

## **Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's new draft recommendations for Cambridge District**

Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group finds broadly acceptable most of the new draft recommendations produced by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 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.

The Labour Group fully supports the proposals for the following divisions: Cherry Hinton, Chesterton, King's Hedges, and Newnham. While we are pleased that the LGBCE has removed proposals to join together Castle and Newnham into a dual-member division, we continue 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. 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 first consultation, 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.

We remain opposed to the proposal creating a dual-member division in Trumpington & Queen Edith's. We surmise that the LGBCE's draft proposals stem from concerns about housing growth proposals in Trumpington. But we believe these concerns could be adequately addressed and adequate numerical equality achieved by keeping Queen Edith's separate from Trumpington. 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.

We believe the dual-member seat would be both objectionable in principle and unwieldy in practice because it would unite two distinct and identifiable communities whose centres lie at significant geographical distance from each other. 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

## **Response to the New Draft Recommendations**

### **for South Cambridgeshire**

1. Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group partially supports the new draft recommendations for county council boundaries in Cambridgeshire. We accept the LGBCE's proposals for the Bar Hill; Cottenham & Willingham; Fulbourn; Histon & Impington; Linton; Longstanton, Northstowe & Over and Waterbeach divisions.
2. However, we do not believe that the recommendations effectively represent local identities or provide for convenient and effective local government around Cambourne, Sawston or Shelford and we therefore propose a number of changes to the new draft recommendations in the south and west of the district.
3. We continue to be opposed to two-member divisions in principle and we refer the LGBCE to our previous submissions as well as to those made by other political groups. However, even if we leave aside these principled objections, there are strong practical reasons to oppose the LGBCE's proposed boundaries for the Sawston & Shelford division.
4. The three parishes of Great Shelford, Little Shelford and Stapleford form a single contiguous settlement commonly referred to as Shelford or The Shelfords. These communities have many shared services, such as Stapleford Community Primary School, Great and Little Shelford Primary School, Shelford Medical Practice and Shelford railway station. All three parishes are in close proximity to Cambridge and will be affected by new housing developments to the south of Addenbrooke's Hospital.
5. In contrast, the parish of Sawston is an entirely separate settlement several miles further down the A1301. Children there attend Ickniel and Bellfield Primary schools and residents access GP services from Sawston Medical Practice. Although many people in the village commute to Cambridge, they are not affected in the same way by the expansion of the city as Shelford is.
6. Moreover, the Sawston & Shelford division separates Sawston from the village of Pampisford. Only a short stretch of open land divides the main areas of the two villages from one another and areas that are geographically in the south of Sawston are actually within the parish of Pampisford for local government purposes. Children in Pampisford attend Bellbird Primary School and residents access GP services from Sawston Medical Practice. We

therefore think it is clear that Sawston and Shelford should be in different divisions and that Sawston should be in a division with Pampisford.

7. We hence propose that the Sawston division should be made up of the parishes of Sawston, Babraham, Pampisford, Hinxton and Whittlesford. Key shared interests affecting this division include the busy A505 road that runs through it, Sawston Village College, whose catchment area covers all parishes in the division, Sawston Medical Practice and the train stations at Sawston and Whittlesford Parkway. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of -5%.
8. We also propose a single-member Shelford division made up of the parishes of Great Shelford, Little Shelford, Stapleford, Harston, Hauxton and Newton. The shared interests of the first three parishes have already been enumerated. The other three parishes sit on the other side of the M11 from Shelford and share many services, such as Harston Surgery, Harston & Newton Community Primary School and Hauxton Primary School. Like Shelford, they are directly affected by new developments in the south of Cambridge, which are increasing pressure upon the A10 and by new developments in Hauxton itself. The division would have a strong boundary in the west along the River Rhee. This division would be co-extensive with the district wards of The Shelfords & Stapleford and Harston & Hauxton and this would provide for convenient and effective local government. By 2021, this would have an electoral variance of 0%.
9. Accordingly, we propose that the Duxford division should lose the parishes of Pampisford, Hinxton, Whittlesford, Foxton and Shepreth and gain the parish of Melbourn. This ward would unify villages which depend upon good access to the M11, A10 and A505 roads and would bear a closer similarity to the current Duxford division than is found in the new draft recommendations. By 2021, the division would have an electoral variance of -4%.
10. The movement of the parish of Melbourn necessitates further changes to ensure electoral equality, but this should not be viewed as a problem, since it would allow for the creation of a new division representing communities in the central south of the district which under the new draft recommendations are divided from one another on largely arbitrary grounds. Accordingly, we propose a new Meldreth & Haslingfield division, made up of the parishes of Meldreth, Shepreth, Foxton, Orwell, Barrington, Wimpole, Great Eversden, Little Eversden, Harlton and Haslingfield. This division would unite communities along the River Rhee who are served by the A10 and the mainline railway to King's Cross. It would contain the entire

