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Dear LGBCE,

Re: the Release of the second draft of the proposal to move the Romsey Boundary.

I confirm that I strongly believe that the Northern boundary of Romsey, including Coldhams Common and Brampton Road, should stay within the ward of Romsey and should **not** be split and merged with the Abbey ward.

I believe that the Romsey boundary should stay exactly where it is currently, and should not be changed.

- I am part of the Romsey Community: I shop on Mill Road socialise along Mill Road and this is the main route that I use when going into town, or further afield.

- I am part of an established community and do not want to be cut off and alienated to another ward that does not represent my situation.

- I am familiar with the councillors who represent the Romsey ward - they live in the same ward/area as I do and represent my views about local services/issues/facilities that directly affect me.

- I have no affinity with Abbey Ward and am not in any way involved with events in the Abbey Community or physically part of it.

- Coldhams Common is not just a physical barrier to being part of the Abbey Ward, it is also a cultural/community barrier; I rarely venture into Abbey ward and certainly spend no time there.
Kind regards, Ruth Allwood
Dear Sir,

I am a Market Ward resident and I support Map B.

I am concerned about the proposal to rearrange Cambridge City ward boundaries in such a way that Market Ward be lost.

There are strong, recognisable natural boundaries around Market Ward including the River Cam and the inner ring road. The original proposal would move the Park Street area into another ward which stretches all the way to the M11 and force the Kite and Brunswick into a new ward running all the way down Mill Road to the railway, breaking their longstanding identity with the historic city centre.

Solving the inevitable city centre nuisances for residents is much simpler if we also represent the commercial area of the city, giving us straightforward access to both sides. This would be hampered by the original proposal which would split the two apart.

In Market Ward, policy considerations for transport, policing, alcohol licensing and management of the city centre are distinct from the rest of the city. We share a common environment, unlike the rest. This requires an undiluted voice in decision making which would not happen if the ward was dismembered.

I urge the commission to go for Map B and ensure that Market Ward remains intact.

Yours faithfully

Richard Ames-Lewis
Dear LGBCE

I am a resident of Market Ward in Cambridge. My husband and I have lived and worked in the ward for 24 years and have brought up our three children here.

I wish to express my strong preference for Market Ward to be retained in any restructure of ward boundaries in Cambridge. I served for many years on the Brunswick & North Kite Residents’ Association (Brunswick and Kite are historic neighbourhoods of Cambridge that sit within Market Ward). For residents of Market Ward matters such as transport (cycling, buses, commercial vehicles, taxis, private cars), policing, alcohol, licensing, open green spaces and management of the city centre have a particular significance because we live in the mixed commercial and residential centre of the city.

I believe that our democratic representation in local government is best served by having a voice for the residents who live in this distinctive part of the city that is unlike any other of the city’s neighbourhoods. The proposal to merge Market Ward into other wards will, I fear, leave us without adequate or appropriate representation. I therefore urge you to adopt Map 2 in your consultation literature.

Thank you.
Best wishes
Wendy
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 19 November 2015 09:08
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Romsey Ward, Cambridge

From: rick BaldwinSent: 18 November 2015 17:38
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Romsey Ward, Cambridge

Dear LGBCE,
I am writing with reference to Romsey Ward in Cambridge (CB1).
I wish the ward to remain as it is. There is no sense at all in splitting Romsey in half.
Best regards
Mr R.M.Baldwin
From Dick Baxter

Sent: 17 November 2015 10:23
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridge City: further draft recommendations

The Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
21-24 Millbank
London, SW1P 4QP

I have just read through the background papers and looked at the 2 maps showing the draft recommendations and further draft recommendations for Cambridge City. In general, I am content to see a reduction in the number of wards and members in Cambridge City but much prefer the boundaries shown in the further draft recommendations.

In particular, I want to see market ward retained. Geographically it is a coherent area reflecting both the historic centre of the city and much of the shopping/university activity. As someone who has lived in market ward for close to 20 years, I believe it has a distinctive community spirit which should be retained.

Dr R S Baxter
17 November 2015
-----Original Message-----
From: David Blake
Sent: 03 November 2015 19:13
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk; David Blake <dblake@theiet.org>
Subject: Cambridgeshire

Sir

Your request for further comments at
http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council
shows two maps marked as A and B.

Map A does not reflect the makeup of the southern part of Cambridge city
and divides parts of Queen Ediths and Trumpington. This approach is
not viable.

Map B is a better concept but makes a very large area or division. My recommendation is to go for this approach but
divide the area in half using the main railway line as the center boundary.

Regards

David Blake

David Blake
24 November 2015

Alex Hindz,
LGBCE,
CAMBRIDGE

Dear Alex Hindz,

I am pleased to see your alternative proposal for
market and Petersfield wards in the city of Cambridge
as shown on Map B. I hope you will now go ahead
on that basis.

