

<u>Name</u>	<u>Your feedback</u>
Ipswich and Suffolk Credit Union Ltd	<p data-bbox="564 264 1422 324">Ipswich and Suffolk Credit Union Ltd (ISCU) is in favour of the 3 unitary authority proposal, with Lowestoft retained in Suffolk.</p> <p data-bbox="564 421 1449 510">ISCU field of membership is "anyone who lives or works in Suffolk", so reducing the numbers of people residing in Suffolk would have an adverse effect on our existing and potential membership in the future.</p> <p data-bbox="564 539 1477 689">The law states that existing members of a credit union who no longer qualify for membership (usually because they move away) become non-qualifying members (1979 Credit Union Act). If a part of Suffolk becomes a different county, the ISCU members in that area will automatically lose their status as full members of ISCU and will become non-qualifying members</p> <p data-bbox="564 786 1485 1178">Ipswich as an urban area, suffers from particular social and financial exclusion issues, this is well documented in social policy research, DWP statistics, Census data etc, and a recent EEDA report on Financial Exclusion identified Ipswich as having hotspots of severe financial exclusion issues. As a credit union dealing with people on low incomes we see very different problems in Ipswich to other areas of Suffolk. We feel that a unitary authority for Ipswich would be better at focusing on these issues as this already happens as present with the existing local authority of IBC. IBC has a good understanding of social and financial exclusion issues, and has undertaken several projects with the credit union to tackle them, whereas other local authorities in Suffolk do not have the same numbers of people with these problems and therefore do not have projects with the credit union to tackle them.</p> <p data-bbox="564 1211 1474 1272">Example: Rent Deposit Scheme in Ipswich, Home Improvements Scheme to tackle inadequate housing stock</p>

<p>Richard Herbert</p>	<p>Haverhill Enterprise Ltd is a business group formed to 1994 to promote Haverhill as an excellent place to work and live.</p> <p>We have considered your draft proposal to create 2 unitary authorities in Suffolk, and wish to support the ‘third’ proposal to create 3 unitary authorities.</p> <p>The Western part of Suffolk is culturally and economically remote from the Eastern/Coastal part of the county. Haverhill looks west and south towards Cambridge and Stansted Airport, and thence to London. Ipswich is seen from here as a distant place, unconsidered from a business viewpoint.</p> <p>A single unitary authority based in Ipswich would be a disaster. It would be almost impossible to balance the very different demands of the two sides of the county within a huge unitary authority, and we know that our part of the county would again be almost completely neglected by Ipswich, as is the tendency now as regards SCC matters. We do not believe that the ‘local’ offices proposed by those promoting the single authority are other than a sham, effective power would reside in Ipswich.</p> <p>We are also concerned that a ‘North Haven’ and ‘Rest of Suffolk’ split also tries to combine two parts of a county that do not economically fit together.</p> <p>Thus we would prefer the ‘third’ solution of 3 unitary authorities, being West Suffolk, East Suffolk (inc Lowestoft) and ‘North Haven’.</p>
------------------------	--

<p>Peter McCarthy-Ward</p>	<p>ELECTORAL COMMISSION: BOUNDARY REVIEW FOR SUFFOLK</p> <p>BT Comments on the Electoral Commissions Proposals for Suffolk.</p> <p>I comment as BT's Regional Director for the East of England</p> <p>BT is a significant employer in Suffolk, both at its research and development site at Adastral Park and of Suffolk residents working elsewhere within and beyond the County. Our business interests are impacted by the effectiveness and efficiency of the operation of local government. We offer these observations on Suffolk boundary proposals to assist the Commission in determining the advice it will tender to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>BT enjoys good working relationships with the existing County, District and Local Authorities in Suffolk and has respect for their ability to work separately and jointly in developing the economic prosperity, social equity and infrastructure of the region, and in the provision of services to businesses and consumers.</p> <p>If change is to be contemplated we believe it should contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• improved efficiency in the delivery of services;• improved understanding of and responsiveness to local needs;• improved effectiveness in the services provided,• and improved coherence in cross boundary planning and the delivery of County and Regional goals. <p>These criteria can pull in contrasting directions: efficiency calls for fewer layers of Local Government and the concentration of activity at the smallest feasible number of sites. Understanding and responsiveness call for authorities operating at the level of discrete and distinct communities, and within recognisable geographies and travel to work areas.</p> <p>BT does not have the information or competence to assert which of the Commission's proposals best meets the criteria we set out. We simply urge the Commission to take account of the concerns we express in coming to their decision. Should a single centralised approach be the preferred route</p>
----------------------------	---

