

Response ID ANON-7YE8-KAR5-Z

Submitted to Consultation on Proposals for Local Government Reorganisation in Norfolk and Suffolk
Submitted on 2026-01-07 12:23:15

Tell us about yourself

1 What is your name?

Name:
Joanna Abbott

2 Are you responding as an individual or providing an official response on behalf of an organisation?

Official response on behalf of an organisation

3 Have you been invited to respond as a named consultee?

No

4 In which council area is your address? (if you are responding as an individual this is your home address. If you are responding as an organisation this is your organisation address)

Suffolk County Council

5 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know the organisation's name:

Organisation:
Kesgrave Town Council

6 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know your position within the organisation:

Position in organisation:
Town Clerk

7 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the type of organisation from the options below:

Local government - parish/town council

8 What is your email address?

Email Address:
townclerk@kesgravetowncouncil.gov.uk

Personal Data

1 Please read and tick the box before proceeding with the consultation

The sections for each proposal in this consultation include free text boxes where you can explain your answers. Please tick this box to confirm that you will not include information which may identify an individual in these boxes

Consultation on the Proposal from Suffolk County Council

1 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests a council that is based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:
Somewhat agree

2 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed council will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

Dropdown answers:
Neither agree nor disagree

3 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed council is the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

Dropdown answers:
Neither agree nor disagree

4 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed council will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

5 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

6 To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the council in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?

Dropdown answers:

Don't know

7 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

8 If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

Some questions were highly subjective, making it challenging to provide definitive answers.

Several questions were difficult to answer based solely on the business case or plan, as they required assumptions beyond the provided information.

A few questions were too broad, which made interpretation inconsistent and potentially impacted accuracy.

Question formatting could be improved to ensure clarity and alignment with the survey objectives.

Overall, refining the wording and narrowing the scope of certain questions would help respondents provide more precise and actionable feedback.

9 I confirm that I have not included any information that identifies an individual in the free text box.

Yes

Consultation on the proposal from Babergh District Council, East Suffolk District Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Mid Suffolk District Council, and West Suffolk District Council

1 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

2 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

3 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

4 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

5 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

6 To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements, for example, the establishment of a strategic authority?

Dropdown answers:

Don't know

7 To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

8 If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on this proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

The proposed names for the three unitary councils is not consistent or neutral. All three should align to preserve a shared regional identity. This approach avoids favoritism and ensures that all communities feel represented.

'Ipswich and Southern Suffolk' should be 'Southern Suffolk' to name Ipswich in the title will signal that Ipswich is the dominant or defining feature of that area which will undermine the sense of inclusion of other towns, including those in the other two unitary councils.

Consistency: All three names should follow the same geographic naming pattern.

Inclusivity: Avoid singling out one town to prevent perceptions of bias.

Identity Preservation: Neutral names help maintain the identity of all towns within the area.

General overview:

Some questions were highly subjective, making it challenging to provide definitive answers.

Several questions were difficult to answer based solely on the business case or plan, as they required assumptions beyond the provided information.

A few questions were too broad, which made interpretation inconsistent and potentially impacted accuracy.

Question formatting could be improved to ensure clarity and alignment with the survey objectives.

Overall, refining the wording and narrowing the scope of certain questions would help respondents provide more precise and actionable feedback.

9 This proposal is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary change. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

10 If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9.

Text box to add further comments:

We strongly disagree with this proposal. Kesgrave is a rural/coastal town that should remain within the East Suffolk boundary. Kesgrave has a strong and distinct identity, and this proposal does not support or reflect that. Furthermore, there appears to be a political asymmetry in the suggested changes, which raises additional concerns.

11 I confirm that I have not included any information that identifies an individual in the free text boxes.

Yes