district wards of Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Orwell & Barrington and Meldreth. By 2021, it would have an electoral variance of -7%.

11. We then propose a Gamlingay & Bassingbourn division made up of the parishes of Gamlingay, Hatley, Arrington, Croydon, Tadlow, Shingay-cum-Wendy, Abington Pigotts, Guilden Morden, Steeple Morden, Litlington, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth and Whaddon. Whereas the Gamlingay division proposed by the new draft recommendations extends a long arm towards Cambridge, our proposals would create a cohesive division covering areas to the west of Ermine Street which are served by Bassingbourn Village College and Gamlingay Village College. Whereas in most of South Cambridgeshire Cambridge serves as the predominant urban centre, in these parts of the district Royston and Biggleswade are important local centres and there are close connections across county boundaries with Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. Our proposals recognise this distinct set of interests. Moreover, the division would contain the entirety of the district wards of Bassingbourn and The Mordens, as well as the greater part of the district ward of Gamlingay. By 2021, it would have an electoral variance of 5%.
12. We cannot support the LGBCE's proposed Cambourne division. Longstowe and Little Gransden do not look towards Cambourne and it seems that they were added primarily because of the representations of villages closer to Cambourne which objected to being included in the same division as it. Such objections are not illogical, since Cambourne is a large and growing purpose-built settlement, built at relatively high densities and largely populated by those working in (and in many cases originally from) Cambridge. Its interests are rather different to those of the much older and small villages surrounding it and it would be reasonable for such villages to feel that their interests might be overlooked in favour of those of their more populous neighbour.
13. Moreover, Cambourne is expanding beyond the current parish boundaries. Cambourne Parish Council is seeking to have the development of Cambourne West, in the north of the parish of Caxton, added to Cambourne and it has received conditional support for this from Caxton Parish Council. Whilst Caxton Parish Council expressed a wish not to be in the same division as Cambourne, it is surely clear that this should be read as referring only to the village core of Caxton and not to a new development that the parish council themselves believe should be part of Cambourne.

14. We therefore propose a Cambourne division made up of the parish of Cambourne and that part of the parish of Caxton north and east of the A1198. This would be a compact, cohesive division serving the distinct community of Cambourne. By 2021, it would have an electoral variance of -5%.
15. Accordingly, we propose minor modifications to the LGBCE's proposed Hardwick division. We believe that it should lose the parishes of Great Eversden, Little Eversden and Harlton, which should be placed with Haslingfield, as is already the case at a district level. It should in turn gain the parish of Bourn. This would create a cohesive division of villages along the A428 and B1046 roads, all of which are served by Comberton Village College and by local bus services including Stagecoach's 18 and Whippet's 1, 2 and 3 services. By 2021, the division would have an electoral variance of 3%.
16. Finally, we propose minor changes to the LGBCE's proposed Papworth & Swavesey division. Clearly, it makes sense to have a division taking in rural areas in the west of the district. However, as mentioned above we believe that the Cambourne West development within Caxton parish should be removed and that the parishes of Longstowe and Little Gransden should be added in their place. By 2021, our proposed division would have an electoral variance of -10%.
17. Our proposals deliver superior electoral equality relative to the new draft recommendations. Both of our plans create a division with a -10% electoral variance, but whereas the LGBCE proposals for South Cambridgeshire have a division with a -8% variance, our next worst variance is -7% and all other divisions have a variance of 5% or less. Moreover, our proposals improve co-terminosity. Whereas the new draft recommendations split 12 out of 34 wards, our proposals split only 9 out of 34 wards and hence serve to promote convenient and effective local government.

