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As a long-term Romsey resident I should like to express my support for the latest proposals ie the boundaries marked in red in the Further Draft Recommendations map. This will maintain the Romsey area as a single electoral unit and enable its strong character (eg finalist in this year’s National High Street awards) to be reflected.

Yours faithfully

Simon Mason
From: Nick McCave
Sent: 18 November 2015 15:27
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly object to the proposed gerrymandering of Market Ward in which I live. We have a coherent and cohesive grouping of residents with active Residents' Associations. The new proposals simply hack up Petersfield and Market and impose an inappropriate E-W dividing line. I support the arrangement in Map 2 'Further draft recommendations' which retains the present city centre Market Ward.

Yours faithfully,

Nick McCave

--
-----Original Message-----
From: Catherine Mellis
Sent: 14 November 2015 21:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: New proposal for boundary change for Romsey

To whom it may concern,

I would like to let it be known that I am incredibly pleased with the new proposals for Romsey. I chose my house in no small part to it being in Romsey, an area I feel I strongly identify with. I use Mill road a great deal, use the shops and services.

I also would like to say I have little or no knowledge or experience of Abbey Ward. Part of the reason for this is that there is a common between us and Abbey and a result we cannot actually see any of it from Coldhams Road. We have everything we need here and if not I walk into town or go to the Beehive centre and as a result never need to go into Abbey ward.

We have a common, a railway track and a river between us and Abbey and I really really hope that Brampton Road could stay part of Romsey. Please please please!

Thank you,
Catherine Mellis,
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,

Iryna Minakova
To Whom it May Concern,

I write to note that the further draft recommendation for Cambridge City (map B found at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council) is a much fairer and clearer boundary division proposal. This maintains existing communities and should be confirmed.

Regards,
Dr Kaeten Mistry

On 3 November 2015 at 16:10, Mayers, Mishka <mishka.mayers@lgbce.org.uk> 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,

Alex Hinds
Review Officer
alex.hinds@lgbce.org.uk
0330 500 1274
Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing in response to the further redrafting of electoral boundaries in Cambridge - I submitted a response to the original consultation, in which I raised my concerns regarding the movement of the boundary between Romsey and Abbey. I am pleased to see in the redrafted boundaries, the existing boundary (across Coldham's Common) is proposed. I would fully support this. More generally I feel that the revised boundaries better reflect the natural communities within Cambridge (e.g. the return to Market and Petersfield).

Yours faithfully

Susan Mitchell
26th November 2015

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission
14th Floor Millbank Towers
Millbank
LONDON SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

re: Electoral Review of Cambridge
Further Limited Consultation

I was pleased to receive your letter containing latest alternative proposals for division arrangements for the City of Cambridge. For the Romsey Ward these alternative division arrangements are definitely preferable to the...
they maintain the identity and unity of the community on the south side of Coldburn's Corner. This is a much more natural boundary to define an area with shared interests and therefore more electorally satisfactory than the artificial division at the traffic barriers contained in the previous draft proposal. The Roosay Town Allotment Gardener will also remain in the Roosay Ward under the new alternative division arrangements. Therefore support the new alternative division arrangements.

Yours sincerely,
From: Lynn Murdoch  
Sent: 29 November 2015 17:09  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council

Dear Sir,

I am a member of Market Ward and it has just been brought to my attention that there is a revised proposal for Market within the reallocation of electoral boundaries. Market is a very distinct area and needs its own representation for policy decisions in relation to the city centre. I would therefore very strongly support the map B and that the Ward should not be dismembered.

Thank you very much for taking my view into consideration.

Yours,

Lynn Murdoch
To whom it may concern,

Please may I add my name to the many, many who have I believe already written to express their desire that you not split the ward of Romsey in two. Please leave the boundary in its old location--on the railway line crossing Coldhams Common. Romsey is a strong and coherent community with a particular identity and spirit. It would be a shame to disrupt that by moving the boundary line.

