

Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 30 November 2015 18:22
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Boundary Submission from Labour City Councillors
Attachments: Labour Group Response to LGBCE Further Consultation.docx

-----Original Message-----

From: Lewis Herbert [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2015 16:44
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Submission from Labour City Councillors

Submission from Cambridge City Council Labour Councillors:

Dear Commissioners

Cambridge City Council is currently led by Labour councillors and our city group writes to support all the points made by Labour County Councillors in their submission attached.

In particular:

1. In cities like Cambridge, one-member county divisions work very differently to rural or town/rural areas and far more effective than two-member divisions. They create

- communities that have a single clear identity on the county council
- accountability and connection to that community for their county representative
- a consistent pattern across Cambridge of one County Councillor per ward that has been very successful since 2004 working as a team with local City Councillors and worked well before then too
- the opportunity for exactly the same boundaries, in a future city council boundary review, for the larger number of City Councillors representing the same community (currently 3 per division) to represent the same co-terminous areas.

And on that last point, six member city council wards would not be successful, and would weaken local democracy in the city if 2 x 6 member wards elected a third of a future city council.

The data on housing and population to 2020 is also known and predictable and there are a clear geographic dividers neatly splitting both of the two member divisions being consulted on, to create effective one member divisions

2. On detail, we also support all of the attached specific points so that the new boundaries in Cambridge respect and respond to real communities.

For example, in (e) attached, the few streets north of Cherry Hinton Road, the Lichfield Road area of 235 voters, should be in the new Romsey division and not added to Queen Edith's. It is an integral part of the wider community that is currently 'Coleridge Ward' and links north. This small change has no significant impact on relative division populations which, for the wards proposed, would remain well within the Commission's targets for even and fair numbers distribution .

We hope you will be able to support these changes, which recognising the benefits of some of the ward details being consulted on. The net numbers work in terms of electoral equality. There is wide support in our and other political parties in Cambridge for the boundary changes as amended meet the needs and aspirations of the Cambridge community, subject to your agreeing to the attached variations.

It is also critical that the Commission makes the right decisions given that you are effectively deciding the shape for the next consultation, on a consequential view and the need for very similar City Council election divisions for Cambridge too. Co-terminosity has been a great success, one we want continued based on wise boundary choices.

Best wishes

Councillor Lewis Herbert
Leader of the Labour Group
Cambridge City Council

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this e-mail?

The information in this email may be confidential and legally privileged.

You are advised to scan attachments for viruses before opening them.

Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's further consultation in Cambridge District

Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group finds broadly acceptable most of the further draft recommendations produced by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in Cambridge District. The Labour Group accepts that the recommendations for Cambridge attempt broadly to balance the priorities of improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors in each division, reflecting community identity, and providing for effective and convenient local government. But it regrets that the draft appears to place greater emphasis on theories of community identity than on numerical equality (in our view the more important principle).

The Labour Group nevertheless supports the proposals for the following divisions: Abbey, Cherry Hinton, Chesterton, King's Hedges, and Market. But the Labour Group continues to oppose the principle of two-member divisions for Cambridge District. No such form of representation on the County Council has ever existed in the city. All political groups on the County Council oppose dual-member divisions. Further we believe electors in Cambridge agree that co-terminosity of boundaries between City and County Council elections benefits effective and convenient local government by minimising confusion. During the submission process, both major political groups on Cambridge City Council resolved at a meeting of the Civic Affairs Committee to support the principle of co-terminosity between divisions and ward boundaries. But a two-member division would render this proposal impossible when the City Council comes to review its own boundaries over coming years.

In particular, we are opposed to the proposals to create two dual-member divisions in (a) Castle & Newnham (b) Trumpington & Queen Edith's. We surmise that the Commission's draft proposals stem from concerns about housing growth proposals around Madingley Road and in Trumpington. But we believe these concerns could be adequately addressed and adequate numerical equality achieved by keeping Castle separate from Newnham and Queen Edith's separate from Trumpington.

We believe the two proposed dual seats would be both objectionable in principle and unwieldy in practice because they would each unite two distinct and identifiable communities whose centres lie at some geographical distance from each other.

