

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Warding patterns	5
Draft recommendations	6
North	7
Central	9
South	10
Conclusions	12
Parish electoral arrangements	12
3 Have your say	14

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council	16
B Submissions received	18
C Glossary and abbreviations	19



# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why East Cambridgeshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of East Cambridgeshire District Council following a request by the Council in order to consider a reduction in council size.

## Our proposals for East Cambridgeshire

East Cambridgeshire District Council currently has 39 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a council size of 28 members – a reduction of 11 – will ensure that the Council can perform its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

As East Cambridgeshire District Council is elected by whole-council elections, the Commission will aim to produce a pattern of mixed wards. Our draft recommendations therefore propose that the Council's 28 councillors should represent three single-member, eight two-member and three three-member wards. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for East Cambridgeshire by 2021.

**You have until 11 January 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 14 for how to have your say.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review East Cambridgeshire District Council's ('the Council's) electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the district. The Council requested that we conduct a review in order to provide for new electoral arrangements that reflected the Council's new decision-making structure.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the district. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations. This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
23 June 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
1 September 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
17 November 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
12 January 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
5 April 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

recommendations.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2015	2021
Electorate of East Cambridgeshire	65,530	71,650
Number of councillors	28	28
Average number of electors per councillor	2,340	2,559

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for East Cambridgeshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of East Cambridgeshire or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by new housing developments in Ely.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

16 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to us to decrease the council size from 39 to 27 members. This was the only proposal made to us in relation to council size.

17 In supporting its proposal, the Council stated that it had sought to balance the streamlining of its decision-making structures against the need to ensure member capacity to develop the role of the Council. The submission outlined its new governance and decision-making structures as well as a perceived shift of responsibility from the district council to parish and town councils and other organisations. We carefully considered the Council's submission. We considered that its proposal for a council size of 27 members was supported by adequate evidence. We therefore invited proposals for warding arrangements based on a council size of 27 members.

18 During the consultation on warding patterns, the Council submitted a scheme based on a council size of 28, rather than 27. It argued that this provided a more cohesive warding pattern across the district. As we developed our draft recommendations, we confirmed that 27 councillors did not allow us to provide for an appropriate pattern of wards that reflected communities. We agree that 28 councillors would allow for a pattern of wards that more effectively meet our statutory criteria.

19 On this basis we have decided to put forward draft recommendations based on a council size of 28 members.

## Warding patterns

20 During consultation on warding patterns, we received 23 submissions, including one district-wide proposal from the Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district or provided general comments, some on the Council's proposal.

21 The Council's scheme provided for an arrangement of four single-member, nine two-member and two three-member wards for the district. We received a representation from Stephen Barclay MP (North East Cambridgeshire) in support of the Council's proposals. City of Ely Council also submitted comments in favour of the Council's proposal.

22 The scheme put forward by the Council provided for good electoral equality across the district, apart from their proposed two-member Sutton ward, which had an electoral variance of 12.5%. We did not consider that sufficiently persuasive evidence was received to warrant a ward with such a high variance and we are therefore proposing to move away from the Council's proposals in this area. We would particularly welcome submissions on our draft recommendations for this area during this consultation period.

23 We noted that the Council had not provided specific names for its proposed wards in Ely, and we have therefore named them Ely East, Ely North and Ely West. We would welcome comments on these names during the consultation period.

24 Our draft recommendations are primarily based on the proposals put forward by the Council. We have, however, made some amendments, particularly in the Bottisham and Woodditton area, the aforementioned Sutton ward, and in Ely where we have made some minor changes.

25 Our draft recommendations are for three single-member, eight two-member and three three-member wards. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

26 The proposed ward boundaries in our draft recommendations for the district of East Cambridgeshire seek to take account of proposed county division boundaries for Cambridgeshire, which are currently under review by the Commission.

27 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 16–17) and on the large map accompanying this report.

28 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

## Draft recommendations

29 The tables on pages 7–11 detail our draft recommendations for each area of East Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for effective and convenient local government