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:

### **1. Arbury and Castle**

We propose that the area to the west of Histon Road known as the McManus Estate 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 McManus Estate has always remained within the Castle division and identifies more with the community residing around the Mayfield Primary School than with the Arbury community to the east of Histon Road.

### **2. Abbey, Petersfield, and Market**

We do not support the suggestion that the boundary between Abbey and Petersfield should run along St Matthew's Street and Norfolk Street before bisecting Sturton Street. This proposal does not enjoy community support and it is rightly opposed by the Petersfield Area Community Trust because it would divide clear community identity in the St Matthew's area. Although a boundary once existed there, social and demographic change now means that the proposed boundary cannot adequately respect community identity. The new draft recommendation does not provide an obvious boundary. For instance, it splits Gwydir Street from Upper Gwydir Street.

We propose that the following streets only should be moved from Petersfield to Abbey: St Matthew's Gardens, the section of York Street north of the junction with St Matthew's Gardens, the entirety of New Street, and the eastern side of East Road including Parker's Terrace. The following streets would remain, in their entirety, in Petersfield: Young Street, Petworth Street, Geldart Street, St Matthew's Court, Vicarage Terrace, Edward Street, St Matthew's Street, Norfolk Street, Upper Gwydir Street, and Sturton Street. This would create an obvious boundary, recognisable by the local community, across St Matthew's Piece. As a new development, the community within St Matthew's Gardens identifies less with the traditional nineteenth-century housing on the other side of the Piece than with similar new developments off New Street and Newmarket Road.

We also propose that the western boundary of the Abbey division be extended over the Elizabeth Way bridge into the Riverside development, taking in Kingsley Walk and Walnut Tree Avenue. Abbey should also gain Evening Court and the northern side of Newmarket Road as far as the junction with Evening Court. This area shares a community identity with the Riverside area on the other side of the roundabout and both areas back onto the River Cam with a riverside path connecting them to Midsummer Common which runs beneath the underpass beneath Elizabeth Way. They also share access onto Newmarket Road. As a new development, this area identifies less with the traditional nineteenth-century housing in the Brunswick area than with similar new developments off Newmarket Road. In creating a single-member seat in Chesterton, the LGBCE has agreed that Elizabeth Way does not need to serve as a boundary north of the river. Equally, Elizabeth Way should not serve as a boundary south of the river. We believe this alternative proposal would maintain numerical

equality of representation in Abbey, Market, and Petersfield while better respecting community identities across the three divisions.

We are, further, concerned that the LGBCE's assumptions for population growth in Abbey are mistaken. The estimates in the City Council's Local Plan submission and Annual Monitoring Report for 2013 show that there will be 67 new dwellings in Abbey between 2014 and 2021. The City Council identified four sites for future housing expansion in Abbey. The application 15/1020 has seen its permission expired and is now being resubmitted; the application 11/0219 will contain 75 dwellings and not 30 swellings because the City Council has only counted the social housing element of the scheme; the application 12/0628 is now completed with 13 dwellings; and the application for 64-66 Peverel Road for 10 dwellings was not constructed and the site is not identified in the local plan as a development site. The estimates are therefore out of date and inaccurate and drastically underestimate population growth in Abbey.

A total of 757 units of accommodation are recently occupied, under construction or with planning permission but the information takes no account of major housing trends in Abbey.

1. The continuing extensive redevelopment of former industrial land between New Street and Newmarket Road that has resulted in two further schemes being constructed and occupied in the last two years at 71-75 New Street (13/0901 – now occupied) and 132-136 Newmarket Road (13/1139 – under construction)
2. The public/private house building scheme for Cambridge agreed by the Homes and Communities Agency with several sites in Abbey all completed in the last two years in Barnwell Road, Latimer Close, Stansfield Road, and Wadloes Road with one further site currently under construction in Ekin Road.
3. The growth in dedicated student housing blocks with two major schemes agreed in Abbey for two sites totalling 523 student rooms.

