

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 September 2022 11:24  
**To:** reviews  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed new electoral arrangements for Tunbridge Wells

**Categories:** Submissions

As the [REDACTED] Goudhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan which was finally made last February after 5 ½ years' work, I would like to add the following critique of the proposed new electoral arrangements.

It was very noticeable how the bonds between the 2 satellite communities of Curtisden Green and Kilndown to Goudhurst have developed historically and have today forged a strong identity as a unified parish – one of the largest in the South East albeit with a population of only some 3,500. The topography of the parish, its position in an AONB and the routes of the A21 and A262 have given us quite a different set of concerns to those of even our nearest neighbouring communities such as Horsmonden and these are reflected in great detail in our NDP document. To date our Borough councillors have been able to speak solely for our interests without their message being diluted by the differing concerns of neighbouring villages.

Moreover I believe Horsmonden and Brenchley have yet to complete their NDP's. So under the proposed new ward 'Rural Tunbridge Wells' the councillors may have to tailor their representations according to the legal mandates given by Goudhurst and Lamberhurst and the divined wishes of the rest of the ward instead of being able to speak authoritatively with one voice as at present.

I am therefore in favour of an arrangement which links each community with their own dedicated councillor.

Finally the proposed new name is more appropriate to Rusthall or Southborough. Better "Goudhurst, Lamberhurst & Horsmonden' or 'Central High Weald' if we have to accept the current proposal.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]