Thank you.

Regards,
Dr. Joshua Nall
University of Cambridge

Trustee: The Museum of Cambridge
Dear Review officer,

I would like to support the revised plans for the Cambridge ward boundaries:


Thank you,

Anne Forde
Dear Review Officer,

I've looked at the map of the proposed ward boundaries and two (Castle and Newnham, and Queen Ediths and Trumpington both of which are expanding) look far too large for anyone (or any two members) to handle properly. I cannot see how newsletters can be distributed over such a large area, how members can make sure they meet as many people in their ward as possible or how meetings for the ward could be sensibly managed.

I think smaller wards would be far more beneficial for everyone.

your faithfully

B Nicolson.
Dear Sirs,

We strongly object to the alterations proposed to Romsey, Cambridge constituency boundaries.

The reason being we are on the edge of the Northern boundary of Romsey, where there is a natural barrier to the Romsey constituency, consisting of allotments, railway line and Coldhams Common. In fact the nearest domestic dwelling north of us is at least three quarters of a mile north of us. Should you impose this arbitrary boundary on us, we will feel isolated physically and naturally as we can relate and integrate personally with the Romsey area. We have no link whatsoever with the constituency North of us, both physically or personally.

PLEASE LEAVE ROMSEY BOUNDARIES ALONE!

Yours

Roy and Angela Nunn,
I am a resident of Willow Walk. It had escaped my notice that the Electoral Boundary Commission had proposed changing local council wards, eliminating the one we live in, Market Ward! It seems to me this would be very undesirable, as our community is very distinct from surrounding areas, for example for policing, management of hostels, transport and local access, management of local parks and commons, and shopping areas.

We form a strong community with a sense of belonging.

Regine Page
Dear Sir/Madam,

We were very pleased to see the review of the proposed changes to Cambridge council boundaries and we agree with the further draft recommendations as they fit well within the natural boundaries of the Romsey ward.

I want to reiterate that I do not agree with the original draft but only agree with the further draft recommendations.

Kind regards,

Mr. Philip Podmore
Dr. Nichola Podmore
From: Richard Price
Sent: 18 November 2015 12:02
To: reviews <reviews@gbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

The Boundary Commission

Dear Sir or Madam

My wife and I are Market Ward residents since 2005.

We urge you to adopt Map B and keep Market Ward intact and to reject Map A for the following reasons.

We were very alarmed that the earlier proposals for boundary changes (Map A) sought to divide this dense residential area in the city centre of which we are part, and to parcel some of us off to the Castle & Newnham communities to the N and W of the river with whom we have no community links and from whom we are separated by a natural boundary, the River Cam. We have much more in common with those living in the nearby King Street area who are allocated to a new St Matthews division.

We who live in the centre of this city have different needs and priorities when compared with those who live in the quiet residential streets of Newnham and Castle. Those elected to represent them may not be willing to represent the views and needs of a much smaller subset of their electorate in the way that our present councillors do.

For example, policies relating to transport, policing, licensed premises and management of the city centre are quite different from those relating to the quiet leafy streets of Newnham and Castle. We need councillors who understand these matters and who will work for the benefit of both residents and businesses in the city centre. This will be much harder to achieve if Market Ward is broken up.

The position of Jesus Green, one of the city's largest and most widely used and appreciated public open spaces, is also a major concern. Its arbitrary separation in Map A from those most close to it seems very strange. In addition to a thriving residents association we also have a Jesus Green Association, most of whose committee members live in these streets. It would be a matter of great concern if we became separated from this wonderful open space by an arbitrary electoral boundary. We overlook the green, actively promote its best interests with the authorities and receive strong support from our councillors. It is very unlikely that those who live out in Newnham and Castle will share our concerns about the Green, meaning that those elected to represent them will likewise have its care as a lower priority.

