

Final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for East Cambridgeshire District Council

Electoral review

September 2016

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Summary | 1 |
| 1 Introduction | 2 |
| 2 Analysis and final recommendations | 4 |
| Submissions received | 4 |
| Electorate figures | 5 |
| Council size | 5 |
| Warding patterns | 5 |
| Draft recommendations | 6 |
| Final recommendations | 6 |
| Detailed wards | 8 |
| North | 9 |
| Central | 12 |
| South | 13 |
| Conclusions | 15 |
| Parish electoral arrangements | 15 |
| 3 What happens next? | 17 |
| | |
| Appendices | |
| A Table A1: Final recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council | 18 |
| B Submissions received | 20 |
| C Glossary and abbreviations | 21 |

Summary

Who we are

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

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

Electoral review

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

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

Why East Cambridgeshire?

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

Our proposals for East Cambridgeshire

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

Electoral arrangements

As East Cambridgeshire District Council is elected by whole-council elections, the Commission can produce a pattern of mixed wards. Our draft recommendations therefore propose that the Council's 28 councillors should represent two single-member, ten two-member and two three-member wards. One of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for East Cambridgeshire by 2021.

We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements in East Cambridgeshire.

1 Introduction

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

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

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

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

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting a submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the district. The submissions received during our consultation have informed our final recommendations. This review was conducted as follows:

| Stage starts | Description |
|---------------------|---|
| 23 June 2015 | Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE |
| 1 September 2015 | LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations |
| 17 November 2015 | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation |
| 12 January 2016 | Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations |
| 6 September 2016 | Publication of final recommendations |

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

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

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

| | 2016 | 2021 |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Electorate of East Cambridgeshire District | 65,530 | 71,650 |
| Number of councillors | 28 | 28 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 2,340 | 2,559 |

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

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

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

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices, by appointment, and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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

Electorate figures

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

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

Council size

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

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

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

19 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received one comment on council size, supporting the proposed reduction. On this basis, we have put forward final recommendations based on a council size of 28 members.

Warding patterns

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

21 The scheme put forward by the Council provided for good electoral equality across the district, apart from their proposed two-member Sutton ward, which had an electoral variance of 12.5%. We did not consider that persuasive evidence was received to warrant a ward with such a high variance and we therefore proposed to move away from the Council's proposals in this area.

22 Our draft recommendations were for three single-member, eight two-member and three three-member wards, largely based on the proposals put forward by the Council. We considered that our draft recommendations provided for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

Draft recommendations

23 We received 23 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations including submissions from East Cambridgeshire District Council, eight parish and town councils, and 14 local residents. Eleven of these submissions related to the Carey Close and Kings Avenue area of Ely.

Final recommendations

Ely

24 We received 13 submissions relating to Ely. One submission, from City of Ely Council, referred to the parish wards in Ely, and requested that the more rural parish wards be abolished. However, due to the division arrangements for Cambridgeshire, along with the proposed warding pattern in East Cambridgeshire, legislation states that it is necessary for parish wards to be created here. We are not able to put forward consequential parish warding arrangements which do not reflect the boundaries of both district wards and county electoral divisions. We received one submission that put forward an extensively altered pattern of seven single-member wards for Ely. Whilst we consider that the submission received would provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality, we are not persuaded that evidence was received to detail why the alternative pattern would better reflect community identities. We also received some submissions supporting our draft recommendations for Ely.

25 Eleven of the 13 submissions regarding Ely were in reference to the Carey Close and Kings Avenue area. Residents requested that Carey Close and Kings Avenue move from the proposed Ely East ward into the proposed Ely North ward, as it was argued that these properties were part of the same development as those in Ely North. We consider that this alteration would provide for better representation of community identity, and are therefore proposing it as part of our final recommendations.

Littleport and Downham Villages

26 We received one submission relating to the proposed Downham Villages ward, supporting the recommendations. We did not receive any submissions relating to the proposed Littleport ward. We therefore confirm both wards as part of our final recommendations.

