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Dear Sir

I would like to add my Personal support to the case, against re-assigning my locality to one which has absolutely no synergy with it, being made by Sandie Giles.

I am sure you have lots of evidence to consider so to be brief, my locality, Milton Avenue, is directly adjacent to the rest of the "Eatons" and as such shares all of the issues affecting them. It has absolutely no day to day interaction with Little Paxton and Priory Park so any issues that it might have will be seen in competition with those of the proposed new grouping rather than being complementary to the needs of the "Eatons".... Very specifically, Milton Avenue is closely aligned with Crosshall School and many parents use it as a means to reach that school both on foot and by car. Issue that arise in the area are of absolutely no relevance to the LP or PP....

Please reconsider the proposals.....

J Abele
Re-Sent as result of Richard Bucks OOO message

Dear Sir

I would like to add my Personal support to the case, against re-assigning my locality to one which has absolutely no synergy with it, being made by Sandie Giles.

I am sure you have lots of evidence to consider so to be brief, my locality, Milton Avenue, is directly adjacent to the rest of the "Eatons" and as such shares all of the issues affecting them. It has absolutely no day to day interaction with Little Paxton and Priory Park so any issues that it might have will be seen in competition with those of the proposed new grouping rather than being complementary to the needs of the "Eatons".... Very specifically, Milton Avenue is closely aligned with Crosshall School and many parents use it as a means to reach that school both on foot and by car.

Issue that arise in the area are of absolutely no relevance to the LP or PP....

Please reconsider the proposals.....

S Abele
I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed ward boundary change which would effectively move part of Petersfield (including Edward Street where I live) into Abbey Ward.

Petersfield enjoys a strong and well established local identity. I object in principle to the idea of breaking up our community in this way.

Furthermore, I understand that the original reason for the proposal was to even up numbers of voters in each area. In reality, however, the figures do not justify this change. Petersfield had 600 more voters than Abbey Ward in 2014 whereas latest figures in 2016 show Petersfield has 1330 fewer voters than Abbey.

I urge you to take these points in to consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Jane Adams (Ms)
Dear Review Officer (Cambridgeshire),

We are writing to strongly object to the proposal that Eaton Ford should be put into the ward for Little Paxton or Priory Park. There was settlement here in Neolithic and in Anglo Saxon times with Eaton Socon as Eatun and Eaton Ford as Sudbury. Eaton Socon and Eaton Ford are both ancient settlements which are mentioned in the Doomsday Book as being an area called the Barony of Eaton. We are a distinct community with our own church, Doctors Surgery, shops and associations (like the Scouts). The boundary with St Neots is the River Great Ouse. The situation has remained the same since recorded history, except that Eaton Socon and Eaton Ford are in Cambridgeshire, now, rather than Bedfordshire. The river is a natural boundary and the Eatons should remain a ward in their own right. Please respect our wishes to remain a separate ward.

Yours Respectfully,
Mr J.R. and Mrs P.K. Allcock
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Cathy Allen
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I don't understand why Shepreth is being placed in Duxford area. I have never even heard of some of the villages named such as Ickleton, Hinxton & Chrishall, never visited most of the others and only Fowlmere and Foxton are villages close enough to Shepreth to feel that there is any connection. Meldreth has my local shop and Melbourn is the main local centre for myself and probably many other Shepreth residents as it has the GP, Dentist, Vet, hairdresser, pharmacy, school facilities etc that I use. It therefore really doesn’t make sense to me that Shepreth is included with Duxford instead of with Melbourn.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hello ALEX
I am not politically active, other than to vote when necessary, but when made aware of or the proposed changes I thought here we go more change for the sake of change.  
I can understand that you may need to reduce the amount of councillors sometimes.  
It was always my belief that the idea of the local ward, was to have local people as councillors, who were neighbours and friends who lived in the ward, who were easily accessible to the people of the ward, who had their ears to the ground and knew the thoughts and concerns of local people.  
So I cannot understand the proposal of merging our local ward, with a village 2 mile away, and one across the river, which is nearly as far.  
I have no real objections to a merger, with an adjacent ward, logically with Eaton Socon, which we share community centre and churches and local organization with.  
It would appear whoever proposed the idea has no local knowledge or history of the area, if they had little objection would of arisen. The two EATONS are already a close knit community, proud of there history, Would of been a sensible solution.  
I hope my thoughts help to come to a logical and sensible solution, if it is deemed necessary to do away with our councillor.  

ALAN ALLSOP  
Eaton Ford resident
To the Review Officer (Cambridgeshire),

I am writing to thank you for the time and thought you and your colleagues have devoted to the question of local government boundaries.

I would like to ask you, however, to revisit the proposed new boundaries for Petersfield. My neighbourhood, St Matthew's, has been unusually coherent and unitary over the past 50 years. The church, St Matthew's School (also St Matthew's), pubs and bakery all date to the 1860s - 1880s and remain the heart of the neighbourhood. The proposal to move these areas to the Abbey ward makes no historical sense and would put our united community at risk. With thanks, Catherine

From: Catherine

Received: 15 Jul 2016
Dear Sirs,
We wish to protest at the proposed changes to the Petersfield Electoral Ward Boundary in the City of Cambridge. Our reasons are as follows:

1. For the past forty years, the St Matthews neighbourhood has been part of the Petersfield Ward and, together with its school, church, Piece (green space) and network of residential Victorian terraced streets, forms a single community with a distinctive local identity embracing many ethnic and sharing the same concerns. Removing a vital part of Petersfield and attaching it to a much larger, more commercial and diverse area, with different priorities and concerns will break up a tight-knit, established community. Residents in quiet Upper Gwydir St, Edward St and the part of Sturton St designated for removal, along with all the other streets so-designated, naturally look towards Gwydir St and the remainder of Sturton St, together with the rest of the Petersfield Ward and Mill Rd, rather than to an area of retail parks, car sales showrooms, an airport, football stadium and dual carriageway arterial road. The councillors for this area will have a totally different set of concerns from ours and, because of size and time pressures be unable to put our issues near the top of their agenda: we will be totally overwhelmed by commercial, not residential interests. Thus, the proposed move goes against your stated aim of keeping established communities together.