I write to you after your first proposals to present
me with details of the unnatural and unhelpful make-
of A two wards to be called St Michael’s and St Paul’s
(Map A). I will not repeat here the arguments made in
that letter, but if you get support for ward A, I beg you
to read again what I said against it. Map B restores
Petersfield to its unity central on the community of Mill
Road; it also preserves the special nature of Market ward
in encompassing the city centre. I served as County
Councillor for Market ward from 1997 to 2005, and was
always aware I had to do my best to represent the inhabitants of the wards but also to take account of all
those outside the ward who needed access to the centre
of town. The arrival of the City Deal strengthens the
need to think in both ways about the area, and it will
be easier to do that if it is spoken for as the unit it
does the function that it is.
I did not comment last time on the removal of the Park Street area from Market Ward. I do so now to welcome it home. I served for 16 years as a Governor of Park Street Primary School and I see that Map B makes much better sense of its catchment.

So: Map B, please!

Yours faithfully,
Is this only for local elections, ie for councillors?
Or does it also cover national elections?

For both:
- I like that more of Queen Ediths is included in the City.
- I do not agree with Map 1 showing a boundary separating Queen Ediths from Addenbrookes, Babraham Road and Netherhall Farm and other potential green belt development. These existing areas are very much the Queen Ediths community. There is a strong link to Addenbrookes and to Queen Ediths and Netherhall school. There is no logic to including Babraham Road and Netherhall Farm in a separate Trumpington.
- Map 2 showing a combined Trumpington Queen Ediths has some sense, but I am not clear how 2 members represent effectively such a large ward.

Re national elections
- Does this mean that finally Queen Ediths voters are voting for a City MP?
- Current arrangements whereby a significant City electorate are subsumed into South Cambs are far from democratic – these are two very different communities, but the city community is far outweighed in numbers, so votes are not felt count.
- It’s fair to say currently Queen Ediths voters feel left out/alienated when voting at general elections.

Fiona Brooks
As a resident of Cambridgeshire, I am appalled to understand that the LGBCE are considering two enormous electoral divisions which dictate that 20,000 of us are to be represented by a mere two (2) county councillors. This is tantamount to, and a clear indication that, a planned under representation programme is the road map which lays ahead for the electorate, their children, the child in the womb and those children yet to be conceived, all of whom will be forced to forego an element of their quality of life by this proposal, should such a proposal become reality. The current electoral division sporting one County Councillor is barely lucrative but the best of a bad offer, however to create enormous such divisions represented by two (2) County Councillors will make for unnecessary ill will together with two very ill or very idle County Councillors.

The current electoral divisions must remain unchanged and unhindered.
From: Edward Carlsson Browne
Sent: 16 November 2015 12:13
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Further Draft Recommendations

Dear LGBCE,

I would like to make a submission opposing the further draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council. As part of this submission, I would like to present an alternative pattern of divisional arrangements to rectify certain problems I perceive with the further draft recommendations (primarily the two two-member divisions proposed.)

However, this cannot be done using the current Cambridge polling districts as building blocks, since a greater level of granularity is required to ensure equality of electorates. Would you be able to provide me with street-by-street projections of Cambridge's electorate for the year 2020?

Yours sincerely,

Edward Carlsson Browne
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to plea for Romsey Ward in Cambridge. I understand that Brampton Road is likely to be moved into Abbey Ward but that there is a second draft that would keep it in Romsey. We have lived in this house over 50 years and are very attached to Romsey. Furthermore we are both in our 80’s and my husband is in bad health and would not be able to get to Abbey Ward to vote if we do like to vote each time.

Again my plea for Brampton Road to stay in Romsey Ward.

Yours faithfully,
John Rosemary Chambers
Dear Sirs,

With reference for the draft recommendations for Cambridge City which are currently being consulted upon, I wish to place on record that as a resident of Romsey, Cambridge we have always considered our street and local environs as being part of Romsey and NOT part of the proposed Barnwell/Abbey area. We use local Romsey facilities and shops and feel part of the Romsey community. Further, the proposed changes to put our street in a neighbouring area seem odd, as Coldham's Common is a natural boundary between Romsey and Barnwell/Abbey and therefore we (and those roads off Coldham's Lane) should remain part of Romsey.

I therefore would OBJECT to Map A and SUPPORT Map B (further draft recommendations).

Best regards,

Mr & Mrs Clarke
Cambridge (Romsey)
From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 17 November 2015 10:19
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed CCC divisions in City.

From: Barbara Cleverly
Sent: 14 November 2015 15:33
To: reviews<reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed CCC divisions in City.

Barbara Cleverly.