We respectfully urge you to reject Map A and to adopt Map B.

yours sincerely

Richard and Vanessa Price
Electoral review for Cambridgeshire County: further comments on south Cambridge city

Firstly, writing as a community organiser here in the Queen Edith’s division of Cambridge city, I would like to thank and congratulate the team at LGBCE regarding their revised proposal for the city, in particular the south of the area. This is a vast improvement on the initial proposal, and it has been well received by almost all of the residents I have spoken to. The only loud objections I have heard are from political parties which seem to have a problem with the organisational implications of multi-member divisions. I have not found this to be a problem with ordinary residents.

However, there are a final few tweaks which I would like to suggest that would satisfy the remaining objections of residents in the south-eastern corner of the city, who feel they are in a historically ‘wrong’ division. As this mainly necessitates a two-way ‘swap’ of roads between the Cherry Hinton division and the new Queen Edith’s & Trumpington division (so much nicer in alphabetical order, don’t you think?), I cannot see any reason why this should not take place.

There are comments from residents on my Queen Edith’s Online blog which back up these recommendations, but I can collect more views of residents from the roads concerned if required. I also believe that all these proposals have the support of local councillors.

Chris Rand

Contents:
1. Move cul-de-sac roads off Cherry Hinton Road between Mowbray Road and Cherry Hinton Hall into Queen Edith’s & Trumpington
2. Leave roads around the eastern tip of Cherry Hinton Road in Cherry Hinton
3. Leave area south of Fulbourn Road in Cherry Hinton
4. Summary
1 Move cul-de-sac roads off Cherry Hinton Road, between Mowbray Road and Cherry Hinton Hall, into Queen Edith’s & Trumpington

The area shown in red in the map below is currently allocated to Cherry Hinton (orange). However, geographically and historically, it has very little to do with Cherry Hinton, whose village centre is 15–25 minutes’ walk away to the north-east, and a lot to do with Queen Edith’s, whose centre is very close by (in Wulfstan Way, the south-west corner of map below).

This change would also produce a more consistent treatment of Cherry Hinton Road’s western and eastern halves, i.e. allocating them both to Queen Edith’s & Trumpington.

In terms of electoral quality, please consider parts 1, 2 and 3 of this submission together, to even out the imbalance between the Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith’s & Trumpington divisions.
Leave roads around the eastern tip of Cherry Hinton Road in Cherry Hinton

The area shown in red in the map below is currently allocated to Queen Edith’s & Trumpington (lilac). However, geographically and historically, it has much more to do with Cherry Hinton, whose village centre is 5–15 minutes’ walk away to the north-east.

This change is certainly backed by residents, and avoids unnecessarily moving them from their current division (Cherry Hinton).

In terms of electoral quality, please consider parts 1, 2 and 3 of this submission together, to even out the imbalance between the Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith’s & Trumpington divisions.

(Above) Leaving the red area in Cherry Hinton makes geographical and historical sense.

(Left) Comment from resident of Cherry Hinton on Queen Edith’s Online blog, May 2015
http://queen-ediths.co.uk/cambridge-planning/proposal-to-radically-re-shape-queen-ediths-pat-forward/
3 Leave area south of Fulbourn Road in Cherry Hinton

The central area in the map below is currently scheduled to be moved to Queen Edith’s & Trumpington. However, geographically and historically, it is part of Cherry Hinton (red). This proposal cannot be argued in terms of electoral quality, as it involves land which has little or no occupation. But ask any local resident where the chalk pits and nature reserve are, and they will reply ‘Cherry Hinton’. Moving this uninhabited area to Queen Edith’s is unnecessary and illogical.

There is a potential future implication: the Peterhouse Technology Park (home of ARM, clearly shown below) could well expand southwards. If so, under the latest proposal it would cut across two divisions awkwardly and pointlessly.

(Above) Ask any local resident where the chalk pits and nature reserve are, and they will reply ‘Cherry Hinton’. There is no reason to move this area to Queen Edith’s & Trumpington.
4 Summary

The proposed new boundaries for the multi-member Queen Edith’s & Trumpington division are excellent. However, the minor enhancements I am suggesting will:
– improve electoral quality further;
– make historical and geographical sense;
– be widely appreciated by the residents affected.