2. Our local green space, St Matthew's Piece, is vital to the family-oriented community feel of Petersfield Ward. The commercially-orientated Abbey Ward has the large Coldham's and Stourbridge Commons to care for, both of which are of a totally different nature to our small Pieces - again, the existing boundary suits the distinctive differing identities: remove St Matthew's Piece and St Matthew's Church and you rip out the heart of a residential family community and disrupt the connection between the Church and St Matthew's School. Communication between PCCs, PCs and City Councils will become more fragmented and thus less representative, more open to misinterpretation or stagnation of issues and increased expense.

3. The latest figures for Petersfield Ward shows we have 1,330 fewer registered voters than
Abbey. Why move lots of residents into a larger electoral area when the figures do not justify the change? Again, the former Petersfield voters will be the bottom of the pile in a huge Ward, rather than receiving fair representation in their former Ward.
4. Cambridge City traditionally votes Labour (we, incidentally do not) with some occasional deviations to LibDem, therefore the proposed change will make little, if any, difference to the overall result of who is elected or has overall control of the Council. Why WASTE time, effort and OUR MONEY on a pointless exercise which will destroy a peaceful, close-knit, community-spirited, family-orientated, predominantly residential area, leaving us poorly represented.
Please listen to our concerns and leave Petersfield Ward as it is. Thank you.
Simon and Joanne Alper

Sent from my iPad
From: Claire Appleyard
Sent: 18 May 2016 21:15
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Trumpington and Queen Edith's, Cambridge

Dear Sir/Madam

It is with great concern that I hear that Trumpington could be merged with Queen Edith's, to create a huge double division for voting purposes.

While I understand that the aim is to even up the number of voters, I strongly believe that Trumpington and Queen Edith's should not be merged as proposed.

- Trumpington and Queen Edith's are very different: we don't use the same shops, schools, doctors surgery, playgrounds or churches.
- The new division would be a muddle, different to the City Council voting ward, with two MPs and police teams. Voting options must be clear and meaningful for voters to make clear and meaningful choices.
- It would have 16,000 people - a lot, even for two councillors. How can the needs of all these people be properly heard and represented?

These wards do not need joining together. Please can you consider implementing alternatives.

I am also very concerned that you are proposing cutting the number of councillors, meaning Cambridge would be represented by just 12 councillors on the County Council, the authority responsible for our transport, education and social care.

I urge you to reconsider these proposals.

Yours faithfully,

Claire Appleyard
Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to express concern about proposals to merge Queen Edith’s with Trumpington voting civils.

As a Queen Edith’s resident, I have no connection with Trumpington by road but I have no contact with Trumpington except by shopping. The occasional visit to the church.

There is no need to merge Queen Edith’s with Trumpington - we are different and wish to remain so. A merger would be a mistake.

I urge the Boundary Commission to re-examine the proposals in the name of sanity and clarity.

Yours sincerely,

7 June 20
We would like to strongly object to the change of parish boundary dividing the village of Sutton near Ely. It would spoil the community aspect of the village and be more difficult for the counsellors to administer and listen to the problems of the public.

Rob Barter
Doreen Ashpole

Sent from my iPad
**Cambridgeshire County**

**Personal Details:**

- **Name:** D Beauregard
- **E-mail:** [Redacted]
- **Postcode:** [Redacted]
- **Organisation Name:**

**Feature Annotations**

1. **Community resource: cemetery**
2. **Community resource: park**
3. **Community resource: allotments**

**Comment text:**

My representation relates specifically to the proposed new boundaries for Petersfield (where I am resident) and the adjoining Abbey and Trumpington Wards. The Petersfield boundary should be left as it is at present because the communities in this part of Cambridge are more defined by being within the sections between the major roads (East Road, Coldham's Lane, Mill Road, Hills Road, Trumpington Road) than by whether they lie across these roads. The proposed new boundaries will result in voters who are extremely far away from ‘Petersfield’ (i.e., the top end of Mill Road) being included in Petersfield Ward; in particular in the section west of Hills Road as far away as the Shaftesbury Ave area and the behemoth that is _____ that has absolutely nothing to do with those resident in Petersfield itself. The ability of voters and their elected councillors to get the best results when decisions are made that affect local community concerns like housing/development, licensing, transport, parking, and community resources will be severely diluted. For example, it seems extremely unlikely that residents of the Shaftesbury Ave area will have any interest in the management of the three Petersfield community resources that I have highlighted above (Mill Rd cemetery, St Matthew’s Pieces park, and New St allotments), or traffic/development issues in Petersfield, licensing/PPPO matters on Mill Road, etc. Similarly, it seems unlikely that many Petersfield residents will be affected or interested in similar issues that may affect Brooklands Avenue, _____ the Leys School, etc. The boundaries must be kept as they are because the new boundaries that have been proposed will be unfair for Petersfield, Abbey, and Trumpington Wards residents.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Please, splitting a village in half is ludicrous. Lorna Dupree has another option which does not split Sutton but reduces the numbers of councillors as desired. I suggest you talk to her and leave our village intact.

K Bennett
Mepal Rd
Sutton
Dear Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)

I strongly object to the idea of breaking our community in half and the idea of moving lots of current Petersfield residents, including myself, to Abbey Ward. It makes no sense when Abbey is already such a huge ward and will break up our community in a very arbitrary way.

Best wishes

Michelle Bernard
Petersfield Ward
Sirs –

In relation to the most recent (4th, I think) review of the above, I would like to make the following points and for them to be considered at the review –

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Reducing the number to 61, despite Cambridgeshire’s rapidly growing population, will lead to a significant increase in the ratio of electors to Councillors, making it more difficult for County Councillors to adequately represent residents.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between residents and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which were put forward last year by East Cambridgeshire District Council (9 County Councillors for East Cambridgeshire) and by Fenland District Council (10 County Councillors for Fenland).