I write to state my preference for PLAN B.

The status quo works well - why change?
Your alternative makes no sense geographically, culturally or politically.

Barbara Cleverly.
-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Constable
Sent: 17 November 2015 10:49
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL DIVISIONS IN THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

I am a resident of market ward and oppose the proposed Alternative Division Pattern. Market ward as presently structured is inevitably linked with the City centre and commercial area. Transport, policing, licensing and management of the green spaces all require a single voice to manage and control.
I am strongly in support of the 2nd map B.
Yours
Peter S Constable.
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 13 November 2015 11:34
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

From: Margaret Cranmer
Sent: 13 November 2015 10:52
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Good morning,

I am a resident in the Petersfield ward of Cambridge (living in Tenison Road) and I wish to express my support for Map B. I am a local historian and the retention of Petersfield ward makes sense historically.

Thank you.
Margaret Cranmer
Hello,

As a Romsey resident, I can say that I am happy with the changes to my area that directly affect myself and my family. The boundary change to place the Romsey boundary through Coldhams Common is the most practical solution for the local area and local residents rather than splitting up an area for the sake of good numbers. Allowing ourselves to be able to be have a voice in the area that we live in, use and are a part of (Romsey) and not placed in an area that we are separate from, don't use and don't feel a part of. (Barnwell)

Thanks,

Sean Crimlis
-----Original Message-----
From: Neil Cunningham
Sent: 15 November 2015 14:24
To: reviews <reviews@gbcce.org.uk>
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

I am writing to protest about the proposed division of the current Petersfield Ward in Cambridge with a new arrangement (Map A) that makes no sense in terms of representing the people of this special and diverse area and would result in there being no effective representation for an area that is recognised throughout the UK as a distinct and very unique place.

I am a Petersfield resident and value the work done by the Petersfield councillors in promoting and protecting a great part of a great city. I support the revised plan (Map B) as this retains representation whilst allowing an overall simplification of the boundaries.

Regards
Neil Cunningham
From: Anna Dempster

Sent: 30 November 2015 20:00
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 'Michael' <m.villaverde@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are Market Ward residents living in region of Midsummer Common and would like to make a strong objection to the proposal to eradicate the Market Ward area in the recent proposals to re-draw electoral boundaries.

Market ward - as it stands now - not only represents a clear and coherent geographic area – with obvious and visible natural (river) and urban(road) boundaries but - perhaps more importantly - a coherent social and economic grouping with its own, distinct identity and specific needs which are best served by its own elected representative(s), not carved up unnecessarily, as proposed.

Over nearly 20 years of living in Cambridge (from student days to today) and having lived in many different parts of Cambridge – the Kite, Newnham village, De Freville Avenue and most recent Market Ward, I can say with some confidence that, my immediate neighbourhood and the Market ward more widely has an intrinsic and shared identity which has developed and emerged - over a significant period of time - to become the very vibrant, friendly and positive community it is today. It would be a great shame to lose that.

Furthermore, our experience of Market ward is as a rare and wonderful blend of diversity within an internally balanced community, with a shared sense of purpose and unique needs -- it is both at the very geographic heart of Cambridge and mirrors Cambridge more widely, at its best) - it would be a great shame and folly to divide and destroy that.

I would strongly support MAP 2 with Market Ward intact.

Sincerely yours,

Anna

-----------------------------
Dr. Anna M. Dempster
Head of Academic Programmes
From: bryan_donoghue
Sent: 27 November 2015 13:26
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: Bryan Donoghue <bryan_donoghue@yahoo.com>; Helen Hutchinson <helenhutchinson60@gmail.com>
Subject: Electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council (Consultation on further draft recommendations)

With reference to the electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council (Consultation on further draft recommendations) and the ward boundaries within the City of Cambridge.

I wish to present the case that Windsor Road should remain in Castle Ward.

In your letter of 3rd November to Cambridgeshire County Council and associated maps you make some proposed changes to the initial draft recommendations, but appear to make none on the area of the Newnham/Castle and Arbury boundary.

I am extremely disappointed that you continue to suggest that Windsor Road be transferred from the Castle Ward to Arbury.

Windsor Road should remain in the Castle Ward because it shares a strong community identity with the neighbouring streets of Oxford Road and Richmond Road. These roads were all built in the pre-war period and have developed a strong community over time. They are well connected by road and walkway which has resulted in strong social bonds. The roads share and maintain common community facilities, campaign together and organise shared events e.g.

- The Residents Associations of Windsor, Oxford and Richmond Road campaign together on local issues such as traffic calming. Such campaigning would become much more difficult if the roads were in different wards with different councillors and different city council area committees.