forward we would wish to see arrangements in place to ensure that the focus and responsiveness we currently enjoy from the present District Council arrangements is sustained. Under both proposals we recognise the case made by the Commission for improved linkage between Lowestoft and its Norfolk neighbours.

We do not in this submission make comment on the alternative models which have been put to the Electoral Commission, since we understand those have already been considered by the Commission in reaching its decision to consult on the two options above

BT

September 2008

<p>William Bond</p>	<p>I wish to raise an objection on behalf of Felixstowe Rifle Club to the proposed changes in the local Boundary's that will effectively move Felixstowe into the Ipswich boundary.</p> <p>We believe that Ipswich should remain an independant "borough" type Council that covers the same area as at present. Felixstowe should remain within a similar boundry to that at present, all be it enlarged to become East Suffolk.</p> <p>It is felt that should Felixstowe become part of Ipswich, the interests of both the residents of Felixstowe and the small local organisations, like the FRC, will be lost within the larger scale of the Ipswich area.</p> <p>We currently enjoy a good relationship with SCDC, have received support from them when developing the club to what it is today, and we do not believe that we would receive the same support</p> <p>from the new Ipswich Council. William Bond - Vice Chairman - Felixstowe Rifle Club</p>
---------------------	--

<p>Professor S.F.Bush</p>	<p>I support very strongly the Boundary Commission's preferred proposal for the reorganisation of Suffolk's local government namely a unitary authority for all of Suffolk less Ipswich and Felixstowe which would form another unitary authority of population around 205,000 and the combining of Lowestoft with its immediate coastal neighbour Great Yarmouth in Norfolk .</p> <p>The new Suffolk authority would have a population of nearly 400,000 which is towards the top end of Unitary councils in England and considerably greater than in the rest of the United Kingdom. except Glasagow and Edinburgh. The argument being made in your responses that such a new authority would lack the resources to function properly is thus invalid unless we believe that the standards already established by unitary councils elsewhere in the country are somehow inapplicable to Suffolk.</p> <p>Moreover besides the argument on population grounds, without Ipswich , Felixstowe and Lowestoft, Suffolk is fundamentally homogeneous in its commercial, farming, housing , market town and village structures. This will thus give the new authority the opportunity to develop patterns of service for the people of Suffolk free of the very different demands of the essentially seaport- metropolitan area of Ipswich and Fellixstowe which, rightly has a very different development agenda for the future.</p> <p>Those who have argued strongly for a single authority for the whole of present -day Suffolk should confront the fact that the only unitaries bigger in population terms than that are Birmingham, and Leeds; even Manchester and Sheffield are smaller .All these cities are much more compact geographically than either the present or proposed new Suffolk .</p> <p>Finally I believe that a unitary authority for the 'new' Suffolk would allow new life to be breathed into the parish and town councils . These latter should gain in influence and responsiveness to strictly local wishes with sensible devolution of powers from the new Unitary Council. Hopefully this could include planning proposals below a certain level.</p>
---------------------------	--