In terms of housing completions, the end-of-year figures are as follows, amounting to 104 dwellings: 31/3/13 – 23 dwellings; 31/4/14 – 15 dwellings; and 31/3/15 – 66 dwellings.

In terms of housing under construction, unfortunately the completions for 31/3/16 are not yet available but schemes under construction as supplied by the Housing Policy service at the City Council are as of 31/3/15:

<b>Case</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Under construction</b>	<b>As at date</b>
C/00219/11	9-15 Harvest Way	75	31/03/2015
C/00308/14	249 Newmarket Road	7	31/03/2015
C/00466/14	4, Sunnyside	6	31/03/2015
C/00713/14	Ditton Fields Nursery School, Wadloes Road	9	31/03/2015
C/00887/14	11-45, Ekin Road	6	31/03/2015
C/01139/13	132-136, Newmarket Road	13	31/03/2015
C/0901/13	71-75, New Street	14	31/03/2015
	Total units under construction as of 31/3/15	130	

In terms of new planning permission, in addition to the above during the 2014 and 2015 the City Council received two major applications for student development in Abbey:

1. The application 14/1154 at West Garage, 217 Newmarket Road, for the erection of 202 new student rooms. This application was refused by the City Council but allowed on appeal.
2. The application 15/0398 at 8, 10, and 10a Cheddars Lane and 351-355 Newmarket Road for the erection of 321 student rooms following the demolition of industrial buildings. This scheme was passed by the City Council's Planning Committee on 5 August 2015 but the decision notice has not yet been issued because the Section 106 agreement accompanying the permission has not been finally agreed with the consortium of land owners.

### **3. Petersfield and Trumpington**

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. Our proposed boundary would better preserve the principle of electoral equality because it would allow a viable single-member Trumpington division while keeping Petersfield within the required variance. 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.

### **4. Market and Trumpington**

We propose that the north side of Lensfield Road should be placed within the Market division. This side of the road is almost entirely housing for students at Downing College, which remains in Market, and students identify more with the community within Market than with Trumpington. The back gardens of the houses on Lensfield Road also enjoy open access to the grounds of Downing College, rendering any electoral boundary there largely meaningless.

### **5. 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.

Cllr Ashley Walsh

Leader of the Labour Group, on behalf of the Labour Group

**Response to the New Draft Recommendations  
for East Cambridgeshire**

1. Cambridge County Council Labour Group does not support the new draft recommendations for county council boundaries in East Cambridgeshire. We propose relatively minor changes in Ely and to the Woodditton division and more substantial changes elsewhere in order to secure a pattern of uniform single-member divisions that reflect community identities.
2. The new draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire are woefully unsatisfactory and it is hardly surprising that they were criticised by all respondents during the consultation of the draft recommendations. For reasons of space, we do not intend to repeat all these criticisms (although they continue to remain valid) and will confine ourselves to summarising the most egregious shortcomings of the proposed arrangements.
3. Despite the fact that Littleport is the right size for a single-member division, the new draft recommendations divide the town down the middle. The western half is placed in a sprawling two-member division taking in 13 parishes, combining communities with no clear identity. Road connections are poor, public transport links are non-existent, there is no resemblance between the division's boundaries and school catchment areas and the proposed division has been roundly condemned by most parish councils in the area. The division does not reflect local identities and its sprawling, unwieldy nature will not provide for convenient and effective local government.
4. The eastern half of Littleport is combined with the northern half of Soham, despite the lack of links between these two settlements. Transport connections between them are poor (and anybody travelling from one settlement to the other would use the A10 and A142, rather than the back roads contained in this division) and no bus service connects them. Children in Littleport attend Ely College, whereas in Soham they attend Soham Village College. This division was roundly criticised during the consultation of the draft recommendations and it is not credible for the LGBCE to call for more evidence. Evidence has been provided that the proposed arrangements for Littleport and Soham are not acceptable to local opinion and they should be modified accordingly.
5. The southern half of Soham is combined with rural areas to its south and east in a two-member division the LGBCE proposed to call 'Fordham Villages and Soham South'. The name

is puzzling, since settlements such as Burwell and Swaffham Prior cannot by any reasonable standard be considered to be Fordham Villages, but more than that the division is simply unnecessary. As we will demonstrate, a pattern of uniform single-member divisions can provide for smaller, more cohesive divisions which better reflect the statutory criteria.