- The shared playground for children is the Histon Recreation Ground, adjacent to Richmond Road. This is the only accessible playground in the area, and provides a central meeting place and play area for the children.

- St Augustine’s in Richmond Road hosts shared community events. It has a programme of lectures, musical events, children’s groups and coffee mornings. This community facility is heavily used by local residents and supported by the residents’ associations of Windsor, Oxford and Richmond Road.

I urge you to allow Windsor Road to remain in the Castle Ward so that it can retain its strong ties with Oxford Road and Richmond Road.

Windsor Road has just 210 registered voters (about 1% of ward voters). Allowing it to remain with its long-standing community neighbours within the Castle/Newnham division would help to rebalance the smaller relative-size of the Castle/Newnham division.

Bryan Donoghue
From: Corinne Duhig
Sent: 14 November 2015 18:31
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

I have been a Petersfield resident for 30 years, and am shocked at the ludicrous proposal to obliterate Petersfield ward.

We are a community, focused around our ‘spine’ of Mill Road. We have far more in common, economically and socially, with each other than with the adjacent wards. For this reason, and supporting the ‘if it ain’t broke don’t fix it’ principe, I support Map B.

Yours

Corinne Duhig

* * * * *
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing briefly in response to the proposed boundary changes in Cambridge city. I have been online to: Cambridgeshire County Council | LGBCE

Cambridgeshire County Council | LGBCE
The Commission is carrying out an electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council. The aim of the electoral review is to recommend electoral division boundaries that mean each county councillor represents approximately the same number of voters. We also aim to ensure that the ...

From the documents I have read, I agree that the amended proposal, specifically the aim to keep Romsey as a unified district, has great merit. There are clearly effects of this elsewhere, but the value in this distinctive and historic neighbourhood continuing to be recognised are very significant and I support that change.

All best wishes,

Dr Matt Dyson
Dear Sirs,
I am writing, as a resident of the Petersfield division for twenty years, to object to the proposal to remove Petersfield from the map and divide it between Kite area and the Colleges. Since I moved to Cambridge, Petersfield has changed massively and has become very lively and has developed a strong community feel. An instance of this is, of course, the Mill Road Winter Fair, due to be held next weekend. With a division right down the middle of Mill Road, how would that continue?
For me East Road is a much more obvious division between the wards - it has less of a community spirit and being a much busier road is a more obvious boundary. A ward, like Kite, divided by East Road, would have very little opportunity to develop as a community.
So for these reasons, I support Map B.
Yours sincerely,
Dilys Eagle
1. This submission is made on a personal basis.

2. Broadly, I welcome the revised treatment of central and eastern Cambridge as mapped in the "further draft recommendations for Cambridge city" published on 3rd November 2015. These appear far better to reflect the identities and interests of local communities, and to have regard (so far as is possible) to the boundaries of the City Council wards, than the original draft proposals. Specifically I welcome:
   - the retention of recognisable Market and Petersfield Divisions, rather than the novel and awkward St Matthew's and St Paul's Divisions;
   - the retention of the New Park Street area in Market Division;
   - the retention of the existing boundary between Romsey and Abbey Divisions (where I see the proposed change generated by far the largest volume of objections to the original draft proposals, some 60 in all).

3. However, I am disappointed that the Commission has compounded the undesirable, unwieldy and unnecessary creation of a 2-member Castle & Newnham Division by proposing a further 2-member Division for Queen Edith's and Trumpington. These monster Divisions cannot in any sense be regarded as local communities, nor can they be a basis (without division) for a future scheme of City Council wards - which I assume will have to be produced in the fairly near future. In particular, the existing Queen Edith's and Trumpington Wards are in different Parliamentary Constituencies, and were proposed to remain so in the constituency review which was aborted in 2013. Councillors will not be able to represent such large and diverse Divisions without effectively dividing up responsibility geographically between themselves, and it is far better that the Commission should do this job for them and make the splits as equitable as possible.

4. I hope, even at this stage, that the Commission will consider the proposals in this document for creating very nearly equal splits (based on 2020 electorates) into single member divisions in these areas.

5. I believe it is generally evident enough, from the maps which follow, where I intend the boundaries to run. However there are a couple of places where this may not be so apparent, as I am following the boundaries of proposed developments which are not yet well advanced. Thus, the western end of the Castle / Newnham boundary follows the southern limit of the University's NW Cambridge development site. Similarly the southern end of the Queen Edith's / Trumpington boundary follows the southern limit of the Bell's School development site.

