

Consultee database

Lowestoft Community Governance Review

Date	Comments
Tue 04/10/2016 15:57	The proposal is a pragmatic solution for the present, but does continue to provide anomalies within the suburban areas of Lowestoft where different sides of the same road are located between different town and parish councils; this has the propensity to create divisions within communities
Tue 04/10/2016 16:06	As stated more than once, I am completely opposed to any layers of government below the present arrangement on 4 October 2016. Waveney District Council satisfy all the needs of people living in this part of Suffolk. Extra layers of government would cost more money and no improvement could possibly be made: such governance would be inefficient and unproductive. If residents in any of Waveney's localities have worthwhile views about how things might be improved, there are already ways for them to do this.
Tue 04/10/2016 16:26	As a long-time (and continuing) researcher into Lowestoft's history - and as a former teacher in its schools for nearly forty years - I would like once again to support the idea of a successor town council. It is important that Lowestoft has such a forum, and to have it composed of both main urban areas, to north and south of the harbour, is probably sensible in terms of electoral cohesion and administrative efficiency. The Town Hall would make an ideal venue for the new council to meet, with adequate adjacent parking space made available for councillors, officers and members of the public and with a dedicated fund set up for maintenance of the building (easily achievable from the sale of land currently being disposed of in the immediate area). Furthermore, even though the Charter Trustees would no longer exist as such, some mechanism to retain control of former borough assets should be established (e.g. land purchased for public amenity on the North Denes and the collection of art-work largely established by individual gifts, to name but two). Civic identity is not simply a matter of the forum which represents a particular community; it must also take account of the past and the means by which certain residents of the time sought to enhance its character for the common good. I am greatly encouraged by the proposed boundary changes to Corton Parish. It will remove the rather strange re-alignments made during the 1930s and create a more cohesive electoral unit. Residents of Corton Long Lane and The Woodlands will feel much more a part of the village than was formerly the case and members of the Corton Woods Group (I'm among them!) will be pleased to know that the area sits within the village envelope once again.
Tue 04/10/2016 17:52	I am frankly appalled that this is seriously being considered. It is a totally unnecessary tier of local government which doesn't really get any voter closer to the decision making processes that affect their everyday lives. It is cosmetic democracy and, worse still, with a price tag attached. There also appeared from the consultation comments to be an impression that many in favour of the the options thought that this replaced the existing district representation. Unless I have totally misread things it does not but is simply another tier of bureaucracy. I would like to know why this is being proposed, who asked for this review? Was it prompted by central government?
Tue 04/10/2016 18:57	Considering there was only 80 respondents, it shows the amount of dis-interest in this costly waste of money.
Tue 04/10/2016 19:15	I feel that Option1 is the best outcome for Pakefield. A Lowestoft town council would keep the various areas together but they would all have a say in what happens in their areas.
Tue 04/10/2016 19:29	I think an excellent and creative job of work has been done. The proposal is balanced and fair and I look forward to it being implemented as written.
Wed 05/10/2016 06:07	I support the proposals in the final phase of consultation.

<p>Wed 05/10/2016 12:04</p>	<p>As an incomer and resident of the last 3 years I reiterate that my belief is that Lowestoft should have a Town council. My experiences over the last 3 years lead me to reject the parochial concept of Parish councils as there is no reason why ward representatives should not fulfill their functions in exactly the same way as parish councilors. The ability of the council to raise extra money is understood to be the reason for the proposal for Parish councils. But I strongly urge a hang fire for the proposals for the following reasons; There are still matters to be settled in relation to Devolution proposals and possible mergers with Felixstowe council as I understand it-which may impose extra burdens of cost upon the rate payers as change follows change. Could I also point out that as of early 2017 we shall be pushing article 50 and leaving the EU which would render any person with EU membership not to be included from the vacancies leading to the possible extra cost of replacements. I detect a rush that is unwarranted to impose changes, as if the changes that are proposed have not been needed in the past son one has to wonder why now? Moreover the increases in council tax that will emanate from the changes will not be available for spending in the local economy.</p>
<p>Wed 05/10/2016 15:34</p>	<p>I have already commented on this but would once again put forward being in favour of Option 2 - as I feel Option 1 would be too big for one council to manage satisfactorily and of benefit to residents of Lowestoft.</p>
<p>Thu 06/10/2016 11:04</p>	<p>I am in favour of a parish for Pakefield and it is important that those representing the area should live in Pakefield so they are aware of any challenges. I am surprised at the lack of response to this survey and I wonder how it was advertised, not all residents will use email/internet services. Were surveys sent out by post? Were the proposals advertised in the local press? Were flyers posted at bus stops, post offices etc.</p>
<p>Fri 07/10/2016 12:00</p>	<p>Whole proposal is totally unnecessary and the cost has been understated. Too many layers of governance are unhealthy and will lead to voter fatigue</p>
<p>Sat 08/10/2016 13:14</p>	<p>I strongly object to the being forced to pay this disgusting levy. The people of Lowestoft see very little return for the exorbitant amount of Council Tax that they are already paying. Most people only get their refuse collected for this charge. In addition the street lights are not even on all night now. This proposed extra tier of local government is totally unnecessary and is an example of cronyism in its purist & nasty form. The people that dreamed this up have no idea of the dire financial strain that this will put households under.</p>