<p>Michael Lincoln</p>	<p>This submission is made on behalf of the Governing Body of The Denes High School.</p> <p>We strongly support the option for a unitary authority for Suffolk, but one which includes Lowestoft. We believe that for The Denes and all other schools in Lowestoft any other option would have catastrophic consequences for the town's children and young people.</p> <p>In September 2010 the first stage of a total reorganisation of schools in Lowestoft begins. This will be completed in September 2011, by which time we will have moved from a three tier system of 4-9 Primary Schools, 9-13 Middle Schools and 13-18 high schools to one with 4-11 Primaries, 11-16 Highs and a Sixth Form College.</p> <p>Schools are already hard pressed to manage this change whilst at the same time focusing on maintaining and improving standards. For instance for my own school in September 2011 we will face the challenge of a new intake of around 720 students in Years 7, 8 and 9. We will require around 30 new teaching staff and a similar number of new support staff such as teaching assistants, technicians and administrative staff.</p> <p>If in April 2010 we are given the task of establishing relationships with a completely new local authority then we feel that it might well be beyond our current capacity to manage. We certainly believe that it will make it even more difficult to maintain our focus on student achievement.</p> <p>We realise that a unitary Suffolk would be different from the current two tier arrangement. However, it seems likely that in a unitary Suffolk the personnel managing education will be largely the same and the systems used are likely to be those with which we are already familiar. In other words, it will take nothing away from our capacity to manage the enormous changes about to happen for children and young people in Lowestoft.</p>
------------------------	--

Ceri Thomson	<p>I am writing to you as Chair of Governors at Great Whelnetham V. C. Primary School to say that I warmly endorse the response sent to you in September 2008 by Suffolk Governors Forum Executive Group. I particularly support their response as it relates to the implementation and funding of the School Organisation Review.</p> <p>In Autumn 2007 Great Whelnetham School was judged by OFSTED and Church Inspectors as Outstanding. It is a rural primary school with a pressing need for more classrooms to accommodate a rising roll. I am most concerned that the excellent service Great Whelnetham provides, which is highly valued by professionals and parents, would be put at risk if the Boundary Commission does not opt for a unitary Suffolk Authority, as urged by Suffolk Governors Forum, because this would inevitably compound and delay decisions which are critical to the future success of the school.</p> <p>Ceri Thomson Chair of Governors Great Whelnetham V. C. Primary School Stanningfield Road Great Whelnetham Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP30 0UA</p>
--------------	--

C Daines	<p>I am a Governor at a small village school bordering on the Lowestoft area. If there were 2 authorities it would duplicate the agencies and increase running costs, hence reducing the available funds for spending on the essential services provided. I also feel that to remove Lowestoft from Suffolk would be wrong, in as much that it would remove access to facilities and services vital to the support of a small school, and also the neighbouring local High School, as those provided by Norfolk in Lowestoft would not be available to those in the Beccles area. The necessary back up from agencies would not be available in the locality and would not be cost effective and value for money if run from other areas of the county, the administration costs would reduce the amount able to be spent on facilities for those intended to benefit. .</p>
----------	--

<p>Barnby & North Cove Primary School</p>	<p>We write to advise that we would support a unitary Suffolk Authority including Lowestoft. We see this as the best option for the delivery of services for the benefit of children and young people across Suffolk.</p> <p>Our Northern Area Office is based in Lowestoft and a lot of our support and courses are from here. Should Lowestoft be excluded from Suffolk, we feel this would cause a lot of disruption and cost to, not only Lowestoft, but the surrounding areas.</p> <p>As a rural school, we feel that the two unitary authority proposal would also appear to provide a risk to the funding for rural schools in Suffolk.</p>
---	--

Moirra Humphreys	<p>If change is necessary, as a Suffolk High School, we support a new single unitary authority for Suffolk. There is a strong tradition of Suffolk schools working together and, like other secondary schools, we work in a number of partnerships. For example, we work in partnership with Ipswich schools and rural schools like Hadleigh (with whom we have strong links) and Claydon High School. In our view, 2 unitary authorities would not be helpful or supportive to the work we are doing. The arguments for a single authority are stronger and more likely to support us as we strive to achieve our aspirations for the young people we serve..</p>
------------------	--