They are:
1. Allocate the area in purple to the Queen Edith’s & Trumpington division (lilac)
2. Allocate the area in red to Cherry Hinton (orange)
I am sending this again, as I am told that there is still the possibility that the decision about the relevant boundary is still up for discussion.

Keith van Rijsbergen

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith van Rijsbergen
Date: 6 July 2015 15:59:06 BST
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Draft proposal new electoral boundaries

I would like to comment on the redrawing of the electoral boundary which affects our community in Market Ward. My wife and I have been intimately involved with the area around us since 1975. During that time we have, together with many of the residents, put a huge efforts into building a community identity involving both students and permanent residents.

We have succeeded in doing this over the years e.g saving Park Street School, advising that the old generation station be transformed for residential accommodation, and promoting the development of the Oliver Rix site into student accommodation. The Park Street Resident Association (PSRA) has been active in all these campaigns, drawing the community together. PSRA has a very constructive working relationship with the Jesus Green Association. We have almost no relationship with those who live in Newnham and Castle.

It makes no sense to us to split up a thriving community along the lines proposed and attach us to Newnham and Castle communities who have very different priorities and needs. Our undivided community has worked well for years and has been represented by our councilors with our priorities and needs at heart.

This comment has been written in haste since we have only recently (last few days) been made aware of the proposal.
Yours sincerely

Keith van Rijsbergen
Dear Sir / Madam,

After having objected to the previous draft, I am very pleased to see that the many comments against the Romsey / Barnwell boundary proposed in the Commission's draft recommendations for Cambridge City have been listened to.

The new alternative division between the above mentioned two areas reflects now more closely the strong sense of community felt among those living between Mill road and Coldham's common. Moreover, it uses sensibly the common as a natural boundary.

Given the large number of local residents who raised their objections in the previous consultation, I am hopeful that the new boundary proposed in the Commission's further draft recommendations will be maintained. Readjusting the density by modifying the southern boundary near Cherry Hinton Road is a more sensible decision.

I strongly support the new Romsey / Abbey boundary in the Commission's further draft recommendations for Cambridge City.

Your sincerely,

Dr. S. Rios
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 13 November 2015 08:54
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Romney boundary

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Roberts
Sent: 12 November 2015 17:34
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Romney boundary

I am emailing to say I would greatly prefer the boundary to remain unchanged. Romney is a diverse but coherent and vigorous community and it would be a retrograde step to split it.
Sarah Roberts
Sent from my iPhone
LGBCE Boundary Review (Cambridgeshire)

Further draft recommendations for Cambridge city.

Submission by Colin Rosenstiel

Status
Please refer to my earlier submission on the draft proposals.

Further draft recommendations
In my submission these overcome a large number of weighty objections to the draft recommendations and should be preferred to that part of them. As I predicted, a similar weight of objection from North Romsey to similar proposals made over a dozen years ago was made. I also endorse the comments by Keith Edkins on these changes and commend them to the Commission.

I find it disappointing that many similar points made in relation to other parts of the city seem not to have been heeded. These include the division of communities in the present Castle division and Chesterton area, despite the rules which bind the Commission in drawing up electoral division boundaries. The removal of such an important community focus as Mitcham's Corner from Chesterton by placing it in the Castle/Newnham Division is particularly unfortunate. I find it hard to understand how the arrangement of much of the north of the city can reflect the identities and interests of local communities there. This problem and many others in the area were addressed in my earlier submission.