6. The estimated electorates for the proposed divisions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE</td>
<td>5835</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>7756</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWNHAM</td>
<td>7822</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7905</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEEN EDITH'S</td>
<td>7496</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>8180</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUMPINGTON</td>
<td>5219</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>8275</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed boundaries of Castle and Newnham Divisions
Proposed boundaries of Queen Edith's and Trumpington Divisions
From: Steve Fagg
Sent: 30 November 2015 22:19
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council

Dear LGBCE

I am writing in response to your revised proposal for division boundaries in Cambridge a City. In particular, the question of the boundary between Romsey and what you propose to call Barnwell (presently Abbey). I wrote to object to the previous proposals which would take my home (along with homes in several other streets in our neighbourhood) out of Romsey and into Barnwell. I objected on the grounds that the community focus of residents in the affected area is strongly contiguous with those living in the rest of the street (to the south of the proposed new boundary line). There is no community connection with what is now Abbey as there is a large uninhabited area (Coldham's Common), a railway line and a major road in between the two.

I am pleased to see that the revised proposals address my objections entirely, keeping me in Romsey and allowing me to vote for a councillor whose remit will be Romsey as a whole. I therefore urge you to adopt the revised proposals in preference to the original ones.

Yours sincerely,
Steve Fagg

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed eradication of Market Ward in Cambridge, for reasons which do not seem particularly logical or persuasive. I am delighted that consultation has been re-opened by the Boundary Commission, and want to express my (correspondingly) strong support for preserving the current mix of residential and commercial interests that Market Ward represents, in addition to retaining the natural ward boundaries formed by both the River Cam and Inner Ring Road. The revised plans contained in the document ‘Consultation on further draft recommendations’ seem to preserve this valuable identity, and I very much hope that the Boundary Commission will follow this schedule, and preserve Market Ward, when making their final decision on Cambridge ward boundaries. I have lived in Market Ward for over twenty years, but my reasons for seeking its preservation are more than purely nostalgic and/or historical: as things stand, it seems to work.

Thank you for your consideration

Richard Fisher
24.11.15
From: Clive Gibbon
Sent: 02 December 2015 19:58
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Review

To whom it may concern,

I am a Cambridgeshire resident for a few years now and have concerns that the Commission may be looking at larger than current Division size and therefore ask the Commission not to create enormous two-member Divisions anywhere in Cambridgeshire, but instead to ensure that we have one County Councillor per electoral Division.

Yours faithfully,

[Removal of personal information]
FROM: DR. TIMOTHY GROUT

Dear Alex Hinds – Review Officer – LGBCE,

RE: Cambridgeshire County Council (Cambridge).

Thank you for your letter dated 3 November 2015 with respect to the new proposed boundary changes for Cambridgeshire County Council - Cambridge area - elections in 2017?

The new suggested changes for the further draft recommendations are very much better than the original draft recommendations.

In principal, I would have no real objections to the suggested changes - however there may still be some minor changes?

As before, you can publish my name but not my current postal address (where I live at present), neither telephone number and remove signature from this letter.

Yours Sincerely

cc Gillian Beasley,
Chief Executive,
Cambridgeshire County Council.

RECEIVED
17 NOV 2015
Dear Sir,

I am writing to you about the issue of changing the boundary of Ramsey ward in Cambridge.

I understand the local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) have released a second draft of a proposal which will ensure Ramsey stays complete. I welcome this very much.

 Ramsey, as it is now, whole and intact is a vibrant, individual and special community of Cambridge with residents proud of its unique features, giving it "colour" outside of the city's centre and the University. Preserve it please and register this as a vote to keep Ramsey intact.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir, Madam,

I have had a long-standing connection with, and a strong attachment to being part of Romsey for many years. I understand that there is a proposal to cut Romsey in half, by moving some of it (XXXXXX) to another ward. I would therefore object strongly to this proposal to change the ward boundaries. The current boundary line which means that Cromwell Road is connected to the adjacent streets towards Mill Road makes sense, as we are in the same geographical and cultural block, bordering as we are by Coldhams Common. I have in the past been proud to participate in The Romsey Arts Festival, as a Romsey resident. I also began the debate about what would happen to the Ridgeons site development and organised meetings with others in the Romsey Ward who had concerns, so I have been very actively involved in the ward. I am part of this rich, diverse, lively community. I do not want to be cut off from it politically and to have my identification with the area weakened by some arbitrary decision. I hope this email will be added to the other objections to the proposal and that our voices will be listened to.

Regards
Amanda Hall
From: Penny Hall
Sent: 03 November 2015 16:47
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: electoral review of Cambridgeshire: further limited consultation for Cambridge

To the review officer,
I strongly support the change to the proposed division arrangements shown in the further draft recommendations in Map B. They address my concerns with the original proposed divisions in that Petersfield remains in tact so maintaining the ward community around Mill Road, the vibrant street that is at the heart of our community.
Thank you for inviting feedback and responding to it with the proposed new division arrangements.
Yours faithfully
Penny Hall
Dear Sirs

I would like to record my strong support for the Commission’s latest draft proposals for Cambridge (shown on Map B, which seems to be called Map 2 in your letter to the Chief Executive of the County Council).