David Mettrick	<p>I oppose the option for Suffolk, which divides the provision of major services in Suffolk between a North Haven authority and the rest of Suffolk. Currently, these services (children's, transport, and social care) provided by Suffolk County Council are well established and well regarded. Splitting them up risks undermining their quality and will certainly increase their cost to the local taxpayer. As a school governor, I am particularly concerned about the effect on the support, which the local authority is able to provide in support of schools. Suffolk CC has a good track record in this and I fear that under a two-unitary solution, the full range of expertise currently available will be denied to all the schools in Suffolk. I therefore support the creation of a unitary authority for the whole of Suffolk (including Lowestoft).</p>
----------------	---

Libby Brown

I write on behalf of the Kyson Primary School Governing Body:

We do not wish to be part of "Rural Suffolk" and be disconnected from Ipswich and the LA body with whom we have long standing relationships and who advise us on a wide range of issues. We do not wish to be disconnected from the Cluster of Kesgrave schools with whom we work closely and have done so for many years . We do not wish do be disconnected from the Ipswich Referral Units who currently advise and support us with our vulnerable children and their parents and have done so for many years. We have excellent working relationships with all these professional bodies and have built them up over a long period of time. The strength and closeness of such relationships save a great deal of time for all concerned and ensure efficient service and support is provided to all our children and their parents. Our school would find itself at a much greater distance from our new Eucation Centre, this would put our 65 staff at a disadvantage in accessing training and in all other professional links.

We do not wish to be part of "Rural Suffolk" as it appears from the very closely guarded information around the proposed change that we would lose 11 roads in our catchment area. This would significantly affect the number of children in our school and would lead to staff redundancies. Our school has an excellent reputation in the community because of the professional way we serve the diverse needs of a diverse learning community and we have worked very hard over a number of years to create a very professional staff team. Job losses would significantly affect that effectiveness.

There is nothing in the proposed change to "Rural Suffolk" which would benefit our community, we are totally opposed to it.

<p>V. Aldous</p>	<p>Governors of Springfield Infant School and Nursery's Comments on Draft Proposals for Unitary Local Government in Suffolk</p> <p>We would like to make our representation on the Boundary Committee's proposals for Suffolk Local Government re-organisation in favour of the One Suffolk unitary authority.</p> <p>Our school is within the urban area of Ipswich, but the education service is currently run by Suffolk County Council. We feel that it is important for the education of all children in Suffolk for there to be a unified and consistent provision of service across the whole county, urban and rural alike. Ipswich generally includes higher levels of social deprivation compared with the county as a whole, but this is balanced out by county-wide provision of services: we understand, for example, that currently, 49% of Looked After Children in Suffolk are in the Ipswich area, but this area has only 37% of the county's places to support those children (principally foster-places and children's homes). If a separate North Haven authority had to buy in the required additional places, this would be expensive (currently, about Â£600 p.w. for foster care, and Â£1,500-Â£2,000 p.w. for a children's home place, per child). At present, such places are spread across the county and included within current budgets.</p> <p>There are obvious economies of scale in having One Suffolk, which we believe already supplies some 75% of local government services within the county. A new North Haven authority would need to appoint its own new statutory officers for education (and other) purposes in addition to those in what would be left of the surrounding County Council. This would increase bureaucracy and cost a great deal, whereas all the county-wide services are currently already provided by an existing County Council framework. Existing small county-wide teams in education (such as Extended Schools, Parent Partnership) which currently work well, would be split into two, which would probably mean they would be cut to unworkably smaller units, unable to take advantage of the economies of scale a larger authority would be able to provide. In Suffolk, the County Council education service works well on the whole, and has a high reputation amongst other Local Authorities (lots of teachers elsewhere in the country want to work here) - why meddle with it?</p> <p>In educational terms, the creation of a new North Haven would also cut across existing cluster boundaries, and needlessly break up or complicate inter-school relationships which have taken years to establish and which work well. It would also hugely complicate the Buildings Schools for the Future (BSF) programme, which is now well into the planning stage in Suffolk and involves some Â£600 million in Suffolk over a fifteen year period. Amongst the first wave of schools in Suffolk are several schools within Ipswich and Felixstowe: Deben and Orwell High School, Felixstowe, Thurleston, Westbourne (in our own pyramid and cluster), Chanty, Stoke and Holywells High Schools, Ipswich, Thomas Wolsey, Belstead and Beacon Hill Special Schools and Westbridge and Parkside Pupil Referral Units in Ipswich. A new education authority in North Haven would have to renegotiate the funding for this programme from scratch and the whole process would be held up (probably for years rather than months) and become more costly to the taxpayer and disadvantageous to the children of Ipswich and Felixstowe. New</p>
------------------	--