Haddenham & Sutton and Stretham

27 We received four submissions relating to the proposed Haddenham & Sutton ward, including comments from the Council. Two of these submissions supported our proposed three-member ward. Haddenham Parish Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council proposed a single-member Haddenham ward, with a variance of +7%, and a two-member Sutton ward, comprising the parishes of Sutton, Mepal, Witcham and Wentworth, with a variance of -12%. The creation of the single-member Haddenham ward would cause the electoral variance of a two-member Sutton ward to increase to -12%, outside the normal acceptable range. However, we consider that the evidence provided was persuasive to warrant a move away from our draft recommendations here. We are therefore proposing a single-member Haddenham ward and a two-member Sutton ward as part of our final recommendations.

28 One submission proposed that the parish of Wentworth be included in the proposed Stretham ward, as the parish encompasses part of the village of Witchford. The majority of the village falls inside our proposed Stretham ward. However, we do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify a change here, and are confirming the proposed Stretham ward as part of our final recommendations.

Fordham and Isleham

29 We received one comment regarding these wards from East Cambridgeshire District Council, who proposed combining the single-member wards to form a two-member ward. The Council state that this would better reflect the community identity of the area, in particular because the five parishes in the area make up the Three Rivers group of parishes. We consider that the change proposed by the Council provides for good electoral equality, and represents links in the area, and we are therefore including this alteration in our final recommendations.

Burwell

30 We received one submission relating to our proposed Burwell ward. Burwell Parish Council did not have any objections regarding the ward, and we are therefore confirming it as part of our final recommendations.

Bottisham and Woodditton

31 We received three submissions referencing this area. One submission proposed moving the parishes of Westley Waterless, Brinkley and Burrough Green into the proposed Woodditton ward. However, this would lead to unacceptable levels of electoral inequality, with Bottisham ward having a variance of -16% and Woodditton having a variance of 12%. It would also not be possible to move the parish of Brinkley alone into Woodditton, as there would be no access from the east to the west of the ward.

32 The Council provided good evidence regarding community links to support their proposal to move the parish of Burrough Green from Bottisham into Woodditton, and we propose to include this change as part of our final recommendations.

Soham North and Soham South

33 We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Soham North and Soham South wards. We therefore confirm both wards as part of our final recommendations.

Detailed wards

34 The tables on pages 9–14 detail our final recommendations for each area of East Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