6. Having reiterated our criticisms of the new draft recommendations, we now turn to explain the logic underlying our proposals. We begin by noting the natural divisions within East Cambridgeshire. The district of East Cambridgeshire was formed in 1974 from the merger of the Ely Urban District (covering the city of Ely), the Ely Rural District (covering the other parishes to the west of the Great Ouse) and the Newmarket Rural District (covering the parishes to the east of the Great Ouse). These still to some extent represent different interests within the district.
7. The city of Ely serves as the administrative hub of the district. It has grown rapidly in recent years and further growth is taking place in new developments in the north of the city.
8. The other parishes to the west of the Great Ouse are more rural. Agriculture is an important employer. Residents access some services within Ely, but many others are provided within specific villages (e. g. Witchford Village College) and residents also look to towns outside the district such as St. Ives, Chatteris and Cambridge. Within this area, Littleport forms a distinct sub-region, as a historic river-port which is considerably larger than the others parishes in the old Ely Rural District.
9. To the east of the Great Ouse, the largest town is Soham but Newmarket (situated just outside the district's boundaries) is also an important influence. In this area the horse-racing industry has historically been significant and continues to be a significant local employer.
10. At present, no ward in East Cambridgeshire contains parts of two of these regions, nor do the LGBCE's draft recommendations for new ward boundaries in East Cambridgeshire propose that this should change. However, the distribution of electorate within the district means that it will be necessary for at least one division to contain parts of two of these regions.
11. We note that the city of Ely has almost a quarter of the total electorate of East Cambridgeshire and accordingly we consider that it should be assigned two councillors and only two councillors. We believe that Chettisham, Prickwillow, Queen Adelaide and Stuntney are integral parts of Ely and should therefore be placed in divisions centred on Ely.

12. Accordingly, we propose that the **Ely North** division should be comprised of the present Ely North ward (including Chettisham), along with Prickwillow, Queen Adelaide and the HK1 polling district from Ely East. This pays due heed to existing political boundaries and would create a strong boundary along the High Street and Fore Hill. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of 6%.
13. The **Ely South** division would then be comprised of the Ely South and Ely West district wards, together with Stuntney and the HG1 and HH1 polling districts from Ely East. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of 3%.
14. We propose that the parish of **Littleport** should form a single-member division, as is presently the case. It is not necessary to divide Littleport and doing so serves no benefit, so it should not be done. Nor is there any advantage to be had in adding parts of other parishes to Littleport. A key theme of this representation is that parishes should not be split unless necessary and that when they must be split they should be split into as few parts as possible. A unified Littleport division (which would also be co-terminous with the current district wards of Littleport East and Littleport West and with the Littleport Ward the LGBCE are proposing in their draft recommendations for East Cambridgeshire) serves those ends admirably. It would also respect the catchment areas of Millfield Primary School and Littleport Community Primary School. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of -9%.
15. We propose that there should be a **Sutton** division, as at present. In addition to the parishes of Coveney; Downham; Mepal; Sutton and Witcham, which are presently in the division, we believe it should include the parishes of Thetford, Wentworth and Witchford. These parishes are well-connected to the rest of the division via the A142. Children here attend Rackham Primary School, as do children in Coveney. Residents throughout the division make use of Priors Field Surgery in Sutton and are served by Stagecoach's 9 bus service. There is thus clear evidence of shared interests and identities. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of 10%.
16. It is then necessary to have a division taking in areas to both the east and the west of the Great Ouse. Such a division must have strong and should therefore follow the A1123, the only major east-west link in the district which does not pass through Ely. We propose there should be a **Soham South and Haddenham** division, made up of the parishes of Haddenham, Stretham, Wicken, Wilburton and parts of the town of Soham. Within Soham we believe it

should take the LG2 polling district (covering the south of the town), together with around 1100 electors from the LG1 polling district. We believe that it would be possible to acquire these solely from areas south of Soham Lode, creating a strong and obvious boundary on the ground. If this is not the case, then the necessary electors could instead be acquired by placing the LGBCE's proposed Soham Central parish ward in this division. The rest of Soham should be placed in a **Soham North** division, along with the parishes of Chippenham and Isleham.

