shotley peninsular will be developed, with a bridge or tunnel across the River Stour to link to Harwich and A120, Felixstowe has enormous tourist potential, and can certainly act as the entertainment centre for Ipswich. Housing over-development will be a problem, and S106 could be revised, it's failed to encourage self-build and allowed bland corporate estates everywhere. The new Greater Ipswich provides more opportunities. Rural Suffolk has completely different requirements, and supposedly Greater Ipswich can provide regional centres " in education, health, transport, that will support the small towns and villages outside of the Ipswich area.</p> <p>As a geographer neither plan satisfies. The whole county is too large, with no defined centres. The Greater Ipswich option fails to consider the part the hinterland plays in servicing the conurbation. And the loss of Lowestoft is inexplicable.</p> <p>A dogs dinner all round. If forced to make a choice I'd opt for Greater Ipswich. That will best serve Felixstowe, who can provide many of the amenities that Ipswich town lacks, and combined the units will work well, given political initiative. However the politicians are the weak link. We need more community involvement. Councils and to a lesser extent, councillors, have too much power. That must be devolved, decisions must be openly discussed and explained. The consultation process is a farce in Suffolk Coastal DC. Press releases are issued 36 hours before the 'consultation', they are held in the morning on weekdays, and the public are not allowed to speak. That must be addressed, and changed.</p> <p>Each small town must have a Market Town Health Check, with the local community informed and involved. Every Parish its own plan. The power of councils must be reduced. They are servants of the people.</p> |
|--|---|

| | | |
|----|----------------|--|
| 23 | Tony Greenacre | <p>I would like to express my dismay in the proposed boundary reviews for Suffolk, particularly the idea that Lowestoft should be administered by Norfolk.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council is a 4* improving well council that has invested millions in the Lowestoft area in recent years with support for projects such as University Campus Suffolk and the off shore renewables sector. They continue to push for improvements in the infrastructure with the northern spine relief road and the Beccles rail loop. With the education review moving towards a two tier system we will see the construction of a new high school in the area and the boundary moves will throw more uncertainty in to this area. The potential to lose this kind of support and investment as well as being administered by a much poorer performing council is totally unfair to the residents of the town.</p> <p>The Governments recent green paper regarding the benefits revue has Norfolk proposed as a test county in 2010. With the boundary change this would see Lowestoft coming into the trial and the long term unemployed having to work for their benefits. In a deprived area with serious employment problems this would be extremely unpopular and many may see it that the boundaries were redrawn simply to include a large are of long term unemployment into the trial.</p> <p>I run my own business from premises 4 miles from my home. Under the new proposals my home would be in one authority and, through no choice of mine, my business would be in a different authority. This would mean that I would have no vote for people making decisions that would affect my business.</p> <p>Lowestoft is large administrative town that caters for the rural areas of Waveney District. Taking Lowestoft out of the equation would leave the market towns and rural areas with no focal town and has the potential to leave them feeling like a forgotten area of the county with long journeys to another suitable administrative town.</p> <p>Your preferred proposal to create two unitary authorities would remove large centres of populations from the rest of the county leaving a very rural authority which I feel would put great pressure on services. I support the option for a single unitary to cover all of Suffolk, but it must include Lowestoft. I can see the thinking behind the decision for Lowestoft to join Norfolk due to the similarities between Lowestoft and Gt Yarmouth, but the towns already work together with a joint PCT and the projects that the URC are proposing. They can continue to work together across boundaries with out the need for them to be administered by the same authority.</p> <p>I very much hope that the Boundary Commission listens to the views of residents and councils alike and reconsider their proposals to provide a single authority for the whole of Suffolk including Lowestoft.</p> |
|----|----------------|--|

| | | |
|----|-----------------|--|
| 24 | r eaton | I would like to register my objection to the current preferred plan for Suffolk of 2 unitary authorities. I live in a small village just outside Ipswich. It is a rural farming community & I cannot see that our interests are going to be served by a large county town like Ipswich which is focused on its commercial activity. If we have to become a unitary authority then lets have 1 for the whole of Suffolk. This must be more cost effective & would simply replace the existing Suffolk County Council. |
| 25 | N cobley | Suffolk should have a single authority for the whole county and district and borough councils should be scrapped. Lowestoft should remain as part of Suffolk. The duplication in some areas of local government is a waste of money. |
| 26 | Anthony White | I am very surprised by the BCD recommendations. The recommendations appear to have ignored the opinions of the local communities. Living in Kesgrave, I do not want to become part of a massive Ipswich council. The recommendations will create one of the biggest councils in the country. The proposal concerning Lowestoft is absolutely crazy. The voices of the communities between Felixstowe and Ipswich have been totally ignored. |