I live in Wentworth and never go to Littleport – the idea that we could become a part of Littleport West makes no sense and seems an unnecessary proposal.

Elizabeth Birchley
Dear Sir,

Our address is part of the St. Matthew's neighbourhood.

We are currently part of the Petersfield Ward in the City of Cambridge. For over forty years, our neighbourhood has been part of Petersfield Ward. A single community with a single local identity and our own local councillors. We are emailing to object to the proposal to move us to the Abbey Ward. These proposals would have the effect of breaking up our community in a very arbitrary way despite the Boundary Commission's stated intent of keeping established communities together. We wish to remain in Petersfield.

Yours faithfully

Ian and Helen Brace
I have lived in Petersfield Ward for 42 yrs in total after university. I have always been impressed by its individual identity and remained active in the community during this time. Although my allotment in New Street is now in Abbey Ward the tenants like me live in Petersfield Ward. Abbey Wards identity is totally different from Petersfield and seems to me to be based around the river. I understand that current electoral 2016 figures show Petersfield already has less voters than Abbey whereas the proposals are based on the old 2014 register which showed Petersfield with more voters than Abbey. Since then residential building in central cambridge had increased substantially. Why tear all of us out of Petersfield into Abbey sacrificing all the changes for good in Petersfield Ward in the last 40 years? Please dont move me into a faceless community. Christine Bradley
Dear Boundary Commission,

I have lived in Petersfield for many years. I object to your proposal to change our boundary with Abbey, so that our community will be split. Apart from anything else, some of the streets you propose to take out of Petersfield are only a stone’s throw from Petersfield itself. You also seem to want to take away St Matthew’s Church and St Matthew’s Piece, both of which are at the heart of the Petersfield community. I am unable to find an explanation of your rationale for this change on your website, but my local city councillor tells me that it’s based on voter numbers. However, he also says that the latest figures show fewer voters in Petersfield than in Abbey Ward.

Please do not break up our community in this arbitrary and unnecessary way.

Yours faithfully,

Jo Bradley
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Diana Bray
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We are in [REDACTED] and the only house in Fenland. With the proposed boundaries we have to go to Manea to vote (a 22 mile round trip passing numerous polling stations), we become part of rural March. We are no more than 200 meters from our neighbours (who are in East Cambs) and whose house we have to pass to go anywhere. Mepal is our closest village. It's crazy for us to be part of Manea & March. Please reconsider.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
17-05-2016

Boundary Changes.

Dear Sir’s,

I cannot protest strongly enough about the proposed boundary changes.

Why! And to what advantage!

The Eaton’s are a community which has been very effective for many years. How can you make a community with Lt. Paxton and Priory Park when they are across a river and are 2/3 miles away.

Cost cutting! What will be the cost and to whom, for new road signs, signpost and private change addresses if I will no longer be Eaton Ford. When I moved I had to notify 40 business, friends and family, i.e. banks, insurance, Dula, and why because someone thinks this is a good idea. Well I do not, but then I do not expect it will effect the persons who proposed it.

This is not democratic and is purely political. I am a very angry resident of Crosshall Road and deserve better than this proposal.

Yours sincerely
Dear Mr Hinds, I would like to object to the proposed boundary changes. I can see no logical reason to move Crosshill road, from the Eatons catchment area where they have been over one hundred years. I now live in Crosshill road having lived in Lt Paxton for 40 years and can just imagine the confusion that will be caused by strangers driving around Lt Paxton looking for perhaps Milton Avenue, or one of the smaller roads 2 miles away that people in Lt Paxton will not have clue where they are enquiring about. I believe the proposed boundary change actually stupid and unnecessary. Perhaps you could explain to me why you think this change is required, and who pays for the cost.

yours sincerely ron broadfoot
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: John Brocklehurst
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The Mordens and Litlington have nothing in common with the Gamlingay area. It would make more sense to group them with Bassingbourne, Melbourne and Meldreth - all villages which tend to use Royston (Herts) as their market town.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
16-6-16

Dear Sir,

I am writing to protest against the proposal to join Eaton Ford with Little Paxton. Little Paxton is approximately two miles away across the river. The only reason to visit Little Paxton is to go to the Nature Reserve and the only time Little Paxton comes to brasshall Road is when the river floods and the Paxton Road is closed thus causing a traffic blockage. If we must join someone else let it be Eaton Socon with whom we have a 10.70.
close association, we share schools, churches and work closely on community events.

yours sincerely

MRS. J. M. BROOKS.
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Donald M. and Sally E.M. Broom
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We are opposed to combining Trumpington ward and Queen Edith's ward. We consider that the proposed Trumpington and Queen Edith's ward would be too large so we should not be adequately represented. The population and the distance from one end to the other would be too large for one ward. It would be harder for our voice to be heard if the Councillor represented twice as many people. Another important factor is that these are two different communities. The people in the two wards do not use the same schools, shops, pubs, recreation grounds and community centres so a single Councillor is inappropriate. We were at one time in Trumpington ward and, if some change has to be made, the population could be quite balanced by reverting to this and having two wards with a border along Hills Road. Donald M. Broom and Sally E.M. Broom

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear sir I write to add my voice to the many who have already spoken out. Those of us who live in Eaton Ford do not wish to be tagged onto Priory and Paxton Electoral Division. We are a separate community already and have no need to be moved for no good reason that I can see. Yours sincerely, Geoffrey Browne Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir I write to object to Eaton Ford being placed with Priory and Little Paxton for council electoral divisions. Why put Eaton Ford with places that have nothing in common with us. Surely it is common sense to keep the Eatons together as we have our own identity along with shops church and community association. Please think very carefully before you split us up for no good reason. Thanking you in advance.
I remain yours sincerely Sanchia Browne
Sent from my iPad
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Timothy Brown
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am glad that Windsor Road is remaining in Castle ward, since we have close relationships with Oxford, Richmond and Halifax Roads. That said, I don't see the need for any changes to ward boundaries. Tim Brown,

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
19 May 2016

Dear Sir

Proposed Boundary Change, Eaton Ford, Cambridgeshire

I am writing to express my extreme concern and total objection to the proposed change to move the Milton Avenue estate, Crosshall Road and Saviles Close from the Eaton’s ward to become part of Little Paxton and Priory Park.