17. This would then allow for a **Burwell & Fordham** division, comprised of the parishes of Burwell; Fordham; Kennett; Reach; Snailwell and Swaffham Prior. This division would be based upon small and medium-sized villages which look to Newmarket for many services and are particularly affected by the busy A14 and A142 roads. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of 6%.
18. Finally, we suggest that the LGBCE's proposed **Woodditton** division should gain Swaffham Bulbeck in order to improve electoral equality elsewhere in the district. Swaffham Bulbeck has good connections to Lode and Bottisham via Stagecoach's 10 bus service and adding it to the division creates a continuous road link between Bottisham and eastern parts of the division. By 2021, this division would have an electoral variance of 7%.
19. This proposal has demonstrated that two-member divisions are not necessary in East Cambridgeshire and has also eliminated unnecessary splitting of parishes. Whereas the new draft recommendations divide Ely between three divisions, in this proposal the entire city is contained within only two divisions, and whereas the new draft recommendations split Littleport, in this proposal the village is united. These proposals pay greater heed to community identity and will serve to ensure convenient and effective local government and on that basis we commend them to the LGBCE.

<u>Sawston</u>	Polling District	Parish	District Ward	New Draft Recommendations	2014	2021		
	YE1	SAWSTON	Sawston	SAWSTON	Sawston & Shelford	5519	5970	
	YC1	BABRAHAM	Babraham	THE ABINGTONS	Sawston & Shelford	198	200	
	YD1	PAMPISFORD	Pampisford	THE ABINGTONS	Duxford	270	270	
	WE1	HINXTON	Hinxton	THE ABINGTONS	Duxford	260	260	
	WH1	WHITTLESFORD	Whittlesford	WHITTLESFORD	Duxford	1249	1240	
	WH2	WHITTLESFORD SOUTH	Whittlesford	DUXFORD	Duxford	159	160	8100 0.947701
<u>Shelford</u>								
	TA1	HARSTON	Harston	HARSTON AND HAU	Sawston & Shelford	1381	1380	
	TB1	HAUXTON	Hauxton	HARSTON AND HAU	Sawston & Shelford	590	1100	
	TC1	NEWTON	Newton (S)	THE SHELFORDS AI	Sawston & Shelford	302	300	
	TD1	GREAT SHELFORD	Great Shelford	THE SHELFORDS AI	Sawston & Shelford	3409	3440	
	TE1	LITTLE SHELFORD	Little Shelford	THE SHELFORDS AI	Sawston & Shelford	664	660	
	TF1	STAPLEFORD	Stapleford	THE SHELFORDS AI	Sawston & Shelford	1518	1660	8540 0.999181
<u>Duxford</u>								
	WB1	DUXFORD	Duxford	DUXFORD	Duxford	1493	1480	
	WC1	FOWLMERE	Fowlmere	FOWLMERE AND FC	Duxford	931	920	
	WF1	ICKLETON	Ickleton	DUXFORD	Duxford	522	520	
	WG1	THRILOW VILLAGE	Thriplow	WHITTLESFORD	Duxford	398	390	
	WG2	THRILOW HEATHFIELD	Thriplow	WHITTLESFORD	Duxford	490	490	
	WA1	GREAT CHISHILL	Great and Little Chish	MELBOURN	Duxford	489	500	
	WA2	LITTLE CHISHILL	Great and Little Chish	MELBOURN	Duxford	48	50	
	WD1	HEYDON	Heydon	MELBOURN	Duxford	187	190	
	XJ1	MELBOURN	Melbourn	MELBOURN	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	3626	3690	8230 0.962911
<u>Meldreth &amp; Haslingfield</u>								
	XF1	FOXTON	Foxton	FOWLMERE AND FC	Duxford	979	1000	
	XK1	MELDRETH	Meldreth	MELDRETH	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1484	1510	
	XM1	SHEPRETH	Shepreth	MELDRETH	Duxford	655	670	
	XL1	ORWELL	Orwell	ORWELL AND BARR	Gamlingay	861	860	
	XB1	BARRINGTON	Barrington	ORWELL AND BARR	Gamlingay	824	820	
	XO1	WIMPOLE	Wimpole	ORWELL AND BARR	Gamlingay	239	240	
	XD1	GREAT EVERS DEN	Great Eversden	HASLINGFIELD AND	Hardwick	174	170	
	XE1	LITTLE EVERS DEN	Little Eversden	HASLINGFIELD AND	Hardwick	469	470	
	PF1	HARLTON	Harlton	HASLINGFIELD AND	Hardwick	239	240	
	PG1	HASLINGFIELD	Haslingfield	HASLINGFIELD AND	Sawston & Shelford	1229	1980	7960 0.931321
<u>Gamlingay &amp; Bassingbourn</u>								
	VA1	ABINGTON PIGOTTS	Abington Pigotts	THE MORDENS	Gamlingay	117	120	
	VB1	BASSINGBOURN	Bassingbourn cum Kr	BASSINGBOURN	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	2368	2320	
	VE1	LITLINGTON	Litlington	BASSINGBOURN	Gamlingay	679	670	
	VF1	GULDEN MORDEN	Guilden Morden	THE MORDENS	Gamlingay	775	760	
	VG1	STEEPLE MORDEN	Steeple Morden	THE MORDENS	Gamlingay	869	850	
	VH1	SHINGAY-CUM-WENDY	Shingay cum Wendy	BASSINGBOURN	Gamlingay	88	90	
	VI1	TADLOW	Tadlow	THE MORDENS	Gamlingay	160	160	
	XN1	WHADDON	Whaddon	BASSINGBOURN	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	358	350	
	VC1	GAMLINGAY	Gamlingay	GAMLINGAY	Gamlingay	2788	2980	
	VD1	HATLEY	Hatley	GAMLINGAY	Gamlingay	169	170	
	XA1	ARRINGTON	Arrington	GAMLINGAY	Gamlingay	325	330	
	XC1	CROYDON	Croydon	GAMLINGAY	Gamlingay	176	180	8980 1.050661
<u>Cambourne</u>								
	NP1	CAMBOURNE	Cambourne	BOURN	Cambourne	6094	6590	