| 27 | John W. Hammond | As a resident of Kesgrave, I do not consider myself to be part of the Ipswich community, therefore I am ill disposed to be lumped into an Ipswich and District UA. My preference, should Suffolk Coastal be abolished, would be to have a whole Suffolk UA, as I, along with many other local residents, have many links with the whole of Suffolk. My family and I rarely use Ipswich for services, and find almost all our shopping and services needs in nearby Woodbridge or Felixstowe. If Norfolk is recommended as a whole Norfolk UA, then it appears obvious that equal criteria should apply to Suffolk. |
| 28 | Alan Green | Lowstoft should remain in Suffolk. I can see no gain in moving the boundary. This town has been part of Suffolk for many years. |
| 29 | simon whitney | I would much rather see Suffolk remain as one large unitary Suffolk rather than be split into smaller authorities which I believe will be more inefficient and costly. To help the poor and needy is far easier in large unit rather than small. |
| 30 | Amanda Jones | The Suffolk option with out Lowestoft is preferable. It is likely to require a realignment of the PCT for good partnership working. |
| 31 | Catherine Ward | I think that Kessingland should be part of the Lowestoft/Norfolk proposal. It has always seemed to me that Kessingland is the southern end of Lowestoft rather than an isolated rural parish. |

| | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| 32 | C NORMAN | <p>The proposal for the unitary council changes to the existing Suffolk district councils do not make economic or practical sense. To have one large unitary council for all of Suffolk, apart from Ipswich, is politically motivated. I and all my fellow residents in this part of Suffolk are perfectly happy with the present arrangements. We believe we are served well by Suffolk Coastal District, they are accountable locally, manage their budgets well and are always available for any problems or queries. The officials and employees are local and understand the local needs. One big unitary council for Suffolk would be unwieldy, unaccountable locally, not understand local needs, but more importantly would employ officials on larger salaries, have more grandiose schemes with a much larger budget, which in all likelihood would be spent unevenly through the county. Please leave well alone and listen to the people of Suffolk not your political masters.</p> |
| 33 | Mark Ling | <p>Please may I express my support for the recent Boundaries Commission proposal for a North Haven unitary council including Ipswich and Felixstowe; maintaining a separate unitary council for the rest of Suffolk. I believe your proposed solution will best address the absurdity & wastefulness of our current political layers and boundaries; and allow a unitary body to focus on urban Greater Ipswich area (North Haven); and one for rural Suffolk). For me the key objectives for the new framework (boundaries) is for them to be depolitized to avoid having duplication of functions; and to ensure greater accountability. Simply put, to ensure that less politicians and public servants deliver more of what they promise. Greater Ipswich is one of the fastest growing centres in England, with urban issues and an urban radius of influence. It would be disastrous to force Greater Ipswich under a Suffolk Council, whose issues and objectives are entirely different and vice versa. In my view your current proposal for North Haven is the best solution !</p> <p>My view is that Felixstowe peninsula, Shotley peninsula, Kesgrave, Martlesham and Rushmere St Andrew will be most cost effectively served combined with Greater Ipswich (North Haven). Regardless of local snobbery - and as lovely as they are - most of these areas are already extensions of; and influenced by Ipswich; with shared and common needs. They certainly have little in common with rural communities or towns such as Framlingham, Woodbridge, etc. I am both proud to live in Rushmere St Andrew and be part of Ipswich. Remove the old fashioned prejudices and superfluous councillors trying to cling to power, I am already living in Greater Ipswich area.</p> <p>On the bigger picture of political boundaries, today we have at least five levels of political and public service bureaucracy - borough council, county council, regional assemblies, parliamentary (National) and EU. We have a political game of 'snakes and ladders' leaving to a system that constantly fails to deliver anything it promises - and leaving a bewildered and frustrated electorate. Who pays for this mess ? The taxpayer. In my view only two levels of politics are really needed:- local (unitary) and national. All others are superfluous and produce little benefit or simple accountability for the electorate.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 34 | Nicola Cassy | <p>I am a member of a very small parish council on the suffolk coast. I have lived in the village all my life. I have the following objections to the current proposals:</p> <p>We find it difficult enough to get funding for coastal defences in the current arrangement, but I cannot see people in West Suffolk wishing to fund expensive protection for this area - please note I did not chose to live here as a baby - but have since grown to love the land around me very much! Why should an area I value be destroyed because of other people's greed and destructive habits while they live safe inland away from the damage to the environment they cause.</p> <p>We also have major issues with transportation. Through extra funding from the current councils we now have a but service running to Ipswich 6 times a day - much better than 3 times a week when I was growing up. How is this going to be affected by separating Ipswich from the rest of the county.</p> <p>To have a county headquarters at Bury St. Edmunds would involve an 80 mile round trip for us - a journey currently only possible by car what about the elderly people in our village who have no car? Even Ipswich involves an hour long bus journey each way. Woodbridge is so much more convenient.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that the current arrangements are fine. Neither of the proposals can provide the services we currently have. If anything must change, please, please keep East Suffolk separate.</p> |