The Eatons are a united community with a strong local identity. The Milton Avenue estate has on it our local Infant and Primary Schools, and it makes no sense at all to divide what is the entire catchment area for that school.

Although geographically close we are several miles from Little Paxton and Priory Park by road, we have no close association or affinity with those parts of the town. Little Paxton & Priory Park are growing communities with ongoing new housing developments and the issues which affect those wards are very different to the Eatons which is a well established, fully developed and has little or no future expansion capacity.

Eaton Ford was a separate village in Bedfordshire until the boundary changes in 1965. But it has always been a complete entity with its own village identity. We have our village green, two local pubs, two local shops and our community centre. In the proposed changes we would have no “connection” to any of these. Our greatest public amenity, the Riverside Park would sit half in and half out of the proposed new ward. The Eatons have been a united community for many, many years and must remain a united community.

Yours faithfully
David Byatt

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th floor
Milbank Tower
London SW1P 4QP

19 May 2016

Dear Sir

Proposed Boundary Change, Eaton Ford, Cambridgeshire

I am writing to express my extreme concern and total objection to the proposed change to move the Milton Avenue estate, Crosshall Road and Saviles Close from the Eaton’s ward to become part of Little Paxton and Priory Park.

The Eatons are a united community with a strong local identity. The Milton Avenue estate has on it our local Infant and Primary Schools, and it makes no sense at all to divide what is the entire catchment area for that school.

Although geographically close we are several miles from Little Paxton and Priory Park by road, we have no close association or affinity with those parts of the town. Little Paxton & Priory Park are growing communities with ongoing new housing developments and the issues which affect those wards are very different to the Eatons which is a well established, fully developed and has little or no future expansion capacity.

Eaton Ford was a separate village in Bedfordshire until the boundary changes in 1965. But it has always been a complete entity with its own village identity. We have our village green, two local pubs, two local shops and our community centre. In the proposed changes we would have no “connection” to any of these. Our greatest public amenity, the Riverside Park would sit half in and half out of the proposed new ward. The Eatons have been a united community for many, many years and must remain a united community.

Yours faithfully
David Byatt
Dear Sir

Proposed Boundary Change, Eaton Ford, Cambridgeshire

I am writing to express my extreme concern and total objection to the proposed change to move the Milton Avenue estate, Crosshall Road and Saviles Close from the Eaton’s ward to become part of Little Paxton and Priory Park.

The Eatons are a united community with a strong local identity. The Milton Avenue estate has on it our local Infant and Primary Schools, and it makes no sense at all to divide what is the entire catchment area for that school.

Although geographically close we are several miles from Little Paxton and Priory Park by road, we have no close association or affinity with those parts of the town. Little Paxton & Priory Park are growing communities with ongoing new housing developments and the issues which affect those wards are very different to the Eatons which is a well established, fully developed and has little or no future expansion capacity.

Eaton Ford was a separate village in Bedfordshire until the boundary changes in 1965. But it has always been a complete entity with its own village identity. We have our village green, two local pubs, two local shops and our community centre. In the proposed changes we would have no “connection” to any of these. Our greatest public amenity, the Riverside Park would sit half in and half out of the proposed new ward.

The Eatons have been a united community for many, many years and must remain a united community.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Jacqueline Byatt
Dear Mr. Hinds,

Re: Proposed Boundary Changes Eaton Ford, St. Neots, Cambs.

As a very long term resident of Eaton Ford I object most strongly at the proposed boundary change which will in effect mean that my property will now be considered as part of Little Paxton.

The Eatons have always been a community even in the time we were part of Bedfordshire. The river Ouse has been the natural boundary. Older residents have always been fiercely proud of “living in Thee Eatons as opposed to being part of St Neots.

We try and maintain our village identity, and have all the facilities of a ‘village community’

With the opening of the new shopping facility in The Eatons we are practically self sufficient. I know that over the years people have fought for better facilities ‘in the Eatons’ and have know their County Councillor. It will be ridiculous to now have one councillor for Paxton and our small part of Eaton Ford and another Councillor for the rest of The Eatons which incidentally will be divided by a small area of community grass.

We have very active and successful sports clubs in the Eatons which are based in the current centre of The Eaton. Losing part of the Eatons will in effect mean that members of these clubs will not actually live in The Eatons but will be more associated with the other side of the town.

Please, unless you have had strong representation from Paxton to say that they want us Eaton Forders please do not allow this fragmentation of our community to go through.

Your sincerely

Derek Bygrave
I am writing to make a number of comments on the latest LGBC for Cambridgeshire

(1) In light of the continuing surge in capital investment in Cambridge and surrounding areas leading to many more new jobs being created and many more new people moving into the area, hence the large and expanding house building program it is very difficult to see how reducing further the number of Cambridgeshire councillors can be appropriate.