- (a) The centre of the community in Newnham lies around Newnham Croft, in the far south west of the proposed division, whereas the centre of the community in Castle lies east of Huntingdon Road, in the far north east. We believe that the recommendations neglect the importance of Madingley Road as a clear community distinguisher between the two areas. The LGBCE stated that 'Grange Road provides access between the Newnham area in the south and communities north of Madingley Road'. This appears to imply that Grange Road extends both sides of Madingley Road, which is not the case, and that both distinct communities can be easily accessed. But to access the community in Castle from Newnham, it is necessary to pass along Madingley Road from Grange Road east to Northampton Street and then north, or else west to Storey's Way, and then north, into the Huntingdon Road area

We submit that these two communities are quite distinct. Madingley Road provides an ideal boundary for local government divisions and wards. It has provided the boundary since 1976 and residents continue to recognise its role in this regard. It also

provides a boundary between catchment areas for two separate primary schools. There are surprisingly few properties on Madingley Road because, for much of its length, it is screened by fields, university laboratories, and is abutted by the grounds of Colleges at the University of Cambridge. Residents in the Colleges feel that they belong neither to the Castle nor Newnham areas and the central community focus lies with the University.

We suggest that the LGBCE should create two single-member divisions for Castle and Newnham. The boundary between the proposed divisions would run down Madingley Road. We do not, in short, accept that a variance of more than +/- 10% would plausibly be the result of two single-member divisions in Castle and Newnham. Our proposal would also best reflect community identity. In particular, a single-member division for Newnham would respect the historic village identity of the area west of the River Cam and south of Madingley Road and it would conform exactly to the catchment area of Newnham Croft Primary School.

- (b) We similarly believe that there should be two single-member divisions in Trumpington and Queen Edith's. We do not accept that a variance of more than +/- 10% would plausibly be the result of two single-member divisions in Trumpington and Queen Edith's. The proposed two-member division would be unwieldy as the centre of the village community in Trumpington would lie in the far south-west of the division while the centre of the community in Queen Edith's would lie far to the east.

We propose two single-member divisions that should be demarcated by a clear boundary. Queen Edith's division, to the west, would be bounded by the railway as far south as Long Road. The area around Addenbrooke's Hospital is identified as part of the major development in the south of the city associated with Trumpington and the boundary of Queen Edith's division would therefore be set to exclude those properties on Hills Road and Babraham Road which abut the hospital site. The boundary would then run down Hills Road as far as the district boundary.

Trumpington division would be based on the historic village and would match the catchment area of Fawcett Primary School. It would also incorporate all of Long Road and the roads abutting Addenbrooke's Hospital on the west side of Hills Road and Babraham Road. Further development in the south of the city will lead to an increase in the numbers of voters in this division and care has been taken to ensure that this division will continue to provide electoral equality in 2020 and beyond. New bus connections now mean that Addenbrooke's is accessible from Trumpington. The division would thus respect the continuing identity of Trumpington as a community partially separate from Cambridge and also unites the city's hospital and a large number of its employees in the same division.

We also propose a series of minor amendments to the following divisions:

- (c) Arbury: We propose that the area to the west of Histon Road, known as the MacManus Estate, as well as Windsor Road should remain in the Castle division rather than being moved into the Arbury division. The submission of the County Council to the LGBCE proposed this boundary and clearly demonstrated that both Arbury and Castle divisions would remain within the LGBCE's required variance limits. Further, the MacManus Estate and Windsor Road have always remained within

the Castle division and identify more with the community residing around the Mayfield Primary School than with the Arbury community to the west of Histon Road. If the LGBCE currently believes that a separate Castle division would be too small, adding the MacManus Estate area would help achieve the principle of electoral equality while respecting historic community identities.

- (d) Petersfield: We propose that the area south of the Botanical Gardens, including the roads off and including Brooklands Avenue between Hills Road and Trumpington Road, should remain in the Trumpington division rather than being moved into the Petersfield division. The LGBCE's current proposals show Petersfield is too large by 8% whereas our proposed separate Trumpington division would be too small at present. As such, our proposed boundary would better preserve the principle of electoral equality. It would also better respect community identity as the area south of the Botanical Gardens has historically remained within the Trumpington division. Its residents do not identify with the centre of the community in Petersfield but rather identify with the community gathered alongside Trumpington Road.
- (e) Romsey: We propose that the entirety of the roads north of Cherry Hinton Road from Hills Road to Perne Road should be moved into the Romsey division rather than being moved into Queen Edith's. The community on Lichfield Road, Neville Road, Cowper Road, and Coniston Road identifies more with the community that sits alongside Rustat Road, Perne Road, and Coleridge Road, currently proposed to move into Romsey division, than with the community south of Cherry Hinton Road. Our proposed boundary therefore better respects historic community identity. Nor would it break the LGBCE's requirements for electoral equality.

Cllr Ashley Walsh, on behalf of the Labour Group