contracts for construction would also have to begin all over again, perhaps with the contractors probably less likely to want to give favourable terms to a smaller authority. It would also disrupt the plans for the proposed SWISS Centre, which includes schools from both sides of the potential North Haven / rump County Council divide.

Also, smaller North Haven and rump County Council authorities would be less attractive propositions for all kinds of service providers. Firstly, they would not have the same large size to attract bigger (and usually therefore more cost-effective) providers. Secondly, service providers are currently able to tender for services across the whole county, and therefore they can balance the provision of usually less profitable rural services against generally more profitable urban ones (e.g. care assistance for the elderly). Would a generally rural rump County Council be able to attract the same sort of interest from service providers, or would the cost of services go up dramatically for the rural areas?

A split North Haven and surrounding County Council would also result in two smaller, and therefore less influential (on the national stage), Local Authorities, each much less capable of punching their weight in the competition for local funding and influence than One Suffolk would be.

We support the creation of a single unitary Local Authority for the whole of Suffolk, as we believe this will facilitate the best education for the children of the county as a whole.

V Aldous

Chair of Governors

On behalf of the Board of Governors

Springfield Infant School and Nursery

11 Wesley Way

Bramford Road

Ipswich IP1 4PP

Telephone 01473 741305

Website: <http://www.springfield-inf.suffolk.sch.uk/>

<p>Rainbow Saver Anglia Credit Union Ltd</p>	<p>Rainbow Saver is a community based credit union, with its Admin HQ in Lowestoft, and has volunteers all over East Anglia. Nevertheless, Rainbow would prefer Lowestoft to remain part of Suffolk. Credit union character is quite different in Suffolk to Norfolk, with a co-operative character between Suffolk credit unions for joint training and volunteers support. Rainbow would lose that link and be part of a Norfolk network which would not be as advantageous to Rainbow.</p> <p>Secondly, there is a Norfolk credit union which covers the county of Norfolk, so moving Rainbow into Norfolk would result in direct competition between the two credit unions, which would be undesirable. Undesirable in terms of public funding as both credit unions have received public funds to develop.</p> <p>Lastly, our volunteers and paid staff live in and around Lowestoft, and feel strongly that they want to remain part of Suffolk.</p>
--	--

<p>Ron Longland</p>	<p>As secretary to Clare Business Association the Chairman has requested that I put forward the views of its 38 Members. This membership represents over 50% of the many businesses in Clare and approaching 75% of the shop premises in the centre of Clare. Clare Business Association is firmly of the opinion that a whole-Suffolk unitary council will NOT serve the best interests of the residents of West Suffolk. Clare, Haverhill, Bury St Edmunds, Newmarket and Sudbury, to name a few important towns, have little in common with Aldburgh, Southwold and Lowestoft. Our economy is different. Our requirements are different. Our finances are different. We understand the problems of coastal regions, in particular the continued erosion of the coastline and therefore property and people's livelihoods and possessions. However, we believe that it is unreasonable to expect people and businesses in the far west of the county to contribute to resolving those problems through local taxation in areas that will be unaffected by such erosion. Equally it is unfair to expect people and businesses in the coastal areas to pay for any problems in the far west of Suffolk.</p> <p>Clare Business Association believes that the best arrangement, should there be a need to make any changes anyway, will be to create two unitary councils, with West Suffolk being based in Bury St Edmunds. This system would allow east and west Suffolk to work towards their own concerns whilst also allowing co-operation between each unitary council where interests overlap. Thus Clare Business Association supports fully a West Suffolk Unitary Council and does not support a whole Suffolk Unitary Council. We would be grateful if you could consider this in your final deliberations.</p>
---------------------	--