<p>Sat 08/10/2016 16:12</p>	<p>In terms of the final proposals I fully support a town council for the whole of Lowestoft and the proposed electoral boundaries set out in the final consultation papers. However I disagree with the list of services to be transferred to a Lowestoft Town Council as many of them (whilst being physically located in Lowestoft) are amenities for the wider area and as such should be managed by the District Council and funded by taxpayers across Waveney, not just by taxpayers in Lowestoft. My comments are summarised on a service by service basis below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of 'public open space' including recreational areas, parks, gardens, play areas & play equipment – Support the proposal as a local council should have power to make decisions on such local amenities • Public conveniences – Disagree with the proposals, I think it should be the responsibility of the District Council to make provision for public conveniences across Waveney as a whole • Triangle Market – Support – other town councils in Waveney manage their markets so seems appropriate • Allotments – Support - Lowestoft allotments has always been a Charter Trustee function to happy this transfers as proposed • Museums – Disagree – It's a district wide amenity and should be managed and paid for across Waveney not just by residents of Lowestoft • Town Hall – Disagree – It's too big for a town council, it's an expensive building to maintain and in poor condition so would require significant investment that would be unfair to pass on to residents of Lowestoft alone. • Marina Theatre – Disagree – it's a district wide amenity and should be managed and paid for across Waveney not just by residents of Lowestoft • Community centres/halls – Support as they are local amenities which should be managed at a local level • CCTV – Disagree - it should be the responsibility of the District Council to make provision for CCTV, and I am not aware that any other town councils in Waveney pay for their own CCTV / crime prevention initiatives
<p>Sun 09/10/2016 19:44</p>	<p>It now appears that wdc may be sliding away from lowestoft to secure Jobs in Suffolk county council at additional cost and wish to put parish councilor's in the offices at town hall which where not fit for them self's this is unbelievable rubbish.It's a NO from me. Get on the job build the third crossing and a flood barrier instead of messing about with re org new logo paint jobs and other money spending deals.</p>
<p>Mon 10/10/2016 09:16</p>	<p>I totally disagree with the proposal that is being put forward. There are many reasons and I will just list a few:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cost, another £100.00+ on the Council Tax bill. There are many households that already receive help with their Council bill and this will only increase that bill. As Government cut the subsidies that they give to Councils the "gap is going to have to be picked up by the Council, they will state that they have no money and it will be passed onto the rate payer. 2. Do we really need another layer of Government? The proposal only gives the Town Council very limited powers. Power over allotments, museums, parks and play areas, come on those areas are not really going to get the Town on the map are they? and at the proposed £1.43m. The value for money would be pretty poor. 3. The residents of the proposed area are already represented at local and County level. These Councillors fight for their constituents and this is what they sign up for when they seek election. Another layer will do what apart from cause infighting (this is my area of responsibility etc etc) and cause another layer of committees to have to be gone through. 4. I will come back to cost, £1.43m (and knowing how we are always lied to at the start of anything that will cost money to be told later that the figures have worked out higher, sorry) is just not warranted. If the Council wanted to raise that amount and put it on the rates bill there would be a huge out cry. This way they bang on about being democratic. An example of Lowestoft being democratic. Council proposes to put up car parking charges, but being democratic we will ask the public first. Couple of weeks later consultation complete and the charges increased. So the public wrote in saying "Oh yes lets pay more", when challenged to give the feedback received, closed doors, not allowed to divulge confidential reports. Rubbish the decision was made well before the "public" got involved. 5. In essence the proposal is a bad idea, we do not another layer of people telling us what we should be doing in the parks and playing areas etc for £1.43m, not all residents have access to e-mail internet so be democratic and put it to the vote and don't forget to mention what it will cost. Then we will get a better picture of what the residents think of the idea.