Two member divisions
It is with considerable dismay that, despite the representations from almost everyone involved, not only has the Commission not proposed to divide the Castle/Newnham two-member division into two single-member divisions, it has proposed a further two-member division for Queen Edith's and Trumpington in that case even straddling parliamentary constituency boundaries, a further unnecessary complication. Two-member divisions would be severely disruptive to electoral arrangements for the City of Cambridge. The city is likely to retain three-member wards. There appears to be a consensus in the light of the County Electoral Review that their number should in future be reduced to twelve. They could be coterminous with the Electoral Divisions, as they have been since 1973, but that cannot be if the two-member divisions are not split into pairs of single-member divisions. The Further Electoral Review of the city cannot be long delayed so the numbers will be similar to those of the present review. So the fact that it is not easy to estimate the numbers involved does not avoid the need to divide the proposed two-member divisions. It would be better to do so now.

My friend Keith Edkins has submitted simple proposals which well respect community boundaries and electoral equality to divide both two-member divisions into four single-member divisions which fit the criteria used by the Commission. I strongly commend them to the Commission, even at this late stage.
Dear Sir/Madam

Regarding the consultation I am a Market Ward resident and wish to support Plan B. I hope my views will be taken into consideration.

Yours sincerely

Sally Rose

Sent from my iPhone
From: Christian Rutherford
Sent: 12 November 2015 16:18
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

Dear Sir/Madam

As Market Ward residents we very much wish for the it to be retained and are firmly in support of Map B

Yours

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

I wish to note my support for the revised proposal for the Romsey Division as the further draft recommendations on Map B.
I believe these changes to the draft recommendations will have strong support from local residents.

‘Romsey Town’ is unique part of Cambridge with a strong sense of its identity as both a geographic entity and, probably more importantly as a community. It has a history rooted in the huge Victorian expansion of the city and it always had a unique identity separate from the old borough.

The previous draft’s move of north Romsey to a new Barnwell division would place those residents within a division divided by a large green space (Coldham’s Common) and a railway line (with only two crossing points). Further the north Romsey streets naturally gravitate to the south (especially the Mill Road area) for shops and community facilities.

The inclusion of a part of north Coleridge division in the revised proposal is also to be welcomed. That area has always looked to Mill Road as natural hub which always provided both commercial and community facilities, including places of worship.

The Nuttings /Uphall Roads area is also a natural extension to Romsey as the residents share the use of Romsey’s facilities.
Dear Team,

I would like to make it known that I support map A as this feels more natural and in line with my feelings of living here.

The river in map A being a natural boundary rather than chopping up my local community as in map B. And St Matthews being the centre of the community as in map A, rather than Mill Rd in map B.

Glenys Self.
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 01 December 2015 10:17
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed Cambs.CC. divisions in City of Cambridge

-----Original Message-----
From: J.F.Sergeant
Sent: 29 November 2015 14:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambs.CC. divisions in City of Cambridge

I am a resident of Market, Cambridge. I strongly oppose any change that would separate us from central city issues: we are affected by and part of them.
JFH Sergeant
Dear Commissioner,

I am a resident of Market ward in Cambridge. I have read the proposals for new ward boundaries and believe strongly that Map B is more appropriate.

I would prefer to continue to solve any city centre issues in collaboration with both commercial and resident voices rather than splitting the two areas.

There are existing natural boundaries currently, including the river Cam and the inner ring road, giving Market a natural identity with the historic city.

Being so much a part of the centre brings special considerations, particularly with transport, licensing, management and policing, which are distinct from the rest of the city.

I support Map B for the above reasons, and believe strongly that this should be the preferred option.

Yours sincerely,

Susan Sharples
I welcome the Commission's further draft recommendations for Cambridge City as shown on Map B
http://www.lgbce.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/26694/Cambridge-further-draft-recommendations-map.pdf as the
boundary relating to Romsey Ward better reflects the interests and identities of the local community. Romsey has a
strong local identity and does not divide at Fairfax Road.

regards
Bernard Shaw
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alan Shepherd
Date: 28 November 2015 at 12:08:52 GMT
To: reviews@lgbce.org
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Review

Please note I do not believe that two member Divisions in Cambridgeshire are appropriate and advocate single member Divisions with an electorate of less than 10,000.

