

Ward Name	Polling district(s) letters	Comments on the proposed or existing polling place	Do you have any comments to make about the polling district?	Do you have any other suggestions for the polling district?	Do you have any comments about the proposed polling place? (issues with accessibility etc?)	Is there an alternative venue that the council should consider? Please state why is this a better option.	Response by (A) RO
1. City Ward		I'm one of the councillors for City Ward - these proposed amendments look fine - but please can all residents at the affected addresses be sent letters now and prior to the next election informing them of these changes (if they go ahead).					There is no requirement for changes made as part of a review to be communicated with every household, this would be a costly exercise if it was undertaken across the board. However, the polling notices are sent out 6 weeks prior to the election which will highlight the change of polling station
1. City Ward	S1	It is good	No	Make it more accessible		Sheffield Hallam University	Noted
2. Ecclesall Ward	LA	100% approval of the move from LA to LG. i.e. from Ecclesall Parish Hall on Ringinglow Road to Ecclesall Library Community Room.	No.	No.	The parking problem in LG is slightly improved on LA.	No thanks.	Notied
2. Ecclesall Ward	LC	The single thing that caused me to change to a postal vote was the disorganisation at Bents Green Methodist Church. It was never set up in time there was an awful lot of running around with label and posters even 15 minutes after opening time and treating like the room was the personal lounge of the person in charge. So anything whether place or organisation would improve the voter experience.	No			In the analysis of voters within in each what was the actual count of those who had voted that would indicate whether it was a viable polling station or not and what could be done to improve the turn out to that station eg location or may be campaign to get voters registered for postal votes  Fundamentally is the review about premises for accessibility to vote or increased participation in voting	The issue raised is historical and has been resolved in recent years. Bents Green Methodist Church accomodates 2 x polling stations, one for Dore and Topley ward and one for Ecclesall ward and whilst this is not ideal the mitigation that has been implemented has been succesful.

Page 31

Ward Name	Polling district(s) letters	Comments on the proposed or existing polling place	Do you have any comments to make about the polling district?	Do you have any other suggestions for the polling district?	Do you have any comments about the proposed polling place? (issues with accessibility etc?)	Is there an alternative venue that the council should consider? Please state why is this a better option.	Response by (A) RO
2. Ecclesall Ward	LE	The existing polling place is close, but involves a steep incline for many on foot. The proposed polling place will be easier of access for many of those on foot or using public transport. I am not aware of the internal arrangements and I presume that parking for vehicles will be equally difficult at both venues.	No	No			Noted
2. Ecclesall Ward	LA	Not being a car-user I have in the past walked to the polling station at All Saints Church hall, cutting through the churchyard. With mobility problems this has its hazards for me. And I have latterly taken to postal voting, though I would much rather cast my vote in person. Ecclesall Library would be an excellent venue.					The respondent is registered within a property that will move into the LG polling district, so would be voting at the more convenient Ecclesall Library.
3. Gleadless Valley Ward	Gleadless valley /heeley ward	Bagshaw arms is fine. From the estate it can be reached by the 1a bus and other buses stop nearby.	Not sure at the minuet	???	No idea where the new proposed polling station is. None what so ever	Maybe a local school????	A map of the location of the proposed polling station was shown on the webpage. It is within the boundary of the polling dsitric and reasonably close to the existing station. Given the issues raised regarding the use of the Bagashaw Arms, and the potential for concern at using the Orpen House Sheltered Housing Scheme Community Room, the proposed new station is still regarded as the best option overall.
4. Manor Castle Ward	RF	The table giving an overview of the changes says the boundary between RE and RF will be realigned, but I cannot see any change on the map nor any change described elsewhere in the document. I am happy with there being no change, but confused as to what the realignment refers to.	No	No	No	The centre used for AF (in Norfolk Park) would be closer and easier for me to get to, but I guess you need to spread people around to stop some places getting too crowded.	Error in the statistical table on review page - there are no proposed amendments in these polling districts. Suggested polling station (Centre in the Park) is in Park & Arbourthorne ward.

Page 32

Ward Name	Polling district(s) letters	Comments on the proposed or existing polling place	Do you have any comments to make about the polling district?	Do you have any other suggestions for the polling district?	Do you have any comments about the proposed polling place? (issues with accessibility etc?)	Is there an alternative venue that the council should consider? Please state why is this a better option.	Response by (A) RO
3. Gleadless Valley Ward	OF	There are no proposed changes in my polling district. However I am keen to make a comment about the proposed continued use of the 74th Oak Street Scout Group Hut on Canterbury Road. In many ways this is a good venue. The location is quite good, it is not too close to an edge of the polling district and so is reasonably close for most people. The Scout Hut itself is very good. However the accessibility to the building is poor. The central part of Canterbury Road is unsurfaced. I am sure there is a reason for this, it is unadopted or something along those lines and so the City Council feel they have no responsibility for it. However you are choosing to use the Scout Hut as a polling station and so this means the Council now have a duty of care for the voters who have to use it. I had moderate mobility issues until recently when I had a hip replacement at the Hallamshire Hospital. So for the last few elections I have gone to the polling station using a walking stick and I have found it quite concerning getting across the very rough and uneven surface to get to the polling station. Once inside the polling station it is fine, the building itself is excellent. However I cannot imagine someone on a wheelchair or with real difficulty walking actually being able to get across the several metres of very uneven ground. This potentially discriminates as I am sure this puts off voters who have mobility difficulties. This is easily solvable by ensuring that part, at least, of the approach to the Scout Hut is more even. At the moment this section of road is a real barrier to disabled people and so is not acceptable for a polling station. To solve this the answer is to keep the Scout Hut as the polling station, but spend a little time and money to ensure there is a path to its entrance which can be taken by wheelchair users and others with significant mobility difficulties.	The polling district seems fine, it makes sense geographic ally.	No	Get the access to the Scout Hut polling station sorted out so it is accessible for disabled people (not the Scout Hut itself but the road outside). This is urgently needed.	No, it is a good venue, just sort out the path to it.	The part of Canterbury Road which serves the Scout Hut is unadopted and therefore highway and footpath improvement work cannot be undertaken . The Council may see fit to instruct Highways and Legal officers to look into the possibility of adopting this part of Canterbury Road with a view to future highway improvements

This page is intentionally left blank