(2) Having lived in the West Riding, Greater Manchester, Norfolk and Cambridgeshire (twice) I naturally assumed that single member wards was the accepted norm since it made perfect sense in that 1 councillor known to the electorate as the single point of contact was the best way to ensure smooth contact between electors and elected representative. Going away from single member wards will cause confusion and is not in the best interests of the electorate. If say 2 councillors are to be elected and they live in the same part of the ward this will leave people at the other end of the very large ward feeling ignored. Matters could be even more confusing if say the 2 elected representatives come from different political parties in which case people may find it difficult to know who they should contact and for that matter the 2 councillors may have differing views on a particular matter and actively work against each other which could be detrimental to the interests of the residents. To me the single member arrangement has worked successful for a long time and should not be changed on principle

K I Byron
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: John Cameron
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Foxton is better aligned with Melbourn as it is in the Melbourne Village College catchment area. There is no village college in the proposed re-alignment. In addition, Foxton has direct transport links covering bus route as well as train services to Melbourn. There are little or no common transport links with Duxford, Hinxton, Ickleton, Pampisford and other villages south of the A505. Foxton has access to an excellent rail user group and is an important part of the A10 cycle-path scheme. The County Councillor represents Foxton and she works hard to maintain excellent links with villages along the A10 towards Royston. This is much appreciated by Foxton residents and we wish to maintain such a situation.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Apart from the proposed Divisions of Chatteris, Wisbech West and Wisbech East, which I do support, I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Reducing the number to 61, despite Cambridgeshire’s rapidly growing population, will lead to a significant increase in the ratio of electors to councillors, making it more difficult for County Councillors adequately to represent local residents.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which were put forward last year by East Cambridgeshire District Council (9 County Councillors for East Cambridgeshire) and by Fenland District Council (10 County Councillors for Fenland).

John Candy
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Canning
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I am a resident of Hulatt Road, in Queen Edith’s Ward. Joining together these two wards would make it difficult for me to contact councillors to discuss my problems. I live in a street with multiple dead ends, with nurses from Addenbrooke's Hospital using the road to park their cars to avoid the high car parking charges at Addenbrooke's Hospital. I would have to go by taxi sometimes to visit councillor's surgeries. The driver will not be able to park near my house. Added to this inconvenience is obviously the hefty expense of having to go over to Trumpington to see a councillor. Moreover the councillors would have their work cut out with this double division which makes no sense. Queen Edith’s Ward is a suburban housing development plus the Addenbrooke's medical city with several good or very good primary and secondary schools; plus some FEIs and the HEI of Homerton College. Trumpington is very different. It has the high density Newtown part adjoining the rest of Cambridge, the Accordia development of commuter flats and the Trumpington Village which has more in common with South Cambridgeshire village communities than it does with anywhere else. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Kind Regards, Peter Canning.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
18th May 2016

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission
Millbank Tower
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

Having lived in Milton Avenue, Eaton Ford for fourteen years, we are very much opposed to the change of boundary for the Eatons to be part of the Priory/ little Paston Division.

The Eatons are very much their own community and with the opposite side of the river little Paston/Priory having no connection with this area.

We have a good number of dedicated individuals who support various organisations in the Eatons ensuring it to have its own identity.
and an excellent community spirit.

We protest at any change.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing on behalf of SE Cambs Liberal Democrats to add my support to the Cambridgeshire submission you will have received from Cllr Maurice Leeke.

I would like to draw your attention to the desirability of having single member divisions across the county and also keeping polling districts together, particularly in Ely.

Yours faithfully,

Jonathan Chatfield

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to object to the division of the Petersfield Ward as per the proposed boundary changes.

As a resident, I do not feel it is appropriate to be in the same ward as residents as far away as the airport. The local identity is Petersfield in nature, especially as we are so close to St Matthews Piece which is at the heart of the local community.

I strongly feel we should remain part of Petersfield ward and that the community should not be divided.

Sincerely,

Ben Cijffers
From: Cirstea, Silvia  
Sent: 20 June 2016 11:09  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: objection to the move of ST Matthew's neighbourhood from Petersfield Ward, Cambridge

To the Review Officer (Cambridgeshire),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of St Matthew's Gardens, Cambridge, and I have recently found out about the proposed move of our local area, St Matthew's, from the Petersfield Ward to the Abbey Ward.

Please receive my objection to this move, whose effect would be separating us from the rest of our local community, to which we feel very attached. There are regular events organised by the Petersfield Association PACT, to which St Matthew’s residents contribute actively and enthusiastically – we feel the proposed boundary change would put a dash on such worthy efforts in future and would break up our established community.

Moreover, our understanding is that currently Petersfield Ward has 1330 residents fewer than Abbey Ward, therefore the move would only add to the imbalance of number of voters between the two wards.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Silvia Cirstea,
Dear Sirs

I am appalled that having made an extremely poor job of the initial consultation and proposals for the Local Government Boundary Review for Cambridgeshire County Council, in particular the East Cambridgeshire District, that we are now in the middle of an unprecedented fourth stage of public consultation of what should have been a relatively straightforward job. The most recently published new draft recommendations are identical to your previous “final” recommendations but are still most unwelcome in a number of respects. In particular:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Reducing the number to 61, despite Cambridgeshire’s rapidly growing population, will lead to a significant increase in the ratio of electors to Councillors, making it more difficult for County Councillors adequately to represent local residents.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which were put forward last year by East Cambridgeshire District Council (9 County Councillors for East Cambridgeshire) and by Fenland District Council (10 County Councillors for Fenland).

I refer in particular to the following:

In Littleport:

Littleport, Soham and Ely are individual market towns, each with a very distinct identity, and different issues and needs. The LGBCE’s proposal splits each of the three market towns, placing parts of each of them with parts of the other market towns which have competing interests. There are no examples of coordinated events or groups between the market towns, yet each has numerous examples of these within its own community.

The ECDC proposal for Littleport keeps the market town communities together and is coterminous with the LGBCE’s draft recommendations in the East Cambs review.

The LGBCE’s proposal to split Littleport between two different Divisions is non-coterminous with the draft recommendations in the East Cambs review. It is unnecessary, unwelcome and does not reflect the clear community identity of the village of Littleport. Education, local shopping and local leisure facilities unite Littleport in a clearly identified community. Littleport Parish Council is a well-established local government unit and there is therefore a very strong case, in seeking to
reflect community identity and to secure effective and convenient local government, to create a Division based upon Littleport and the immediately adjacent areas, rather than splitting Littleport between two Divisions.

The LGBCE proposed Littleport West Division covers 13 Parish Councils, all with different identities. The proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division incorporates such a large and varied area of the district, including areas of all the market towns in the district, that all sense of individual community identity is lost.

In addition, transport links across the LGBCE’s proposed Divisions are poor, there are no overarching community groups that represent the area, the Divisions do not reflect where people go to access local services and there are no interests which bind the communities together.