Sent from my iPad
From: Nicholas Sims-Williams
Sent: 21 November 2015 11:06
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

I write as a resident which forms part of the current Market ward. I wish to make clear my support for the revised plan (Map B) which retains the natural connection of my area with the rest of the historic city centre. The life of residents is substantially affected by decisions on licensing, parking and other city centre issues and I believe that our elected councillors will be better able to voice our views and interests if they represent the whole of the city centre rather than an area (as in Map A) which includes only a small fraction of the city centre.

Yours sincerely,
Prof. Nicholas Sims-Williams
Consultation on the proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the City of Cambridge: PROPOSED CHANGES TO MARKET WARD

I have lived and worked in Market Ward for over 40 years, and now I am retired I am quite active within the Community and attend local meetings.

Market Ward is unique amongst the City Wards in that it is centred on the Market Square and has well defined natural boundaries encompassing the historic heart of the City. The Ward is not primarily residential, since it includes the main business centre, much of the University, and many of our public open spaces.

I am very worried at the proposal that this Ward should be divided, and strongly support Map B which retains the essential integrity of the City centre. I have attended many Ward meetings where the issues to be discussed are mainly related to the inevitable problems of city centre nightlife, safety, the use of our public spaces, traffic management and parking in shopping areas, and these are very different from the more local issues of other Wards. Those of us who live in this central area share a common environment and are aware of the particular pressures relating to possible conflicts of interest. We understand the need to balance our local residential issues with the greater good of the whole City community, and I think that good decision making can come from this.

Please adopt Map B and keep the central heart of our City intact.
To whom it may concern.

As residents of Market Ward, I am writing on behalf of myself and my family, to say how strongly opposed we are to the proposed change of boundaries.

Besides being geographically coherent, lying within long established boundaries - roads, the Cam, etc - Market represents the historic and commercial centre of Cambridge and the ward shares numerous issues (positive and negative) which do not affect more outlying areas. It therefore needs to be considered as an organic whole - which it is logically - not splintered and recombined with parts of the city which have quite different problems (and advantages).

Again, across the centre, neighbours, neighbourhood associations, etc. have a long tradition of cooperating and finding solutions to local problems. Cutting across these social bonds by placing people working to deal with similar issues in different administrative areas is particularly undesirable at a time when cuts are inevitably reducing services in all directions.

We all feel that Market ward should be maintained broadly as it is, as appears in Map B.

Caroline Stone
Paul Lunde
Alexander Stone Lunde
James Stone Lunde

Sent from my iPhone
We're really happy with the new proposed boundaries for Romsey as it is now more inclusive of the community as a whole and not based on an arbitrary, tiny roundabout but rather the dividing main road of Coldham’s Lane.

Many thanks for your consideration on this matter.

With all best wishes

Marisa Sutherland-Brown
Dear Sir

I made representations in your last consultation as to the inappropriateness of changing the northern boundary line of Romsey Ward. I have been advised of this further recommendation which now keeps this boundary as is.

I heartily endorse this return to the status quo and hope your latest recommendations are the ones you will adopt at least in respect of Romsey.

Yours,

Alan Syrop

--
Dear Sir

In relation to the above, I wish to comment that the further draft recommendations are much improved in my view. Map B shows ward boundaries for Romsey Town that do not cut-off a significant part of the community on its northern edge and place it in the Abbey Ward. This maintaining of the current boundary in this respect is much to be preferred for reasons I gave in the previous consultation.

Yours faithfully

Mrs R A Syrop
Dear Sir

I am a Market Ward resident and CHAIR of Christ's Pieces Residents' Association, and I (and I know a large number of the residents' of our Association) support Map B.

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

There are strong recognisable natural boundaries around Market Ward which include the River Cam and the inner ring road. The original proposal would move the Park St 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 Rd to the railway, breaking their longstanding identity with the historic city centre.