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## North

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Downham Villages</b>	1	-5%	This ward comprises the parishes of Coveney and Downham.	This ward mirrors that proposed by East Cambridgeshire District Council. It was also proposed by two respondents – a Member of Parliament and Little Downham Parish Council. The ward has clear and established boundaries and provides for good electoral equality, whilst keeping the community links intact.
<b>Ely East</b>	2	-3%	This ward comprises the Stuntney and Middle Fen areas on the outskirts of Ely, as well as the area to the east of Ely Cathedral and Lynn Road, west of Ely Common, and south of the hospital. It lies completely within the boundary of Ely parish.	In addition to the Council's proposals for Ely, we received one submission from City of Ely Council supporting the District Council's proposals and requesting that any Ely wards lie completely within the parish boundary. A submission from the MP made the same request. Our proposed Ely East ward is largely based on the ward put forward by the Council. In order to align more closely with proposed county division boundaries, we do not propose to include the Kings Avenue/Longchamp Drive area in the north, or the Potter's Lane area in the south, in this ward. The Council did not provide a specific name for this ward, and therefore we have chosen Ely East as an appropriate name. We are satisfied that this ward reflects our statutory criteria.
<b>Ely North</b>	2	-3%	This ward comprises the areas north of the hospital and Highfield School, including the new development to the north-east of Ely, along with Chettisham, Queen Adelaide and Prickwillow. It sits entirely	This ward follows closely the ward proposed by the Council. However, we have amended the proposed boundary in the south-west of the ward to align with the proposed county division boundary; we propose to include the Wissey Way area and the Buckingham Drive area in this ward, along with the aforementioned Kings Avenue area in the south-east of the ward. We consider

			within the boundary of Ely parish.	that our proposed ward adheres well to the statutory criteria whilst maintaining community links.
<b>Ely West</b>	3	4%	This ward comprises the area south of Highfield School, west of Ely Cathedral and Lynn Road, and west of the Fen Rivers Way. It sits entirely within the boundary of Ely parish.	This ward mirrors the ward proposed by the Council, with the addition of the Potter's Lane area in the north-east. We have made this change to allow this ward to follow the same boundaries as the proposed Ely West county division. This ward has good electoral equality and strong and identifiable boundaries.
<b>Haddenham &amp; Sutton</b>	3	-6%	This ward comprises the parishes of Haddenham, Mepal, Sutton, Wentworth and Witcham.	We received four submissions relating to this ward, along with the Council's proposals. These submissions favoured a two-member Sutton ward. The Council's proposed two-member Sutton ward had an electoral variance of 12.5%, which would not provide for good electoral equality. To improve the electoral equality, and thus to adhere more closely to our statutory criteria, we propose to combine the Council's proposed Sutton ward with its proposed single-member Haddenham ward. The resulting three-member Haddenham & Sutton ward has considerably improved levels of electoral equality, as well as strong access routes through the ward.
<b>Littleport</b>	3	1%	This ward comprises the entirety of the parish of Littleport.	This ward was proposed by the Council, as well as by Littleport Parish Council, a political group, and a Member of Parliament. It follows the parish boundary, completely encompassing the parish of Littleport. We consider that this ward best reflects our statutory criteria.
<b>Stretham</b>	2	0%	This ward comprises the parishes of Stretham, Thetford, Wilburton and Witchford.	This ward mirrors the ward proposed by the Council. We did not receive any other representations regarding this ward. We consider that it provides for good electoral equality whilst reflecting community identities.

## Central

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Fordham</b>	1	-6%	This ward comprises the parishes of Fordham and Snailwell.	This ward is based on the Council's proposed Fordham ward. We did not receive any other submissions specifically relating to this ward. We consider that this ward entirely fulfils the statutory criteria and has strong boundaries with appropriate access routes through the ward.
<b>Isleham</b>	1	2%	This ward comprises the parishes of Chippenham, Isleham and Kennett.	This ward is based on the Council's proposed Fordham ward. We did not receive any other submissions specifically relating to this ward. We consider that this ward entirely fulfils the statutory criteria and has strong boundaries with appropriate access routes through the ward.
<b>Soham North</b>	2	3%	This ward comprises the northern part of the parish of Soham, including the areas north of Mill Corner, Station Road and Cornwell Close.	This ward follows closely the proposed Soham North ward put forward by the Council, which we consider provided for good electoral equality whilst reflecting community identities. We did not receive any other submissions directly relating to this area. We have moved away from the Council's proposal in the south-east of the ward to align its boundary with proposed county division boundaries for Cambridgeshire. This has no impact on the electoral equality and provides for a strong boundary.
<b>Soham South</b>	2	6%	This ward comprises the southern part of the parish of Soham and the entire parish of Wicken.	This ward follows closely the proposed Soham South ward put forward by the Council, with the aforementioned deviation in the north-east to align the boundary with the proposed county divisions for Cambridgeshire. Apart from the Council's proposals, we did not receive any submissions relating directly to this area. As this proposed ward reflects our statutory criteria, we are content to propose it as part of our draft recommendations.