| 35 | Cliff Cocker | <p>After a lot of deliberation during the consultation period I decided that if the status quo was not an option then the east and west suffolk scheme with Ipswich remaining in its own boundaries was the next best thing. Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils already have a lot of joint working arrangements (including sharing a chief executive) and we do share the same problems. All that has come from your think tank (and I use the words loosely) is a hotch potch of ideas that has had the effect of uniting all of the political parties in a universal condemnation of a scheme which I beleive has been described by a senior political figure as "a load of crap". The only reason for such stupid schemes (both North Haven and one Suffolk excluding Felixstowe and Lowestoft) is that the present administration has never liked the shire counties, especially conservative shire counties and you have been encouraged to put forward schemes that will destroy same shire counties. I am proud to serve both on Suffolk Coastal District Council and Woodbridge Town Council and am completely dismayed by your recomendations</p> <p>Cliff Cocker</p> |

| | | |
|----|------------------|---|
| 36 | John Taylor | I see no need to change anything. If it had not been for Ipswich Borough Council applying for unitary status then things would have stayed as they are now. Of the options available I see the only option being a one suffolk run by one authority county wide. |
| 37 | David Chappell | I believe the proposal as a whole fails to refelect the wishes of the residents of the area. Indeed it would appear no effort has been made to ensure ordinary people feel t is worth taking part |
| 38 | Roger E. Cooper | The concept and adoption of Unitary Councils is not new. Such Councils must have been in existence for around 20 years now and so there must have been lessons learned by now concerning their benefits or otherwise. I find it strange, therefore, that the cases put forward justifying the adoption of Unitary Councils do not refer to any such past experience but favour simple statements such as "we believe" or "we are led to believe". I would have hoped to see statements such as "the change to the Unitary Council system in XXX County in 1999 led to savings of Â£YYY [ZZ%] in the overall annual running costs which by 2002 had ba;lanced out the costs associated with the changeover". In the interests of brevity I quote only a financial example but lessons learned ought to include the effects of increased remoteness of outlying areas from the Council Headquarters for example. I hope that somewhere in the decision structure and process there exists a body of such knowledge which will be brought into play. There should be no need to make these decisions on the basis of zero historical background. |
| 40 | G H Smith | I think the best option for Suffolk is for the boundaries of Ipswich to be enlarged with it becoming a unitary authority and the remainder of the county to be split into East Suffolk and West Suffolk |
| 41 | Peter Bannister | Very disappointed with both proposals which clearly do not take into account the views of the residents of Suffolk. As always a Government body just ignores the people you supposed to serve. One council covering all of suffolk, the fall back option, is much better than breaking up the greater Ipswich Area. |
| 42 | Goodhand | I and my family are totally against the proposals for Lowestoft regarding the boundaries. We most certainly want to remain part of Suffolk as is our heritage. This is unwarranted expense to suggest this change. Lowestoft in Suffolk is the identity that we're born with. The proposals must not go ahead as they will cause great problems in the future. I do not believe that the people of Yarmouth want this change either. I will support any avenue to prevent this happening as i know also, will an amazing amount of people. |
| 43 | Jennifer Plummer | The plan to place Lowestoft within Norfolk is simply not on. We were born in Suffolk and wish to remain in Suffolk. Why cannot the commission listen to the views of the local people. The majority are against splitting off Lowestoft from the rest of Suffolk. Leave our town within Suffolk! |

| | | |
|----|-----------------|---|
| 44 | charlotte lewis | <p>I think both the BCE proposals (draft and fall-back) take no regard of area local differences. It seems that the proposals are the product of central, remote bureaucrats with no particular sensitivity for sense of place or community. Four of the eight councils in Suffolk have proposed three unitary divisions, proposals made by those much closer to the area and with greater knowledge; for instance, Lowestoft and Felixstowe must be together in whatever form of Council materialises since they are both on the coast and experience the particular circumstance of being so. I write bearing in mind that NO CHANGE is not an option, but whatever change is made it must take in communities' peculiarities. Money-saving and efficiency are usually the last things to be noticed when size is the master.</p> |
| 45 | T.H.F.Gentry | <p>I am totally opposed to Martlesham being removed from the care of Suffolk Coastal District Council and being bundled into the Ipswich authority, whatever form that authority takes. Ipswich is an urban area and is naturally concerned with and has knowledge of urban needs and problems. It is not geared up to rural or semi-rural matters and would give them a lower priority. The Council Tax revenues would largely be funneled into urban areas and be largely lost to the other areas. The rural and semi-rural population is less densely concentrated and will have a weaker voice. In my opinion the waste collection and recycling schemes operated by Suffolk Coastal District Council is superior to that in force in Ipswich. If a change to the present councils and their boundaries revised it would be preferable for two complementary councils to join forces, in this case Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils. They have much more in common and a better understanding of the towns, villages and other localities in their present jurisdictions and the needs and problems of these places than a larger urban council such as Ipswich. I might add that I was born and brought up in London and have worked in Glasgow so am not a country man with no experience of urban living.</p> |