<u>Hardwick</u>	ND1	CAMBOURNE WEST	Caxton	BOURN	Papworth & Swavesey	0	1490	8080 0.945361
	NA1	BOURN	Bourn	BOURN	Cambourne	752	750	
	PA1	BARTON	Barton	BARTON	Hardwick	689	710	
	PB1	COMBERTON	Comberton	COMBERTON	Hardwick	1852	1900	
	PC1	COTON	Coton	BARTON	Hardwick	694	710	
	PD1	GRANTCHESTER	Grantchester	BARTON	Hardwick	438	450	
	PE1	HARDWICK	Hardwick	HARDWICK	Hardwick	2049	2100	
	PH1	TOFT	Toft	CALDECOTE	Hardwick	472	480	
	QF1	MADINGLEY	Madingley	BARTON	Hardwick	158	160	
	NC1	CALDECOTE	Caldecote	CALDECOTE	Hardwick	1294	1330	
XH1	KINGSTON	Kingston	CALDECOTE	Hardwick	190	200	8790 1.028431	
<u>Papworth &amp; Swavesey</u>								
	NB1	BOXWORTH	Boxworth	BAR HILL	Papworth & Swavesey	185	190	
	ND1	CAXTON	Caxton	BOURN	Papworth & Swavesey	432	430	
	NL2	CHILDERLEY	Childerley	CALDECOTE	Papworth & Swavesey	20	20	
	XG1	LITTLE GRANSDEN	Little Gransden	GAMLINGAY	Cambourne	223	220	
	XI1	LONGSTOWE	Longstowe	GAMLINGAY	Cambourne	155	160	
	NE1	CONINGTON	Conington (S)	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	117	120	
	NF1	CROXTON	Croxton	BOURN	Papworth & Swavesey	124	120	
	NG1	ELSWORTH	Elsworth	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	542	540	
	NH1	ELTISLEY	Eltisley	BOURN	Papworth & Swavesey	318	320	
	NI1	FEN DRAYTON	Fen Drayton	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	690	690	
	NJ1	GRAVELEY	Graveley	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	182	180	
	NK1	KNAPWELL	Knapwell	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	70	70	
	NM1	PAPWORTH EVERARD	Papworth Everard	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	2358	2690	
	NN1	PAPWORTH ST. AGNES	Papworth St Agnes	PAPWORTH AND EL	Papworth & Swavesey	49	50	
	NO1	SWAVESEY	Swavesey	SWAVESEY	Papworth & Swavesey	1923	1920	7720 0.903241