Mon 10/10/2016 14:18	Hi as a tax payer I'm not in favor of this new council. And won't be supporting it. think the money needs to be spent elsewhere first. just drive down the front or take a walk through the town. both are a sham.
Tue 11/10/2016 16:35	I am very surprised that only 80 people bothered to comment on such a major change to the way that Lowestoft will be governed. I am also surprised that the comments in the Final proposal mention a positive response with such a low response level. I particularly object to the boundary line being drawn to include my home in the Corton Parish. A more sensible line would be in the centre of Corton Long Lane. I have regularly read the minutes from the current Corton Parish Council and am particularly perturbed to hear that I will have to pay money into what will be another level of bureaucracy from which I fear will not prove to be substantially beneficial to me or my family. If there is no alternative then I would prefer to be part of the Gunton Parish.
Tue 11/10/2016 18:27	<p>If this is a new idea, fine but do it within the money you raise at this present time. Everyone pays enough Council Tax and WE; my mother and I; do NOT wish to pay anymore thank you.</p> <p>The Most Damning part of your response to me on this whole process, Must be in the number of responses that the consultation produced compared with the number of residents in the whole area and I believe it brings into question how fair / representative or right it is for the need for a Lowestoft town council.</p> <p>You say that there are 44,400 residents in the area but the consultation resulted in only 261 responses of which 'two thirds'; according to The Advertiser report dated 7th October; is a meagre 174 backing the idea of a Lowestoft Town Council. That's a staggering 0.39% of the population, talk about apathy being rife and, or your message / consultation being ignored.</p> <p>The decision Must be a NO to a Lowestoft Town Council as how can you possibly proceed on such a response.</p> <p>There must be a lower limit / percentage requirement to be achieved, otherwise 174 responses are going to help establish a Town Council and increased costs; such as our Council Taxes; versus 99.61% who either said No or did not respond.....how fair is that., talk about the tail wagging the dog, or in this case, the tip of the tail!</p> <p>Technically and democratically correct, I suppose but correct.....I think not</p> <p>This idea to me, sounds like another reason to screw us over for yet more money.....you get enough. Hell, we know have to pay for our garden rubbish to be collected each year + your new plush offices etc etc.</p> <p>Leave us alone or let those who want this new Town Council pay for it, not us. Thank you</p>
Thu 13/10/2016 12:16	<p>I expect the amount taken from Oulton Broad residents for the Charter Trustees will be deleted to compensate for the amount to be taken for a parish council?</p> <p>Why is there no mention of where this new parish council will meet? I would expect it to meet within the boundaries of the parish council to enable democracy to be delivered in situ and to be easily accessible to the observer residents.</p> <p>Will a new Friends of Nicholas Everitt park be established to enable and encourage more residents to engage?</p> <p>Who will manage Oulton Broad Yacht Harbour? There is no mention of this.</p> <p>How will the three-way grouping to manage the lock g and maintenance between SCC, WDC and The Broads Authority be effected?</p>
Thu 13/10/2016 18:25:00	The public response to the proposals via the Consultation Process is disappointing and hardly give a mandate for the proposals. That said, I would support the proposals, and am glad to see that OB is being recognised as a discrete area.