| 46 | Barbara Rose | <p>AS Manager of the Felixstowe Citizens Advice Bureau, I am fully aware of the needs of my local community and do not favour being brought within a unitary authority which has little understanding of the rural community around Felixstowe. The East/ West split proposed by SCDC was the best scheme as it would have aligned places like Felixstowe and Lowestoft together with similar communities etc. Please ensure the One Suffolk scheme is the one chosen as this at least allows communities to keep their identities.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---------------|---|
| 47 | Graham Emsden | <p>If Ipswich is not large enough to become a Unitary Authority in it's own right why "change the rules" to make it large enough? The idea of combining Ipswich with Felixstowe and the various rural communities between is in my opinion ill thought out, the people and their needs in Ipswich are completely different to the people and their needs in the communities proposed to join Ipswich and this in my opinion should be rejected before any more money is wasted on the concept. This idea seems to be more motivated by a political desire than by any attempt to improve services or save the tax payer money.</p> <p>The idea of seperating Lowestoft from Suffolk for "administrative" purposes is I suspect just a red herring which will be conceded "after public consultation" to show how good the consultation process is.</p> <p>Serious consideration should be given to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Status Quo, if is isn't broke don't mend it 2. A single ALL Suffolk Authority including Lowestoft and 3. A return to the former arrangement of East and West Suffolk. <p>Whichever option is finally chosen should, demonstrably, be for the benefit of the local taxpayers and not politicians whether local or national. We do not need or want any more highly paid council posts which is what I suspect will result from this process.</p> |
| 48 | Jane Lavell | <p>The plans don't seem to follow any logic. The widened Ipswich pulls in villages like Playford and the Bealings which makes little sense, and the rest of Suffolk being the other authority seems ludicrous - there is so much difference between the east and west of the county that an east / west split would be a much better alternative.</p> |
| 49 | Rita Carter | <p>I feel very strongly that Waveney should be joined with Gt Yarmouth. Health is already provided by a PCT and a Foundation Acute Trust across the two areas and many improvements have been made. Many of our services are already provided jointly (housing)</p> |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--|
| 50 | Adrian Williams | <p>I think the plans for Suffolk (and indeed, Norfolk) are unwise. I have two objections. First, the proposal for a unitary for Suffolk would result in an LA which is too large. geographically. The existing local authorities already have to cover large areas (I live near Thetford, but my council, St. Edmundsbury, goes as far south as Haverhill. This tends to result in a democratic detachment - people simply do not relate to local services on that scale. My more serious concern, though relates to the proposal for Ipswich & Felixstowe. These small unitary authorities are not sufficiently large or robust enough to recruit and retain staff, and provide a full range of services. When compared with County LAs, a disproportionate number require government intervention. I think that the main problem is a lack of diversity in population menaing a high demand for services but a tax base which is insufficient to provide them. Education and adult social care are the best examples. If a change is needed (and I think the case is marginal at best) an East/West split is more likely to produce two stable and socially varied authorities. Finally, despite what everyone says at the outset, reorganisations invariably cost far more, take longer and are more disruptive, then people think. I know. I've been involved with several across the country.</p> |
| 51 | Eva Maria Callejas Menendez | <p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I've just read an article in the Suffolk Coastal District Council's newsletter about the BCE's reorganisation proposals for Suffolk councils. According to this article, the BCE said it reached its draft proposals based on five criteria: affordability, VALUE FOR MONEY SERVICES, neighbourhood empowerment, broad cross section of support and strategic leadership.</p> <p>Let us now consider to what extent our current local Council is meeting our needs as local residents. Our household pays Â£ 107 a month for Council Tax and there is no rubbish bins in our area. Therefore, we've been told to keep our household rubbish for a whole week in the flat. The food waste in particular can be very smelly, especially in the hot weather.</p> <p>What we can't believe is that we are spending that amount on Council Tax only to finance speed cameras to make sure that we get a Â£ 60 fine and three points on our licence if we get caught driving at 31 mph in a 30 mph area.</p> <p>We don't care if our Council is based in Woodbridge or if the local services are run in the future by a bigger Council comprising all Suffolk minus Lowestoft, Ipswich, Felixstowe and Kesgrave. All we want is to see the problems that affect us directly solved.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> |