Solving the nuisances for residents in the city centre 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 which would split the two apart

In Market Ward policy considerations for transport, policing, and 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 the Market remains intact. It works wonderfully well for all members of society.

Yours sincerely

Margaret Tait
From: Meg Tait  
Sent: 18 November 2015 11:22  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge

I am writing, as a resident of Market ward, in support of Map B, i.e. retaining Market ward.

Market is a recognisable area within Cambridge city and experiences distinct challenges, including policing, alcohol licensing and management of the city centre. I am very concerned that breaking up the long-established ward and incorporating elements into different new wards will significantly weaken the coherence of representation, planning and policy in these important areas.

I very much hope that the Council will think again and maintain Market ward.

With good wishes,

Meg Tait
-----Original Message-----
From: Mifune Tsuji
Sent: 29 November 2015 12:04
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Consultation on proposed Cambridgeshire County Council divisions in the city of Cambridge:

Dear Sir,

I am a Market resident and I support Map B.

Sincerely Yours,

Mifune Tsuji
Dear Commission,

I have reviewed the draft recommendation map for new divisions of Cambridge, and the subsequent further draft recommendation map with particular attention to Petersfield.

The first suggestion would wipe out Petersfield as an electoral division, dividing it in two down Mill Road. The further suggestion retains Petersfield as an electoral ward, focussed on Mill Road with all its historic connotations as cultural and commercial heart of the ward.

I write to support strongly the "further draft recommendation" and retain Petersfield as an entity. Please take note of this when decisions are made. Thank you.

Peter Varey
Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object of the proposal to eliminate Market Ward. Getting rid of market ward as a demarcated electoral boundary kind of makes a mockery of the idea that it's an historic "market" town with Midsummer Common at the Heart where markets are held!

Sincerely,
Michael Villaverde
Dear Sir or Madam,

I am so pleased that the LGBCE has produced a second draft regarding the movement of part of Romsey to Abbey Ward. I understand that they are keen to know which draft the constituents prefer.

I have lived in Romsey for 53 years having moved there when I was 27 years old. I soon discovered that the community spirit was second to none, that is my main reason for preference to the second draft. The thought of moving my part of Romsey to Abbey Ward is unthinkable to me.

Therefore I beg you to reconsider the initial decision and go with the second draft and keep Romsey as it has always been, united and strong.

Yours faithfully,

Keith Wakefield

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to give you my feedback on the electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council.

I was very unhappy with Map A: The Commission’s draft recommendations for Cambridge city. I am a resident in the Romsey area of Cambridge. Map A would move me from Romsey division to Barnwell division. This made no logical sense to me - it would remove me from my local community and leave me isolated by over a mile from the rest of the proposed Barnwell division. I feel that I could not be sufficiently represented in local issues when separated from the rest of my electoral division by a common and a railway line - such geographic obstacles give a sense of overwhelming isolation. It is obvious that local issues in the rest of the proposed Barnwell division would not be the same local issues.

I am very happy with Map B: The Commission’s further draft recommendations for Cambridge city. I feel that this proposal better represents my needs and preserves the sense of local community in my street.

I also feel that the removal of St Matthew’s division and St Paul’s division in order to create a Market division and a Petersfield division will promote a better sense of community within the city centre too. Splitting the central business district in two and including suburbs in each division just doesn’t seem sensible and I feel that it is unlikely to lead to adequate representation of everyone within those districts. One representative for the city centre and one for the suburban area makes more sense intuitively.

I would like to thank you for allowing me to submit my thoughts and feelings on this matter.

Sincerely,
Matthew Wilcock
I would be horrified if my address no longer was seen as part of Romsey where I have lived for so long!
Dear Sir or Madam,

We are grateful that our concerns about the boundary change which would have cut the established community in Romsey in two parts and would have put us to Abbey has been taken seriously and is now reflected in the further draft.

Coldhams common is a meeting point but ultimately a natural boundary between Abbey and Romsey that should be honoured as such.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Daniel Wunderlich