North

| Ward name | Number of Cllrs | Variance 2021 | Description | Detail |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|--|
| Downham Villages | 1 | -5% | This ward comprises the parishes of Coveney and Downham. | We received support for the proposed Downham Villages ward from the parish council. We do not propose any changes to this ward and confirm Downham Villages ward as part of our final recommendations. |
| Ely East | 2 | -6% | This ward comprises the Stuntney and Middle Fen areas on the outskirts of Ely, as well as the area to the east of Ely Cathedral and Lynn Road, west of Ely Common, and south of the hospital. It lies completely within the boundary of Ely parish. | Eleven of the 13 submissions received regarding Ely were in reference to the Carey Close and Kings Avenue area. Residents requested that Carey Close and 102–164 Kings Avenue move from the proposed Ely East ward into the proposed Ely North ward, as it was argued that these properties were part of the same development as those in Ely North. We consider that this alteration would provide for better representation of community identity, and are therefore proposing it as part of our final recommendations. Subject to this amendment, we are confirming this ward as part of the final recommendations. |
| Ely North | 2 | -1% | This ward comprises the areas north of the hospital and Highfield School, including the new development to the north-east of Ely, along with Chettisham, Queen Adelaide and Prickwillow. It sits entirely within the boundary of Ely parish. | Eleven of the 13 submissions received regarding Ely were in reference to the Carey Close and Kings Avenue area. Residents requested that Carey Close and 102–164 Kings Avenue move from the proposed Ely East ward into the proposed Ely North ward, as it was argued that these properties were part of the same development as those in Ely North. We consider that this alteration would provide for better representation of community identity, and are therefore proposing it as part of our final recommendations. Subject to this amendment, we are confirming this ward as part of the final recommendations. |
| Ely West | 3 | 4% | This ward comprises the area south of Highfield School, west of Ely Cathedral and Lynn Road, and west of the | We received 13 submissions relating to Ely as a whole, two of which were relevant to the proposed Ely West ward. One submission, from City of Ely Council, referred to the parish wards in Ely, and requested that the more rural parish wards |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---|----|--|--|
| | | | Fen Rivers Way. It sits entirely within the boundary of Ely parish. | be abolished. However, due to the division arrangements for Cambridgeshire, along with the proposed warding pattern in East Cambridgeshire, legislation states that it is necessary for parish wards to be created here. We received one submission that put forward an extensively altered pattern of seven single-member wards for Ely. Whilst we consider that the submission received provides for reasonable levels of electoral equality, we do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to suggest that the alternative pattern would better reflect community identities. We also received some support for our proposed wards covering Ely. We are therefore proposing no change to the Ely West ward, and are including it as part of our final recommendations. |
| Haddenham | 1 | 7% | This ward comprises the parish of Haddenham. | We received four submissions that mentioned the proposed Haddenham & Sutton ward. Two of these submissions, including one from the Council, supported the Council's initial submission which suggested that Haddenham parish form its own single-member ward. The creation of the single-member Haddenham ward would result in the electoral variance of a two-member Sutton ward to increase to -12%, outside the normal acceptable range. However, we consider that the evidence provided was persuasive to move away from our draft recommendations here, and we are therefore proposing a single-member Haddenham ward as part of our final recommendations. |
| Littleport | 3 | 1% | This ward comprises the entirety of the parish of Littleport. | We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this proposed ward. We are therefore confirming it as part of our final recommendations. |
| Stretham | 2 | 0% | This ward comprises the parishes of Stretham, Thetford, Wilburton and Witchford. | We received one submission regarding this ward, proposing that the parish of Wentworth be included in the proposed Stretham ward, as the parish encompasses part of the village of Witchford. The majority of the village falls inside our proposed Stretham ward. However, we do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify a change |

| | | | | |
|---------------|---|------|---|--|
| | | | | here, and are confirming the proposed Stretham ward as part of our final recommendations. |
| Sutton | 2 | -12% | This ward comprises the parishes of Mepal, Sutton, Wentworth and Witcham. | We received four submissions that mentioned the proposed Haddenham & Sutton ward. Two of these submissions, including one from the Council, supported the Council's initial submission which suggested that Haddenham parish form its own single-member ward. The creation of the single-member Haddenham ward would result in the electoral variance of a two-member Sutton ward to increase to -12%, outside the normal acceptable range. However, we consider that the evidence provided regarding community identity, both by a parish council and by the Council, was persuasive to move away from our draft recommendations. We are therefore proposing a two-member Sutton ward as part of our final recommendations. |

Central

| Ward name | Number of Cllrs | Variance 2021 | Description | Detail |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|---|
| Fordham & Isleham | 2 | -2% | This ward comprises the parishes of Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett and Snailwell. | <p>We received one comment regarding these wards from East Cambridgeshire District Council, who proposed combining our proposed single-member wards to form a two-member ward. The Council state that this would better reflect the community identity of the area, in particular because the five parishes in the area make up the Three Rivers group of parishes.</p> <p>We consider that the change proposed by the Council provides for good electoral equality, and represents links in the area, and we are therefore including this alteration in our final recommendations.</p> |
| Soham North | 2 | 3% | This ward comprises the northern part of the parish of Soham, including the areas north of Mill Corner, Station Road and Cornwell Close. | We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this proposed ward. We are therefore confirming it as part of our final recommendations. |
| Soham South | 2 | 7% | This ward comprises the southern part of the parish of Soham and the entire parish of Wicken. | We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this proposed ward. We are therefore confirming it as part of our final recommendations. |

