

APPENDIX A

Q1. Please provide your postcode	Q2. In what capacity are you giving us your views (eg individual or councillor)?	Q3. Please share your views or comments on the existing arrangements, including ward boundaries and names.
NG24 1UP	Resident	The town centre is carved up into six wards, most of which dominated by suburban dwellers. It is thus denied a sense of community and political representation.
NG24 2AT	Resident	There fine
NG24 3VH	Resident	Why isn't Balderton included?
NG24 1RF	Resident	The ward names seem irrelevant to anyone other than councillors.
NG24 1NU	Resident	No opinion
NG24 2J	Resident	I think they are suitable names however I believe 5 members for beacon and Devon should be lowered by 1 and those members re allocated to Newark east and south due to the ongoing increased development
NG24 1HE	Resident	I don't really know who represents me
NG24 1SW	Resident	Merge Magnus and Sleaford. Then move boundary between Magnus and Beacon so Barnby Road or railway line the boundary. Councillors for Beacon could then look after East until enough properties to warrant own Councillor
NG24 4HS	Resident	no concerns with existing
NG24 1HW	Resident	I think NG24 1HW post code should come under Castle Ward
NG24 1bu	Resident	Makes sense to me
NG24 4OP	Resident	It's all ok as it is
NG24 4RW	Parish or Town Councillor	The larger Wards could be divided
NG24 4HR	Resident	Fernwood, Balderton and Lowfield should be included within Newark
NG24 2AU	Resident	Why Sleaford...?
NG24 2HX	Resident	I consider that the existing boundaries and names be maintained for the time being.
NG24 1BY	Resident	all good
NG24 4PT	Resident	Newark south should include Hawton
NG24 4ah	Resident	Why do these boundaries need altering?
NG24 4HY	Resident	Fine with me
NG24 4JA	Resident	The areas seem disproportionate.
NG24 4BD	Resident	all fine
NG24 1NE	Resident	I always thought I was in Bridge ward as in the NSDC elections - I don't recall ever noticing Sleaford ward before but on this map it looks like this is my ward! I have always felt very removed from the views expressed about Bridge ward - it's a pretty varied area but we usually just hear about the York Drive estate and issues on Lincoln Road
NG24 2GT	Resident	Why Newark East with 0 members?
NG24 4AL	Resident	I have reviewed the Terms of Reference and I have watched the recording of the NSDC General Purposes and Licensing Committee meeting of 12th December 2024 where it was resolved to hold this review. I note that the officers of NSDC initiated the boundary review due to the lack of housing being built in East Ward, as there is "no prospect of land east being developed ahead of the 2027 elections." The officer also stated "given the level of [housing] growth, and potential growth, it [ward boundary review] may need to be done again in another two to three years possibly, but this will ensure the arrangements are sound ahead of the 2027 elections." I am therefore responding to this review on the basis of the current demographics as outlined in item 6 of the Terms of Reference, and the anticipated change to demographics based on the housing growth in South ward from 2024/25 to 2028/29 as per item 7 of the Terms of Reference. I support the officer's suggestion that if housing growth continues as expected, another ward boundary review may be needed in two or three years' time, following the 2027 election but in advance of the 2031 election. In item 6 of the Terms of Reference, it is clear there is a discrepancy between wards with regard to the ratio of electors to members. There are three wards with a ratio of between 1250 and 1350 electors to 1 member (Bridge ward, Castle ward, Devon ward), and a further three wards (Beacon ward, Sleaford ward, South ward) with a ratio of between 950 and 1050 electors to 1 member - albeit in this list, "Beacon ward" includes both the 4 members and 4934 electors for Beacon ward and the 1 member and 4 electors for East ward. I calculate the ratio for Beacon ward on its own as 1233 electors to 1 member, meaning the Beacon ward ratio is in fact more in line with the ward ratios in Bridge, Castle and Devon wards. The clear anomaly is the Magnus ward, with a ratio of 1 member to 1923 electors. In order to ensure parity of the ratio of members to electors, I suggest a sensible solution would be to incorporate East ward's 4 electors into Beacon ward, but to move the East ward member to Magnus ward; I calculate this would give a ratio of 1234 electors to 1 member in the merged Beacon and East ward, and a ratio of 986 electors to 1 member in the Magnus ward, which would allow Beacon ward to retain parity, and would also bring the Magnus ward ratio in line with the other wards. The terms of reference do not make clear that Newark Town ward boundaries need to be maintained so that District Council and County Council ward boundaries are retained, as mentioned by the officer, when he clarified "we would retain the East Ward in some form, given the county council boundaries and the district council boundaries, so you would have to retain that in name, certainly, you can't just disband that, so you would need to retain that in some form" - I would be very disappointed if this makes my abovementioned suggestion unworkable, as it was not made clear in the Terms of Reference that the District and County ward boundaries would dictate and restrict the options for Newark Town ward boundaries. Item 7 of the Terms of Reference shows the anticipated housing growth, particularly in the South ward, in the coming years; this shows that 307 dwellings are predicted to come forward between 2024/25 and 2028/29. Given that it is highly unlikely that all of these dwellings will be built and inhabited before the 2027 election, there is no reason to expect the ratio of electors to members in the South ward to be significantly different from the other ward ratios for the 2027 election. As previously mentioned, based on the comments made by the officer to councillors at the meeting of 12th December, it seems likely that if housing growth continues, another ward boundary review will be undertaken after the 2027 election; therefore I will not make any suggestions as to future arrangements for this ward beyond the 2027 election.
NG24 4AL	Resident	With regard to the names of the wards, I support the officer's suggestion from the meeting of 12th December 2024, that the South ward be renamed as Middlebeck ward - in fact, I had already planned to suggest this when reading the terms of reference but before seeing the recording of the meeting - as I believe Newark residents are more likely to instinctively locate the ward by the name Middlebeck instead of South, in the same way as anyone with local knowledge can instinctively locate the Devon and Magnus wards based on their names.
Newark Town Council	Representative of local organisation	Formal confirmation of the response of the Town Council to the consultation as agreed at a meeting of the Council that took place last night. 1. South Ward should be renamed the Middlebeck ward. 2. A review of the wards and electoral boundaries is not considered appropriate at this time and should be deferred until the outcome of the local government re-organisation plans and push for unitary authorities proposed by the government in its recent white paper are clear.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Representative of local organisation	The Council appreciates that this is the first of two periods of consultation and that at this time other proposals are likely to come forward. At this stage Nottinghamshire County Council would like to acknowledge our interest in the review but do not wish to make comments at this time. The Council reserves the right to respond during the second consultation stage, after the final draft recommendations have been published. We can then consider these in conjunction with submissions and comments made by local communities during the first phase of consultation. We will therefore consider whether a formal response providing comments is required at that time.