I was the county councillor for Petersfield ward for 8 years until 2013 and lived in the ward for more than 10 years. I now live just outside the boundary. I believe it is enormously important to maintain a ward boundary that best enables Mill Road to perform its natural and traditional function – providing services, a focus for community life and a sense of place for people living and working both to the north and to the south of this street. Clearly the ward boundary is not the only reason for this area’s unusually strong local community, but I believe it does contribute to the sense of local identity. Having a single team of city and county councillors for the area also brings obvious practical advantages.

I also support the proposal to bring the CB1 (Station Road), Newtown and Brooklands Avenue areas into Petersfield as these share the same kind of core urban community character as the rest of the ward.

I would add that I am also convinced that maintaining the integrity of Market ward (where I now live) as the single ward for the city centre is absolutely right.

I truly believe that dismantling Petersfield in the way proposed on the earlier map would be sheer vandalism. And as Map B shows, it is quite unnecessary to do so. This ward is not broke, please don’t let’s try to fix it!

Yours faithfully
Nichola Harrison
I have lived in Cambridge City Market Ward for over 40 years. If revisions are desirable then "Further Draft Recommendations" shown in red on your map appear acceptable.

However I am most concerned about the level of public consultation. I take quite an interest in local issues, but until a local ward councillor recently e-mailed party members, from one of whom I learned of the proposals, I was totally unaware of the review. From what I gather, neither City nor County Councils are tasked with putting proposals to the electorate, since it is your exercise.

It seems bizarre that through my letter box and via e-mails I am made aware of selected local planning issues, road closures for Guy Fawkes night and the availability of a mobile masseuse, but on an important issue of democracy, apparently nothing!

On much lesser issues we are invited to public displays in our shopping centres, local community halls, the Guildhall etc. Have I somehow missed all these?

Grateful for your observations.

Jonathan Hefford
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 01 December 2015 10:17
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Consultation proposal CCC division

From:
Sent: 29 November 2015 21:06
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Consultation proposal CCC division

To whom it may concern
I am a resident of Market Ward [REDACTED]. Apparently this ward is to be changed by the Electoral Boundary Commission and eliminated by splitting it between two others. I am against this proposal and support Map B.

Carrie Herbert
-----Original Message-----
From: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Sent: 12 November 2015 16:49
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: CCC diversion of boundaries for Petersfield.

Please do not make Mill Road a boundary road, it is part of the heart of my community. I do not want Petersfield to be wiped off the map, nor do I want my wonderful mill road community cut in half. Keep plan B.
Felicity Higginson

Sent from my iPad
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 13 November 2015 10:37
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge:

-----Original Message-----
From: Ian Hill
Sent: 12 November 2015 18:19
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge:

, which is in the present Petersfield ward. I have lived here since 1996, and nearby since 1993.

I prefer the map showing a revised Petersfield rather than the one described as St Pauls. I disagree with the prospect of regarding Mill Road as a dividing line rather than as a communal centre. I also agree with the ward including both sides of Hills Road, for the same reason, since the whole area contains a wide variety of both private and council housing, and the local shops and other facilities used by all of us.

Ian Hill
Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to express my views about the proposals for boundary changes to the electoral wards for Cambridgeshire County Council within Cambridge City.

I am a resident of Cambridge within Petersfield Ward. I have lived in Petersfield for a total of 28.5 years (23.5 at my present address), so I believe that I have a well-developed sense of the character of the area and its communities and their interactions.

I wish to support the latest revised proposals for Cambridge City issued on 3 November 2015. In my view these proposals are significantly improved over those issued earlier in the year. This is particularly true of the proposals for my area. The revised proposals (map B or Map2 in http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council) achieve the primary objective of increasing the elector number within the ward by joining the existing Petersfield ward to areas taken from Trumpington (Newtown, ‘the triangle site’ and the new housing between Brooklands Avenue and the Railway line).

These proposals are clearly superior to the earlier plans which split Petersfield and put my own part into a city centre ward. Throughout my time living here, there has always been a strong sense of community around Mill Road and the neighbourhood has a distinct character. To separate our neighbourhood into two different wards is highly undesirable. Just next Saturday, the community will be holding its Annual Winter Fair, a highly successful long-established community event.

I strongly urge you to adopt the revised proposals leaving the existing Petersfield ward intact but enlarged.