South

| Ward name | Number of Cllrs | Variance 2021 | Description | Detail |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|--|
| Bottisham | 2 | -8% | This ward comprises the parishes of Bottisham, Brinkley, Reach, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Westley Waterless. | <p>We received three submissions referencing this area. One submission proposed moving the parishes of Westley Waterless, Brinkley and Burrough Green into the proposed Woodditton ward. However, this would lead to unacceptable levels of electoral inequality, with Bottisham ward having a variance of -16% and Woodditton having a variance of 12%. It would also not be possible to move the parish of Brinkley alone into Woodditton, as there would be no access from the east to the west of the ward.</p> <p>The Council provided good evidence regarding community links to support their proposal to move the parish of Burrough Green from Bottisham into Woodditton. Having considered the evidence received we have decided to make this change as part of our final recommendations.</p> |
| Burwell | 2 | 6% | This ward comprises the entirety of the parish of Burwell. | We received one submission relating to our proposed Burwell ward. Burwell Parish Council did not have any objections regarding the ward, and we are therefore confirming it as part of our final recommendations. |
| Woodditton | 2 | 4% | This ward comprises the parishes of Ashley, Burrough Green, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kirtling, Stetchworth and Woodditton. | We received three submissions referencing this area. One submission proposed moving the parishes of Westley Waterless, Brinkley and Burrough Green into the proposed Woodditton ward. However, this would lead to unacceptable levels of electoral inequality, with Bottisham ward having a variance of -16% and Woodditton having a variance of 12%. It would also not be possible to move the parish of Brinkley alone into Woodditton, as there would be no access from the east to the west of the ward. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | As detailed in the Bottisham section we have decided to modify our recommendation in this area and include the parish of Burrough Green in our Woodditton ward. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

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

Final recommendation

East Cambridgeshire District Council should comprise 28 councillors serving 14 wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

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

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

Parish electoral arrangements

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

37 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, East Cambridgeshire District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish

electoral arrangements.

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

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

Final recommendation

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

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

Final recommendation

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

3 What happens next?

41 We have now completed our review of East Cambridgeshire District Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to Parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2019.

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2015) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2021) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Bottisham | 2 | 4,529 | 2,265 | -3% | 4,730 | 2,365 | -8% |
| 2 | Burwell | 2 | 4,959 | 2,480 | 6% | 5,430 | 2,715 | 6% |
| 3 | Downham Villages | 1 | 2,427 | 2,427 | 4% | 2,440 | 2,440 | -5% |
| 4 | Ely East | 2 | 4,694 | 2,347 | 0% | 4,824 | 2,412 | -6% |
| 5 | Ely North | 2 | 3,161 | 1,581 | -32% | 5,086 | 2,543 | -1% |
| 6 | Ely West | 3 | 7,581 | 2,527 | 8% | 7,960 | 2,653 | 4% |
| 7 | Fordham & Isleham | 2 | 4,808 | 2,404 | 3% | 5,030 | 2,515 | -2% |
| 8 | Haddenham | 1 | 2,656 | 2,656 | 13% | 2,740 | 2,740 | 7% |
| 9 | Littleport | 3 | 6,657 | 2,219 | -5% | 7,740 | 2,580 | 1% |
| 10 | Soham North | 2 | 5,289 | 2,645 | 13% | 5,289 | 2,645 | 3% |
| 11 | Soham South | 2 | 4,193 | 2,097 | -10% | 5,451 | 2,726 | 7% |
| 12 | Stretham | 2 | 5,017 | 2,509 | 7% | 5,130 | 2,565 | 0% |
| 13 | Sutton | 2 | 4,414 | 2,207 | -6% | 4,480 | 2,240 | -12% |

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

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2015) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2021) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 14 Woodditton | 2 | 5,145 | 2,573 | 10% | 5,320 | 2,660 | 4% |
| Totals | 28 | 65,530 | - | - | 71,650 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 2,340 | - | - | 2,559 | - |

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

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

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

Local authority

- East Cambridgeshire District Council

Parish councils

- Brinkley Parish Council
- Burwell Parish Council
- City of Ely Council
- Haddenham Parish Council
- Little Downham Parish Council
- Sutton Parish Council
- Witcham Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council

Local residents

- 14 local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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

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