<p>Home-Start Mid Suffolk</p>	<p>Home-Start is a family support organisation working with families with small children in the rural area. Changing the boundaries is merely an exercise in moving imaginary lines around a map. Unless service providers know what the advantages of such changes are and how services will be delivered in future, there is no way of knowing whether changes to the boundaries are a good or bad thing.</p> <p>The system is working at the moment although the amount of money Suffolk as a county has for services from the government is insufficient. There is a misconception that Suffolk is a wealthy county. It is for some people but the rurally isolated, marginalised and socially-excluded people are more disadvantaged as they are (a) unseen; (b) in insufficient numbers to warrant high areas of deprivation and (c) have far fewer services available than a city/town dweller. You can't eat the scenery.</p> <p>Unless more information is available to be able to make an informed decision, the status quo should be kept. Suffolk should remain as it is with three tier local government which suits this large rural county.</p>
-------------------------------	--

anne wright

governors of st marys primary school in woodbridge would prefer to see suffolk kept together as one authority. to split the county would require doubling up of officers for education and would go against all the work done on community clusters designed to make the best use of shared resources. currently expertise in the area of child welfare is more easily accessible to those who most need it. the boundary line through woodbridge would split the current farlingaye/kesgrave cluster.

anne wright - chairman of governors

ACE - People First

ACE is an advocacy organisation for people with learning disabilities. It is a user led organisation. ACE members have discussed the proposals at their Management Committee Meeting and were unanimous in their view that Suffolk should be a single unitary authority which includes Lowestoft.

There was great opposition to the idea of splitting Suffolk into Haven and Rural as this was thought to disadvantage the poorer rural communities.

It was considered unthinkable to take Lowestoft out of Suffolk and place it in Norfolk. The consequences for the voluntary sector services that currently operate across the county, including Lowestoft, would be dire. There is a real risk that Lowestoft would lose many valuable charitable, voluntary and community based services.

Roger Fern	<p>I am the chair of the Ipswich Umbrella Trust, a recently established charity whose aims are to work with and help individuals and families caught up in chaotic life styles, some of them homeless, all of them on the margins of an otherwise apparently prosperous town. Our intention is to bring into closer collaboration existing organisations working in a similar sphere, and ultimately to create a 'homelessness hub' in Ipswich. Whilst preparing the 'case for support' to send to potential funders and grant providers we have analysed data and information about the population of Ipswich. From the 2004 and 2007 indices of multiple deprivation, for example, it is clear that Ipswich has a significant number of 'super output areas', 79 in all. They are most numerous in 2 domains: living environment and education skills and training. This places Ipswich within the band of the 30% most deprived areas in the country. This is a far more serious situation than anywhere else in Suffolk. These facts are almost always camouflaged within a county which is largely rural and affluent. Ipswich is a classic urban community, but its needs are too often overlooked because of its surrounding area. If either of the Unitary Suffolk or North Haven Unitary councils come into being this situation will continue to the serious detriment of those who need far more help and resources than they currently receive. I am, therefore, keen to promote a Unitary Ipswich based on slightly expanded boundaries (e.g. including the immediately adjacent urban parts of Babergh and Suffolk Coastal) alongside East Suffolk (including Lowestoft) and West Suffolk Unitary Councils. This would retain all the benefits set out in the 2007 Unitary Ipswich bid but resolve the concerns around affordability.</p>
------------	---