Parish	2014 electorate	Entitlement	2020 electorate	Entitlement
<b>Woodditton</b>				
Ashley	485	0.061775963	490	0.057328629
Bottisham	1810	0.230545348	1980	0.231654459
Brinkley	296	0.037702444	300	0.03509916
Burrough Green	307	0.039103548	310	0.036269132
Cheveley	1593	0.202905381	1710	0.200065214
Dullingham	584	0.074385902	580	0.067858377
Kirtling	279	0.035537101	280	0.032759216
Lode	736	0.093746617	740	0.086577929
Stetchworth	517	0.065851903	520	0.060838545
Swaffham Bulbeck	653	0.083174648	650	0.076048181
Westley Waterlees	121	0.015412148	120	0.014039664
Woodditton	1380	0.175774906	1430	0.167305998
	8761	1.115915908	9110	1.065844504
<b>Burwell &amp; Fordham</b>				
Burwell	4959	0.631643304	5430	0.635294803
Fordham	2125	0.270667881	2270	0.265583647
Kennett	291	0.037065578	290	0.033929188
Reach	289	0.036810832	290	0.033929188
Snailwell	139	0.017704864	140	0.016379608
Swaffham Prior	624	0.079480827	650	0.076048181
	8427	1.073373286	9070	1.061164616
<b>Soham North</b>				
Chippenham	370	0.047128055	370	0.043288964
Isleham	1883	0.239843586	1960	0.229314515
Soham (South LG1)	3017	0.384284704	3680	0.430549701
Soham (North)	4290	0.546430687	4290	0.501917994
	9560	1.217687032	10300	1.205071173 Less around 1100 electors from LG1
<b>Soham South &amp; Witchford</b>				
Haddenham	2656	0.338303008	2740	0.320572332
Stretham	1432	0.182398308	1520	0.177835746
Wicken	668	0.085085244	670	0.078388125
Wilburton	1150	0.146479089	1150	0.134546782
Soham (South LG2)	1507	0.191951293	2100	0.267483553
	7413	0.944216942	8180	0.978826537 Plus around 1100 electors from LG1
<b>Sutton</b>				
Coveney	339	0.043179488	340	0.039779048
Downham (South)	2088	0.265955076	2100	0.245694123
Mepal	797	0.101516377	800	0.093597761
Sutton	3121	0.397531509	3180	0.3720511
Thetford	556	0.070819455	560	0.065518433
Wentworth	142	0.018086983	140	0.016379608
Witcham	354	0.045090085	360	0.042118992
Witchford	1879	0.239334093	1900	0.222294682
	9276	1.181513065	9380	1.097433748

**Littleport**

Littleport	6657	0.847922863	7740	0.905558338
	6657	0.847922863	7740	0.905558338

**Ely North**

Ely (Chettisham)	132	0.016813252	130	0.015209636
Ely (Prickwillow)	408	0.051968233	410	0.047968853
Ely (Queen Adelaide)	195	0.024837758	200	0.02339944
Ely (East HK1)	953	0.121386584	950	0.111147341
Ely (North HF1)	3717	0.473445889	3850	0.450439225
Ely (North HF2)	1570	0.199975799	3490	0.408320233
	6975	0.888427515	9030	1.056484728

**Ely South**

Ely (Stuntney)	206	0.026238863	210	0.024569412
Ely (East HG1)	674	0.085849483	670	0.078388125
Ely (East HH1)	762	0.097058318	1270	0.148586446
Ely (South)	3582	0.456250517	3510	0.410660177
Ely (West)	3237	0.412306791	3180	0.3720511
	8461	1.077703972	8840	1.03425526