The smaller Divisions proposed by ECDC meets the statutory requirement to reflect the identity and interests of local communities to a far greater degree that the large ones proposed by the LGBCE.

The LGBCE’s proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division very arbitrarily seeks to link two parts of two very different communities. Littleport and Soham are not close to each other, share no common identity, are poorly connected by road to each other and share no community facilities such as shopping areas, employment areas or schools. Both Littleport and Soham share far more identity with the City of Ely than they do with each other.

The lack of cohesive community identity in the Commission’s proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division is so severe that this breach of the statutory criteria would be unacceptably detrimental to the interests of both communities, especially considering that alternative proposals have been put forward which better satisfy the statutory criteria whilst maintaining Littleport in a single division without including any part of Soham.

In Soham:

Soham, Littleport and Ely are individual market towns, each with a very distinct identity, and different issues and needs. The LGBCE's proposal splits each of the three market towns, placing parts of each of them with parts of the other market towns which have competing interests. There are no examples of coordinated events or groups between the market towns, yet each has numerous examples of these within its own community. The ECDC proposal keeps the market town communities together.

The LGBCE proposal joins the north of Soham with a large part of Littleport, where one Councillor will be responsible for representing large areas of two market towns with different needs and interests, some of which may conflict with each other.

The ECDC proposal divides Soham into north and south (Soham has to be divided somewhere, due to the number of electors). The villages in our two proposed Divisions look to Soham. This avoids the messy LGBCE proposal of joining parts of Soham with the other two market towns of Littleport and Ely. It also retains Wicken with Soham, as requested by Wicken Parish Council.

In Littleport, Downham Villages and Sutton:

The Commission’s proposed two-member “Littleport West” Division is unworkable, unacceptable and clearly fails to meet the statutory requirements in redrawing Division boundaries. This massive proposed Division covers the parishes of Thetford, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham,
Wentworth, Witchford, Sutton, Mepal, Witcham, Coveney and Downham, together with the whole of the Littleport West District Ward and part of Ely. In 2021, this Littleport West Division is projected to have 18,649 electors, which would give it the largest electorate of any of the Commission’s 57 proposed divisions in the whole of Cambridgeshire. It is inconceivable that two members will adequately be able to represent this disparate, oversized Division, which contains so many parishes. If the Commission were to go to Thetford, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Wentworth, Witchford, Sutton or Mepal and ask local residents if they lived in or identified with “Littleport West” they would receive a unanimous “no”.

The Commission, in its own detailed guidance, states that it will not support “doughnut” electoral areas (that is, an electoral area which surrounds another electoral area) on the grounds that the far parts of the “doughnut” will tend to have far more in common, and better community connections, with the central “hole” in the doughnut than they tend to have with each other. That effect is seen starkly in this proposed division. Littleport lies north north-east of the city of Ely. Thetford and Stretham lie south south-west of Ely – 180 degrees the other side of Ely from Littleport. Other than looking towards Ely for larger shopping and some leisure facilities, the villages of Thetford and Stretham have absolutely no common interests with Littleport, share no community identity with Littleport and don’t share a road connection (other than through Ely). Alternative proposals have been put forward for electoral divisions in these areas which far better satisfy the statutory criteria.

As a resident who knows these villages well, it seems to me that the final consultation paid lip service and nothing more, totally ignoring what is best for local residents and their right to the correct representation.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Debbie Clark
I do not agree with the proposal that Sutton should be split in two. It has a strong village identity and needs to remain as a whole with just one person representing the views of the village. Otherwise it could well become a case of them and us with a very divided village for those living on the wrong side of the split.

Sharon Clarke

Sent from Windows Mail
Dear Sirs

I am appalled that having made an extremely poor job of the initial consultation and proposals for the Local Government Boundary Review for Cambridgeshire County Council, in particular the East Cambridgeshire District, that we are now in the middle of an unprecedented fourth stage of public consultation of what should have been a relatively straightforward job. The most recently published new draft recommendations are identical to your previous “final” recommendations but are still most unwelcome in a number of respects. In particular:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Reducing the number to 61, despite Cambridgeshire’s rapidly growing population, will lead to a significant increase in the ratio of electors to Councillors, making it more difficult for County Councillors adequately to represent local residents.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which were put forward last year by East Cambridgeshire District Council (9 County Councillors for East Cambridgeshire) and by Fenland District Council (10 County Councillors for Fenland).

I refer in particular to the following:

In Littleport:

Littleport, Soham and Ely are individual market towns, each with a very distinct identity, and different issues and needs. The LGBCE’s proposal splits each of the three market towns, placing parts of each of them with parts of the other market towns which have competing interests. There are no examples of coordinated events or groups between the market towns, yet each has numerous examples of these within its own community.

The ECDC proposal for Littleport keeps the market town communities together and is coterminous with the LGBCE’s draft recommendations in the East Cambs review.

The LGBCE’s proposal to split Littleport between two different Divisions is non-coterminous with the draft recommendations in the East Cambs review. It is unnecessary, unwelcome and does not reflect the clear community identity of the village of Littleport. Education, local shopping and local leisure facilities unite Littleport in a clearly identified community. Littleport Parish Council is a well-established local government unit and there is therefore a very strong case, in seeking to reflect community identity and to secure effective and convenient local government, to create a
Division based upon Littleport and the immediately adjacent areas, rather than splitting Littleport between two Divisions.

The LGBCE proposed Littleport West Division covers 13 Parish Councils, all with different identities. The proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division incorporates such a large and varied area of the district, including areas of all the market towns in the district, that all sense of individual community identity is lost.

In addition, transport links across the LGBCE’s proposed Divisions are poor, there are no overarching community groups that represent the area, the Divisions do not reflect where people go to access local services and there are no interests which bind the communities together.

The smaller Divisions proposed by ECDC meets the statutory requirement to reflect the identity and interests of local communities to a far greater degree that the large ones proposed by the LGBCE.