Sun 16/10/2016 12:48	I am not in favour of any of the final proposals. I think that if Waveney District & Suffolk County Councils were doing their job properly and efficiently which, after all is what we pay them for, then a further local council structure would be unnecessary. I do not agree with another further layer of local governance nor do I think that the populace who do pay their Council Tax should pay a further premium for it. There is plenty of evidence now to suggest that the Waveney District Council does not represent the real needs of the towns population. as is displayed in the decline of the town and its services. Further, I can see no evidence to suggest that this will change and that democracy will be improved through the setting up of either another Parish or Town Council.
Fri 21/10/2016 18:55	I am a little concerned over the proposed ratio of councillors to electors within the new Lowestoft Town Council area, especially when considering the ratio proposed for Oulton Broad Parish Council. The ratio of 1,819 electors per councillor for Lowestoft compares with on 666 electors per councillor for Oulton Broad and interestingly, Beccles Town Council has 16 councillors for approximately 8,000 electors, providing a ratio of only 500 electors per councillor. My suggestion is that the number of councillors by ward for Lowestoft Town Council be thus:- Elmtree - 4 - ratio 1541 Gunton - 2 - ratio 1302 Harbour - 4 - ratio 1438 Kirkley - 4 - ratio 1358 Normanston - 4 - ratio 1332 Pakefield - 4 - ratio 1375 St Margaret's - 4 - ratio 1400 Total number of councillors = 26 Average ratio of electors per councillor = 1392. This is still far higher than in either Oulton Broad or Beccles, but nonetheless I feel is far more representative for the people of Lowestoft without being an excessive burden on the electorate or council in terms of management of the council. Added to this, it equates to only just over half the number of councillors representing Waveney District Council. I believe that this provides a much more equitable spread of ratios of electors per councillor for each respective ward within the new Town Council area. Other than the issue of the number of councillors, I do have one other area of concern. In one sense, I feel it is a little sad to extricate Oulton Broad from Lowestoft, in that Oulton Broad is inextricably part of the town and is what helps to define Lowestoft for what it is - not just a coastal town on the most easterly fringe of the nation, but an important southern gateway to the Broads and forms a vital part of the tourism and beauty of Lowestoft as a whole. However, I will accept that given the expressed desire of the people of Oulton Broad to have their own local council, I can understand that sentiment. Although as a resident of the new area of Oulton Broad, I still consider myself to be part of Lowestoft as a whole who just happens to live in Oulton Broad. I would naturally prefer to be a resident within the new Lowestoft Town Council area rather than Oulton Broad Parish Council, having no electoral say in what happens to my town of Lowestoft. Other than these two issues, having gone through the final proposals, I can agree with the fundamentals of what is being proposed.
Sun 23/10/2016 12:43	I would like to submit a comment on the Final Proposal of the Lowestoft Community Governance Review. I am the landlord of Waveney House, 13 Waveney Road Lowestoft NR32 1BT, and intend to move there in the Summer. I feel it would be a mistake to separate Oulton Broad from Lowestoft in the new parish council arrangements. A merger between the Districts of Waveney and Suffolk Coastal is almost certain, and when that happens the new District Council will inevitably have less of a focus on Lowestoft than Waveney does. The new parish council(s) will need to compensate for that, and I fear that the proposal for two parishes will leave Lowestoft as a whole weaker rather than stronger. The future of Lowestoft will depend to a considerable extent on tourism. There is much a Town Council could do to boost performance in this industry, and the interests of Oulton Broad in this respect are, it seems to me, inseparable from the rest of Lowestoft. The special character and needs of particular neighbourhoods within the town could surely be accommodated by a committee system, and it simply strikes me that there is a large element of artificiality in the idea that Oulton Broad, certainly as defined in the Final Proposal, is a different place from Lowestoft. Anyway, whatever you decide, I look forward to joining you next year!
Sun 30/10/2016 19:29	I support the proposal to create a Lowestoft Town Council. But the creation of two new organisations, a Parish for Oulton Broad and a Town Council for Lowestoft seems to me to be unnecessarily costly as effectively there would be double the cost for the administration. One Town Council covering the whole area would be the best use of resources.
Sun 30/10/2016 22:41	There does not seem to be any reasoning provided for the proposed solution, there is a disproportionate difference in proposed costs for the two areas and the consultation is entirely unstructured, unlike previous consultations on this issue.

After asking people in Kirkley village about the prospect of a new town council, it has become clear that we do not want this. We do not want to be part of your proposals because

1. We are not part of Lowestoft. Originally we were an independent village, but after centuries of urban sprawl and development of the harbour area, is now part of the urban conurbation of Lowestoft.
2. All the assets and associated services that are proposed to be transferred to the town council are all things that are losing money for Waveney District Council. The buildings that are mentioned in the consultation document are in disrepair, or need large amounts of money spent on them. Just like most of the buildings that are owned by the council, as you haven't spent money on them when repairs were needed. The town has lots of empty shops and buildings I.e. Town Hall, Lowestoft Magistrates Court, the Post Office – the high street is in the doldrums, and the blame can only be laid at the door of the Waveney District Council. How sad to see this happen to Lowestoft, a beautiful town with lots of history, lovely historic buildings that needs a council that cares, and to give incentive for businesses to come here.
3. Kirkley has really expanded its choice of shops, and it is a pleasure to shop here, and spend time to chat to the residents and shopkeepers. Despite the uneven pavements, and the smell of the sewerage from the Victorian sewers, especially at high tide, but that is the responsibility of Waveney District Council's to look after these things.
4. You sent out a letter and an information leaflet to 28,000 households and had 261 responses at the first consultation stage. Then had 80 replies to the second consultation stage. So do you think that you can adopt this proposal when 27,659 people didn't respond.
5. The best proposal is for Kirkley village to have its own parish council and also Pakefield, so decisions can be made regarding what is best for their community, and have their own elected committee to oversee changes that the residents and businesses would like to see.
6. We do not know where this idea came from for a town council and how much money this consultation document has cost to put together, but obviously wasn't a cheap exercise.

So to sum up, with the lack of response from the residents of the Lowestoft area, we do not know how you can possibly decide on a new town council.

You say on page 21, of the final proposal, October 2016 that councillors will review any submissions received during the four week consultation period – before making the final decision at a full council meeting on 16th November 2016 – well it looks like 27,659 have also made the decision not to vote for a town council.

By post