Nick Holmes
Hinds, Alex

-----Original Message-----
From: mishka@gbce.org.uk
Sent: 30 November 2015 16:35
To: reviews <reviews@gbce.org.uk>
Subject: Re: Boundaries URGENT

Dear Sir,

Subject: Representation on Cambridgeshire county council boundaries in Cambridge

I am writing to you as a City Councillor representing Castle Ward in Cambridge. I am aware that you are consulting to establish preferences between your original recommendations and your new, further recommendations. I would like to register my support for the further recommendations, reflected in Map B.

In doing so, I would like to ask you to reconsider two aspects of the proposals which are in common between both sets of boundaries.

(1) Please don’t pursue the two-member divisions. These will introduce wards of a size that is outside the political culture here in Cambridge. Two councillors representing the same area does not necessarily result in them splitting work between them on a geographical basis - as they may be politically in competition. This would result in them both needing to cover the whole area. On a practical level this will introduce personal transport challenges, as the bus network is not aligned to that kind of cross suburb movement. It would also mean that councillors in two members divisions will not have an equal responsibility with those representing single member divisions. This lack of equality between elected representatives is not democratic. Could you consider introducing a dividing boundary within the proposed Castle and Newnham division as close as possible to Madingley Road and if necessary, because of the planned housing developments, revisit just this boundary after 5 years? Likewise for the Trumpington and Queen Edith’s division, where the dividing line should be as close as possible to Hills Road.

(2) Reconsider the boundary that is proposed between Castle (& Newnham) and Arbury. From the perspective of observing natural communities, Histon Road should be treated as the right line to draw for its whole length. There is a strong sense of community within this area and a distinct difference between opposing sides of the Histon Road developed over a prolonged period of time.

If compensatory numbers are required to rebalance, it would be logical to transfer more of the enclave between Gilbert Road and Chesterton Road into Arbury, as numbers require.

I hope it will be possible for you to entertain these points while accepting the ‘further recommendations’ as the basic outline for the city.

Valerie Holt.
-----Original Message-----
From: Jenny Hoyos
Sent: 18 November 2015 09:43
To: reviews@gbce.org.uk
Subject: Cambridge City review-Romsey

I have been informed that a second draft for Romsey, which puts Coldhams Lane/Common back in to Romsey has been released. As a constituent could I please vote that this second draft is adopted.

I have been a resident of Romsey all my life. I went to school in Romsey, was married in Romsey [redacted]. Romsey is a unique ward. Do not split us up! The current residents are from every background and race but all work together as a Community such as is not found in any other ward. The residents of Coldhams Lane are an essential part of this community and would not fit in, or be happy to be part of any other ward. It has worked for many years and will continue to work providing we are not split up in the proposed manner. I also speak for several of my neighbours who think to put us in another ward would be lunacy.

Jenny Hoyos
[redacted]
As a resident in the Newtown area of Cambridge city I wish to support the proposal drafted as Map B for the new ward boundary in my area. This would create a ward, which should be entitled Newtown and Petersfield, which would be socially coherent and join two areas which share many of the same features and interests.

Janet Huskinson (Dr)
Hello

I certainly support the continued inclusion of Cromwell Road, [redacted], and Coldhams Lane, in the Romsey constituency. It seemed to me when looking at the initial recommendations' boundaries, that splitting off a few roads from their traditional constituency is discriminatory and unfair, particularly when the new constituency, Barnwell would be likely to play an increasingly important leisure-related economic role in the life of the city, against the interests of which the few residents of a bordering neighbourhood would have little influence.

Kind regards

Janice Jackson
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 30 November 2015 18:24
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: north newtown and the boundary review

-----Original Message-----
From: Martin Johnson [redacted]
Sent: 30 November 2015 10:38
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: north newtown and the boundary review

dear sirs

with respect the future of north newtown, i strongly support the alternative scheme and the naming of the new ward Newtown and Petersfield. This brings together a more similar set of communities that are already working together

martin johnson
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to support the new plans now on the table which would result in Brampton Road remaining in Romsey ward rather than moving to become part of Abbey ward.

Yours faithfully,

Gill Jones
Dear LGBC

My husband and I would like to object to the proposed plan to alter the northern boundary of Romsey. We are in favour of keeping the Coldhams Common area in the ward. This is for several reasons:

- we would be excluded from our local community in the Mill Road area if we were to be placed in a different ward. This would not only affect our day-to-day lives but also means we would not have a say in local elections on matters that affect us. For example, both my husband and I commute to work to the city centre by bicycle, and so we would like to have a say on traffic issues in the Romsey area.
- In the event of a split of the ward we would also be separated from our ‘new’ community by the industrial estate and Coldhams Common.

Thank you for considering our views.

Lucy Markson-Lainé and Steve Lainé
From: B.M.A.C. Lambrecht
Sent: 30 November 2015 18:18
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: Bart Lambrecht
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a resident of Market Ward in Cambridge.
With this email I would like to let you know I am against the proposal to remove the Market Ward from the map and to amalgamate it with another ward.
I am in favour of keeping the Market Ward intact.