The LGBCE’s proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division very arbitrarily seeks to link two parts of two very different communities. Littleport and Soham are not close to each other, share no common identity, are poorly connected by road to each other and share no community facilities such as shopping areas, employment areas or schools. Both Littleport and Soham share far more identity with the City of Ely than they do with each other.

The lack of cohesive community identity in the Commission’s proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division is so severe that this breach of the statutory criteria would be unacceptably detrimental to the interests of both communities, especially considering that alternative proposals have been put forward which better satisfy the statutory criteria whilst maintaining Littleport in a single division without including any part of Soham.

In Soham:

Soham, Littleport and Ely are individual market towns, each with a very distinct identity, and different issues and needs. The LGBCE’s proposal splits each of the three market towns, placing parts of each of them with parts of the other market towns which have competing interests. There are no examples of coordinated events or groups between the market towns, yet each has numerous examples of these within its own community. The ECDC proposal keeps the market town communities together.

The LGBCE proposal joins the north of Soham with a large part of Littleport, where one Councillor will be responsible for representing large areas of two market towns with different needs and interests, some of which may conflict with each other.

The ECDC proposal divides Soham into north and south (Soham has to be divided somewhere, due to the number of electors). The villages in our two proposed Divisions look to Soham. This avoids the messy LGBCE proposal of joining parts of Soham with the other two market towns of Littleport and Ely. It also retains Wicken with Soham, as requested by Wicken Parish Council.

In Littleport, Downham Villages and Sutton:

The Commission’s proposed two-member “Littleport West” Division is unworkable, unacceptable and clearly fails to meet the statutory requirements in redrawing Division boundaries. This massive proposed Division covers the parishes of Thetford, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Wentworth, Witchford, Sutton, Mepal, Witcham, Coveney and Downham, together with the whole
of the Littleport West District Ward and part of Ely. In 2021, this Littleport West Division is projected to have 18,649 electors, which would give it the largest electorate of any of the Commission’s 57 proposed divisions in the whole of Cambridgeshire. It is inconceivable that two members will adequately be able to represent this disparate, oversized Division, which contains so many parishes. If the Commission were to go to Thetford, Stretham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Wentworth, Witchford, Sutton or Mepal and ask local residents if they lived in or identified with “Littleport West” they would receive a unanimous “no”.

The Commission, in its own detailed guidance, states that it will not support “doughnut” electoral areas (that is, an electoral area which surrounds another electoral area) on the grounds that the far parts of the “doughnut” will tend to have far more in common, and better community connections, with the central “hole” in the doughnut than they tend to have with each other. That effect is seen starkly in this proposed division. Littleport lies north north-east of the city of Ely. Thetford and Stretham lie south south-west of Ely – 180 degrees the other side of Ely from Littleport. Other than looking towards Ely for larger shopping and some leisure facilities, the villages of Thetford and Stretham have absolutely no common interests with Littleport, share no community identity with Littleport and don’t share a road connection (other than through Ely). Alternative proposals have been put forward for electoral divisions in these areas which far better satisfy the statutory criteria.

As a resident who knows these villages well, it seems to me that the final consultation paid lip service and nothing more, totally ignoring what is best for local residents and their right to the correct representation.

Yours faithfully

Mr Timothy Clark
Hello,

Eaton Ford has been part of the Eatons for 51 years and has no connection with the Priory and Paxton division which is on the other side of town, several miles away. I live in Longfellow Place, Eaton Ford and wish to remain part of the Eatons.

Regards,

E. A. Clark-Ward (Mrs.)
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Roberta Coe
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I and many of my neighbours use the facilities in the neighbouring villages of Arrington, Little Gransden, Great Gransden and especially Gamlingay. We are such a small village that we would prefer to be linked in a District of other small villages than linked to the large village (town?) of Cambourne, which has such a huge growth programme. There are so few of us that our loss to that District would be miniscule whereas the gain for us to remain within Gamlingay District is very great. I respectfully request that Longstowe Parish remains in the District of Gamlingay.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Conway Morris
E-mail: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am unclear why Trumpington should be merged with Queen Edith’s ward, the two are distinct areas of Cambridge and do not share central area, shopping, community facilities or other unifying factors. The proposed ward will have a large population and will not be easily represented by councillors. Please reconsider this ill-thought out proposal.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Alex Hinds

The proposed move of the Milton Avenue "Poets Estate" Crosshall Road and Saviles Close to the Priory Park, Little Paxton Ward beggar's belief. Geographically it is not attached, being approx 3 to 4 miles away. Eaton Ford is historically important having its own boundaries, church and a very active community spirit and identity. I understand the need for cost saving but this appears to be a "stick a pin in a map" decision.

Regards

Terry Cooper
Monday 30th May 2016

Dear Review Officer

As a resident of Eaton Ford in St.Neots for over 45 years I strongly object to the boundary change that will remove me from being part of that community and move me into The Priory and Paxton Division. I did not buy a house in the area to be segregated from that village. My children have grown up being able to walk to the local school. I married in the local church. I walk to cast my vote at the local polling station.

Quite frankly it’s a ridiculous idea, segregating a couple of streets from a village. We would be required to have a lengthy walk across town and common land to the electoral division you are proposing we become part of. I object to the fact that I will have to get into my car to cast a vote. What would have been a stroll to the polling station will become a round trip of over an hour walking and just as long crossing the one bridge in heavy traffic in a car. The councilors themselves will be hard pushed to represent their own area and a tiny part of another. These communities have different identities and different needs. Under the existing proposals Community identity will be lost.

I urge you to reconsider your proposal and apply some common sense!