## South

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bottisham</b>	2	-2%	This ward comprises the parishes of Bottisham, Brinkley, Burrough Green, Lode, Reach, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Westley Waterless.	In addition to the proposal put forward by the Council, we received two submissions relating to Bottisham, both of which commented on the awkwardly elongated shape of the existing ward in this area. We also received one submission relating to the parish of Brinkley, requesting that it be joined exclusively with areas to the north-east – this would, however, not provide for acceptable levels of electoral equality. Whilst the Council’s proposed Bottisham ward provided for acceptable electoral equality (-8%), it did not reflect transport links through the ward which run from north to south. The railway line, the A11 and the A14 all divide the ward but we are satisfied that, by adding the parish of Burrough Green to the proposed ward, there is sufficient access across the ward. The addition of Burrough Green parish also significantly improves the electoral equality of the ward.
<b>Burwell</b>	2	6%	This ward comprises the entirety of the parish of Burwell.	Our proposed Burwell ward mirrors the ward proposed by the Council, and by Burwell Parish Council. It encompasses the parish of Burwell and we consider that it reflects our statutory criteria as well as having strong and established boundaries.
<b>Woodditton</b>	2	-2%	This ward comprises the parishes of Ashley, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kirtling, Stetchworth and Woodditton.	Our proposed Woodditton is based on the Council’s proposal for this area, with the exception of the aforementioned transfer of the Burrough Green parish into Bottisham ward. We received two other submissions relating to this area. One submission requested that no changes be made to the existing Dullingham Villages ward. However, this would not be feasible, due to electoral variances and our

				<p>proposals for the wider area. Another submission requested retaining the current Cheveley ward, and that the Woodditton area be removed from a Dullingham Villages ward. However, this warding arrangement would require the addition of extra councillors, as well as resulting in a variance of -57% for a Dullingham Villages ward. We consider that the proposed warding arrangement provides for good electoral equality, and are therefore proposing it as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

## Conclusions

30 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	28	28
Number of electoral wards	14	14
Average number of electors per councillor	2,340	2,559
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Draft recommendation**

East Cambridgeshire District Council should comprise 28 councillors serving three single-member, eight two-member and three three-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for East Cambridgeshire.

**You can also view our draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

## Parish electoral arrangements

31 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

32 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, East Cambridgeshire District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health

Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

33 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ely, Littleport and Soham parishes.

34 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for City of Ely parish.

**Draft recommendation**

City of Ely Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Chettisham (returning one member), Ely East (returning three members), Ely North (returning three members), Ely West (returning six members), Prickwillow (returning one member) and Stuntney (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

35 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littleport parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Littleport Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Littleport East (returning eight members) and Littleport West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

36 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Soham parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Soham Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Soham Central (returning two members), Soham North (returning six members) and Soham South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 Have your say

37 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole district or just a part of it.

38 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for East Cambridgeshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

39 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at [\*\*consultation.lgbce.org.uk\*\*](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

40 Submissions can also be made by emailing [\*\*reviews@lgbce.org.uk\*\*](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk) or by writing to:

**Review Officer (East Cambridgeshire)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP**

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for East Cambridgeshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed ward? Is there any form of public transport?

41 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

42 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

43 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

44 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for East Cambridgeshire District Council in 2019.

## Equalities

45 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Bottisham	2	4,836	2,418	3%	5,040	2,520	-2%
2	Burwell	2	4,959	2,480	6%	5,430	2,715	6%
3	Downham Villages	1	2,427	2,427	4%	2,440	2,440	-5%
4	Ely East	2	4,839	2,420	3%	4,969	2,485	-3%
5	Ely North	2	3,016	1,508	-36%	4,941	2,471	-3%
6	Ely West	3	7,581	2,527	8%	7,960	2,653	4%
7	Fordham	1	2,264	2,264	-3%	2,410	2,410	-6%

**Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
8	Haddenham & Sutton	3	7,070	2,357	1%	7,220	2,407	-6%
9	Isleham	1	2,544	2,544	9%	2,620	2,620	2%
10	Littleport	3	6,657	2,219	-5%	7,740	2,580	1%
11	Soham North	2	5,295	2,648	13%	5,295	2,648	3%
12	Soham South	2	4,187	2,094	-11%	5,445	2,723	6%
13	Stretham	2	5,017	2,509	7%	5,130	2,565	0%
14	Woodditton	2	4,838	2,419	3%	5,010	2,505	-2%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>65,530</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>71,650</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,340</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>2,559</b>	<b>–</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/east-cambridgeshire>

### Local authority

- East Cambridgeshire District Council

### Parish and town councils

- Bottisham Parish Council
- Brinkley Parish Council
- Burwell Parish Council
- City of Ely Council
- Dullingham Parish Council
- Haddenham Parish Council
- Little Downham Parish Council (two submissions)
- Littleport Parish Council
- Mepal Parish Council
- Sutton Parish Council (two submissions)
- Wentworth Parish Council
- Witcham Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council

### Political groups

- North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association

### MP

- Stephen Barclay MP

### Residents

- Five local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council