Yours sincerely,

Bart Lambrecht
From: James Lavender
Sent: 12 November 2015 17:22
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Dear Sir

We are a "Market" area resident and we strongly support Map B

best wishes

--

James Lavender
-----Original Message-----
From: John Lawton
Sent: 29 November 2015 19:54
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Market Ward in Cambridge. I wish to express my concern over the initial plan to remove the present Market Ward in Cambridge as well as to make other highly undesirable changes such as splitting the Mill Road community into two wards, neither of which reflect community realities.

For this reason I strongly support Map B which has undone those undesirable changes.

Yours faithfully,

John Lawton
Dear sir/madam,

My name is 'Jefferson Lee Morgan' living in MARKET ward.

I have just seen the two draft proposals from the Boundary commission, which I believe are designed to re-distribute more equally the number of voters /counsellor.

I wish to make it clear that I support MAP B

Any counsellor would naturally serve to 'protect' his/her ward. I feel very lucky with the support I receive in MARKET.

I have a belief ; if something isn't broken, don' fix it

All are special. However, where MARKET is concerned, there are already pretty clearly defined boundaries and the relationship within this ward is unique in the city area it covers. There is a mindset required to manage such an area compared to wider afield. As such, it makes sense to leave MARKET as it is.

I used to play semi-professional football. The best organised teams had a solid centre, good spine, you could be flexible down the sides. MARKET ward as it is, represents your core. In combination (moving north-South) the likes of Kings Hedges/Chesterton/Petersfield in an established conformation, you have your spine. MAP B fulfils that ethos.

To confirm, please leave MARKET ward as/is and I support MAP B.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Jefferson
Dear Sir,

We write as residents of Market Ward in Cambridge to express our strong opposition to the elimination of the current Market Ward as proposed on your Map A and our preference that Market Ward as at present constituted be retained as on your Map B.

Market Ward is a well established historic community unit in Cambridge City centre, distinct from the rest of the city, with common interests in transport, policing, alcohol licensing which differ from those elsewhere. Its break-up and reapportionment would not be conducive to the efficient management of those common interests.

Professor A. Lentin, Mrs Monica Lentin,
As a resident of Market Ward, I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed changes to the ward boundaries. I would like to support Map B, which stays closest to the keeping the local residents in the same logical unit.

Regards,

Philip Lindsay
From: Leonie Llewellyn  
Sent: 29 November 2015 22:29  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the City of Cambridge.

Dear Sir,


I am a resident of Market Ward and have been so for many years. As such I am extremely concerned about the proposed changes in the Electoral boundaries with regard to Market Ward.

Market Ward has highly recognisable boundaries which include The River Cam and the Inner Ring Road. It has a longstanding identity with the City Centre and Policy considerations with regard to Policing, Transport and Management of the City Centre are quite distinct from other parts of Cambridge. We, in Market Ward share a common environment and any refigurating or elimination of our Ward should be considered with care.

In this respect I support Map B. I do not wish to see Market Ward either eliminated or refigured as in Map A.

Leonie Llewellyn
-----Original Message-----
From: judy davis
Sent: 29 November 2015 22:23
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridge City

I am very happy with proposed changes

J lloyd

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am an interested resident in Romsey, who wrote in response to the first round of consultation on your draft recommendations for Cambridge, specifically objecting to the northern boundary of the Romsey division.

I have looked at your "further draft recommendation" proposals released this month in map 2, and I much prefer these to the earlier plans in map 1.

Specifically, I feel that the new proposed northern boundary to Romsey much better reflects the local community.

Thank you for taking our views on board to produce this alternative proposal.

Peter Lloyd
(Resident in Romsey)

On Tue, 3 Nov 2015, at 16:10, Mayers, Mishka wrote:

3 November 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE: FURTHER LIMITED CONSULTATION FOR CAMBRIDGE

A copy of a letter to the Chief Executive of Cambridgeshire County Council and the map can be found on our website at: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council

The letter outlines the Commission’s intention to undertake further limited consultation in Cambridge.

Given this, our final recommendations will now be published on 9 February 2016 rather than 17 November 2015 as originally planned.

If you have any further questions on the review please contact me on the telephone number below.

Yours sincerely,
From: Mayer, Mishka on behalf of reviews  
Sent: 30 November 2015 18:24  
To: Hinds, Alex  
Subject: FW: Removal of Market Ward  

From: Ruth Loshak  
Sent: 30 November 2015 10:39  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Removal of Market Ward  

Market Ward is an entity with which I associate. I am against the plans to remove this ward.
Yours sincerely  

Ruth Loshak