Yours Faithfully

Cheryl C Cotterill
Dear Mr Buck,

Thank you for your email. I am now sending my previous email below, with a significant addition, as a formal submission of my views for the new draft recommendation.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Cox
Trustee of PACT – Petersfield Area Community Trust

Dear Ms Cox,

Further to my email in March, I can announce that we have today published our new draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council. I have attached a link below.

https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council

Should you wish us to regard your previous complaint as a formal submission of views, I would be grateful if you could notify me of this. We will then publish on our website and take it into account as we develop our final recommendations. Moreover, should you wish to provide additional views on the shape of your divisions in the future, we would welcome any further comments and alternative division patterns during this consultation.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Should you have any further questions on the review, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Buck
Review Manager
LGBCE

Dear Mr Buck,

I am a resident and active member of the local community of Petersfield ward in central Cambridge.
I am horrified to discover, along with many other local residents, that the boundaries of this small, but densely populated ward are about to be changed. This, to my knowledge, is without any consultation whatsoever with those whom it affects. This is apparently to even up the average numbers per ward in the city of Cambridge. If this is true, it is a very cynical approach and a total disregard for age-old communities.

Petersfield is composed of many streets of terraced houses built for the railway workers of the 1850’s+. Thus historically it is a close-knit community with a high population, and which continues to this very day. It does not have its own Community Centre due to lack of space for a building, and despite many people’s best efforts over the years. It does however have a City Council owned park, given to the community during the late 1800s, still registered as a community asset for community use, and which has, and continues to be used, very successfully for community events, both in summer and winter. Imagine our complete horror to discover that even that asset is now to be taken away from us without any warning at all. And we have events already planned, so what position does this put us in please?

Equally devastating is the fact that our street of local shops is to be split, so that one half will remain in Petersfield and the other half will be in the ward of Abbey, which one look at the map will tell you bears no real relation to the area of Petersfield.

The final insult which has recently emerged is the fact that the new proposals are based on the out-of-date figures of 2014, when Petersfield was shown to have 600 more voters than Abbey ward. The 2016 figures show that Petersfield now has 1,330 FEWER voters than Abbey.

These proposals drive at the very heart of a thriving, successful and close-knit community with a definite identity of its own, and I beg you please to reconsider this decision, or at the very least arrange a public meeting to come and talk with us to explain why this is happening and how we are to continue to hold community events without a space.

Thank you.

Susan Cox – Petersfield resident.
Trustee of Petersfield Area Community Trust (Registered Charity)
Dear Review Officer

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed boundary change to Petersfield Ward, Cambridge.

A sense of local community identity is partly created by ward boundaries and so it is important that they are not changed unnecessarily, or just to make numbers add up.

In this case it seems that the proposal has been based on a mistaken calculation that Petersfield has a larger electorate than Abbey whereas, according to local Labour councillors, 2016 figures show that the reverse is the case and that Abbey already has 1330 more voters than Petersfield.

Furthermore, the proposed boundary change not only moves individuals out of their traditional ward community. Key focal points for the community - including a church, a community centre for older people, the nursery school, the local park and a health centre - are all lost to Petersfield in this proposal, which will affect its identity profoundly.

Please reconsider this unnecessary and damaging proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Ursula Crook
I seriously object to the idea that you will include half our community in Abbey Ward - especially as that includes myself! I do NOT belong in Abbey Ward - it's right over the other side of Newmarket Road! I have lived here my entire life, went to primary school at St Matthews, went to youth club at the Howard Mallett (still mourned) and my sister is buried in Mill Road Cemetery - all in Petersfield Ward at present.

What do you know about our community? I don't understand how you can impose this change on so many people. Abbey is so far from me, I will feel as though I belong to no community at all! I might have to go over Newmarket Road to vote!! I *never* go in that direction, it's going away from town, the swimming pool, cinema, all the places I visit.

They tell me some idiot is making this decision on the basis of old figures!!

Please reconsider

Charlie Cubitt

Petersfield Ward
-----Original Message-----
From: Harry Cubitt  
Sent: 14 June 2016 14:00  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Petersfield Ward Cambridge, Boundary changes  

I object most strongly to the suggestion that our Petersfield Community be broken in half. Particularly that parts of the St Matthews area go to Abbey - which is the other side of Newmarket Road, that road is a wide one, like a rushing river in terms of feeling part of our community: please ask a wise person (not the dictionary) to define "community" for you: we feel particularly like Petersfield group especially because of our local group "Petersfield Area Community Trust", which has been operating locally for many years, and has helped to organise us all against threats to loss of community resources in the past. We also have the "Friends of Mill Road Cemetery" which cares for our very valued local wild space.

I understand also that the decision has been made on the basis of outdated figures! I feel it would be a criminal act. OK, maybe not actually illegal, but it should be.

Please don't do this.

Henrietta Cubitt
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Angela Curtis
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Apart from the proposed Divisions of Chatteris, Wisbech West and Wisbech East, which I do support, I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically: 1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Reducing the number to 61, despite Cambridgeshire's rapidly growing population, will lead to a significant increase in the ratio of electors to councillors, making it more difficult for County Councillors adequately to represent local residents. 2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor. 3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which were put forward last year by East Cambridgeshire District Council (9 County Councillors for East Cambridgeshire) and by Fenland District Council (10 County Councillors for Fenland). The Commission's proposed "Littleport East and Soham North" Division very arbitrarily seeks to link two parts of two very different communities. Littleport and Soham are not close to each other, share no common identity, are poorly connected by road to each other and share no community facilities such as shopping areas, employment areas or schools. Both Littleport and Soham share far more identity with the City of Ely than they do with each other. Whilst the projected electoral numbers for 2021 make it practically impossible to avoid splitting Soham between divisions, the same is not true for Littleport. The lack of cohesive community identity in the Commission's proposed Littleport East and Soham North Division is so severe that this breach of the statutory criteria would be unacceptably detrimental to the interests of both communities, especially considering that alternative proposals have been put forward which better satisfy the statutory criteria whilst maintaining Littleport in a single division without including any part of Soham. Furthermore, I used to represent Warboys and Bury Ward as a District Councillor before moving here - whilst I can see the logic of including Bury with Ramsey, the plan to merge the Alconburies and Stukeleys makes no sense whatsoever - the two areas are totally separate from each other in every way. The communities do not communicate or have any common ground - and the transport issues and links for both are very different to each other.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded