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Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Vladimir Oka

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Trumpington and Queen Edith's are different: we don’t use the same shops, schools or churches. The new division would be a muddle, different to the City Council voting ward, with two MPs and police teams. It would have 16,000 people - a lot, even for two councillors. These wards do not need joining together. A line down the middle of Hills Road would make much more sense.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

As a resident that will be effected by the proposed move from Coleridge Ward to Queen Edith’s Ward, I would like to state my preference to move to Queen Edith’s for the following reasons:

My wife runs a Brownie group in Queen Edith ward and we use the pub and shops in Queen Edith’s Ward.

For recreational walks, we use Nightingale Rec which is in Queen Edith’s

However, we have little in common with the Coleridge ward which seems like a different community.

Best Regards

Andrew Olive
I am very concerned about and opposed to the breaking up of our community here in Cambridge. While I would remain in Petersfield Ward, we would lose neighbouring streets to Abbey Ward. This would, among other things, seriously affect our parking rights. Those living much further out would be able to park in nearby streets, where we often have to park because of pressure in our streets. We would lose those rights and the pressure on streets here would be enormous. Aside from parking, we share common interests here near the centre of Cambridge which are different from those of much of Abbey Ward which stretches much further out.

I would also like to express my frustration that these changes have been sprung on us with so little time to confer and oppose the plans.

Jane O'Neill
Dear Mr Buck,

I wish to provide additional views on the shape of my division in the future.

In order for some of the streets to be retained in Petersfield, I propose that some housing currently in Market should go into Abbey.

This housing on the old Brunswick School, off Newmarket Road, namely the following streets: Kingsley Walk, Brunswick House, and Evening Court, would have more of a legitimate sensible physical contact with Abbey as they are on the same side of the road and they all have 'through access' via Midsummer Common to Stourbridge Common and the River.

The ward of Abbey has open space already ** and they would not naturally identify with St Matthew's Piece. (**They have the River, Stourbridge Common and Coldham's Common.)

I would also suggest that the roads which come off New Street, ie Occupation Road, Abbey Street should be in Abbey.

On the other side of New Street the boundary between Petersfield and Abbey could go from the corner of York Street and join the existing proposed boundary.

This would mean that that whole block of housing including the top end of York Street and St Matthew's Gardens would be in Abbey.

Petersfield is a well defined area, delineated by roads and the railway. Electors consequently identify strongly with the area. They also relate to the only green space in the area, namely St Matthews Piece. This space was given to the people of Petersfield for perpetuity, for Rest and Recreation.

The Piece is the heart of the Petersfield Community.

I should therefore like to propose that St Matthew's Piece remains in Petersfield. People regularly use this space.

P.A.C.T. have held events there.

We (P.A.C.T.) have a Noticeboard for Communication on the Piece. It acts as a focal point for the Community.

The way that the proposed boundary has been drawn is meandering nonsensical and it carves up the area in a brutal way.

The front of my house is in Upper Gwydir Street, in Petersfield, and the back of my house is in Abbey!.

I suggest that the following streets remain in Petersfield: Abbey Walk, Fairsford Place, Young Street, Petworth Street, Geldart Street (which has the Vicarage in it), Vicarage Terrace, Edward Street and not forgetting Upper Gwydir Street!.

I also think that the Church on St Matthew's Street (St Matthew's Church) should remain in Petersfield. This acts as our Polling Station and again, people see it as the church for Petersfield.

I do hope that these comments will be taken into account.

Please can you keep me informed of further developments.

Yours Sincerely,
> Dear Ms Owles,
>
> Further to my email in March, I can announce that we have today
> published our new draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire County
> Council. I have attached a link below.
>
> https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambri
dgeshire-county-council
>
> Should you wish us to regard your previous complaint as a formal
> submission of views, I would be grateful if you could notify me of this.
> We will then publish on our website and take it into account as we
> develop our final recommendations. Moreover, should you wish to
> provide additional views on the shape of your divisions in the future,
> we would welcome any further comments and alternative division
> patterns during this consultation.
>
> I look forward to hearing back from you.
>
> Should you have any further questions on the review, please do not
> hesitate to contact me.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> Richard Buck
> Review Manager
> LGBCE
> 14th Floor Millbank Tower
> London SW1P 4QP
> 0330 500 1271
>

> How are we doing? Click here to give us your views.
>
> ------Original Message-----
> From: Buck, Richard
> Sent: 24 March 2016 15:02
> To:
> Subject: RE: Petersfield Ward
>
> Dear Ms Owles,
>
> We recently wrote to you to inform you that the Commission would be
> considering the issues you raised in your complaint regarding the
> electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council.
>
> At its meeting on 15 March, the Commission acknowledged that, despite
> following the statutory procedure governing reviews and its own
> guidance, some residents and groups could feel that there had been
> insufficient opportunity for their views to be communicated during the
> consultation process. Accordingly, the Commission has agreed to hold a
Dear Boundary Commission,

You have already received a large number of objections to this proposed merger. I endorse these objections - this would be a clumsy development out of line with both the constituency boundaries for MPs and the Police and City Council arrangements.

16,000 people is the current estimate for the size of this new ward - and likely to grow with the increased population in what is effectively a new town of Great Kneighton. Please consider that Trumpington is a far bigger entity in 2016 than when it was a village assigned councillors in previous re-organisations. There are also major developments along Long Road between the current Queen Edith's Ward and Trumpington itself which distorts the numbers of voters.

Yours sincerely,

John Parry
Given our close association with Eaton Socon and Duloe, both being west of the river, I strongly object to the Milton Avenue Estate, Chrosshall Road and Savilles Close being hived off to another electoral area. Leave well alone. Don Pateman Eaton Ford, St. Neots.
Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to raise a strong objection to the proposed boundary change to Petersfield Ward in Cambridge, which would have the effect of splitting a long-established and settled community in two. Even as relative newcomers to Cambridge (12 years), it has become clear to my wife and myself that Petersfield has a clear identity as a part of urban Cambridge, with its own highly successful primary school, community church and Cherry Trees day centre for elderly people. We are hoping too that the changes being made to the Howard Mallet Centre and surrounding St Matthew's Piece will add to the community's facilities, including much-need green space.

St Matthew's also has its own resident's association (Petersfield Area Community Trust) and a number of local events are organised in the ward. The proposed boundary change would have a severe negative effect on all of this.

As residents of St. Matthew's Gardens my wife and I would be 'relocated' to Abbey Ward, with which we have no affinity. We understand that the proposed changed are to balance the population numbers in each ward, but we are not convinced that the numbers make this necessary.

We hope very much that you will reconsider the changes in light of the above.

Yours faithfully,

Richard and Penny Peoples
Dear Sir,

I am a resident of Eaton Ford, St Neots. I wish Eaton ford to remain intact and NOT be combined with Priory and Paxton, because we have our own identity with community association, church, schools and shops.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Frances M Peppiatt
Dear Sir,

I am a resident of Eaton Ford, St Neots. I wish Eaton ford to remain intact and NOT be combined with Priory and Paxton, because we have our own identity with community association, church, schools and shops.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Roger Peppiatt
I would like to object strongly to the change of boundaries with Petersfield/Abbay. Our community already has serious difficulties with parking daily, and worse at weekends, despite our residents’ permits. To increase numbers allowed to park in our area will create chaos.

Jacqueline M. Pettit
From: Helen Phillips
Sent: 13 June 2016 17:18
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Proposed Boundary Changes

To: The Review Officer (Cambridgeshire), LGBC for England

From: Helen Phillips

I understand that the Boundary Commission are proposing to change the boundaries between the Wards of Petersfield and Abbey in Cambridge. I am writing to object to this proposal as a longstanding resident where I have lived in since 1983.

Petersfield Ward enjoys a strong sense of community, and for me, this has been especially evident in the St Matthew's neighbourhood where I live. This identity has been built up over the past 40 years as we have benefitted from having our own community Association – PACT –, and local Councillors who know our area and serve us well, in addition to a local primary school and many other neighbourhood facilities.

I simply cannot understand why you are proposing to divide our community in half by moving lots of current residents into Abbey Ward, when the latest figures for in 2016 show that Petersfield Ward has 1,330 fewer voters than Abbey Ward. This does not make any sense if your stated aim is to even up the number of voters in each area, and it will have a really negative impact on our neighbourhood.

I strongly urge you to leave the current Ward boundaries as they stand.

Helen Phillips

13th June 2016
I would like to voice my concern and object to the proposed boundary change of Petersfield Ward to incorporate part of it in Abbey Ward. Petersfield has a thriving community and is a cohesive social group which relies on it's identity as Petersfield. Breaking up the ward by joining parts of it to Abbey Ward would be detrimental to the community and I strongly object to this as do many of my neighbour's within the Petersfield community.

Amanda Pyatt

Sent from my iPad
I am writing to object to the proposed boundary change which will cut our community in half. It makes no sense either in terms of geography or in terms of the number of currently registered voters. Please reconsider.

Rosemary Randall
Cambridgeshire County Council electoral review

I am re-submitting the attached proposed modifications to the eastern end of the Trumpington & Queen Edith's division, as I feel they may have been too minor to have been taken into consideration. However, they have considerable local support and will have a positive impact on electoral quality. The net effect is to swap areas between Cherry Hinton and Trumpington & Queen Edith's, resulting in electoral variations closer to 0% for both divisions.

With best regards

Chris Rand
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.

(Above) Allocating the red area to Queen Edith’s & Trumpington would give a more consistent treatment for Cherry Hinton Road’s western and eastern halves

(Left) Comment from resident of Carrick Close, on Queen Edith’s Online blog, May 2015
http://queen-ediths.co.uk/cambridge-planning/proposal-to-radically-re-shape-queen-ediths-put-forward/
2 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 Queen Edith’s Way, on Queen Edith’s Online blog, May 2015
http://queen-ediths.co.uk/cambridge-planning/proposal-to-radically-re-shape-queen-ediths-put-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)
Hello

I am mailing to object to the plans to merge Queen Edith's ward with Trumpington ward in Cambridge. The two areas have separate identities, with their own shops, schools and churches and are very geographically separate. A new ward would be huge, about 16,000 people, and growing due to expansion within the Green Belt. This is a lot of people, even for 2 councillors.

The proposed new division would be confusing for residents. It would not only be different to the City Council voting ward, but also have 2 MPs and Police teams.

It would be far better to keep these wards separate along the long established line of Hills Road which follows the path approx of the Roman Via Devana.

Thank you

Sheila Redhead
Hi Alex, can I chat to see how to treat this?
Karen

-----Original Message-----
From: Diane Redmond
Sent: 24 May 2016 13:15
Subject: boundary changes

I am fiercely against the proposed boundary changes which directly effect Geldart Street where I live. I am not part of ABBEY and don’t wish to be for all the reasons specified in your letter. This is a piece of bureaucratic rubbish which has angered the well established Petersfield community.
Yours
Diane Redmond
From: Amanda redshaw
Sent: 14 June 2016 19:40
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Commission consultation

Dear Sir/Madam,

In considering boundaries, it is essential that they make sense in community terms - such as the boundary between Romsey and Abbey using the natural boundary across Coldhams Common so that the northern part of Romsey remains part of that community. I believe that the recommendations made by the Commission in February are better than those they made previously because they respected community links much better.

I ask you to consider this approach again in making the final decision on this.

Regards

Anthony Redshaw
Dear Sirs

I am writing to formally register my objection to the plan to remove Milton Avenue Estate, Crosshall Road and Saviles Close from the Eatons and to make these areas part of Little Paxton and Priory Park.

We were one of the very first families to move to Milton Avenue in 1970 and have lived in the same house ever since. We brought up our three children here and have always enjoyed the community feeling of Eaton Ford. Whilst close to St Neots, even through the development of the area we have seen over our 46 years as residents, Eaton Ford has retained its own identity. Quite rightly, we have our own District Councillor, Community Association, Church, Schools, and Shops. Eaton Ford has a very clear and distinct community identity.

The idea to ‘dump’ us in with these other totally separate areas is simply ridiculous and quite insulting to us as residents. We consider Little Paxton and Priory Park to be quite remote to us here in Eaton Ford. Geographically they are at the opposite side of St Neots completely. There could be no community spirit within such a spread out area. How can it possibly be acceptable to expect us to lie down and accept this preposterous suggestion!

My Husband of 60 years sadly passed away in February 2015. He would have been horrified at this proposal and would most definitely have put pen to paper to object in the strongest terms. My three children are also appalled, but presumably cannot object themselves as they do not live in this house.

I think you can tell from what I have said, I am genuinely very upset at this proposal. I trust that the opinions of residents will be taken seriously and hope that ultimately the removal of us from Eaton Ford will not be allowed.

Yours faithfully
Jean Riddy (Mrs)

Sent from Jayne’s iPad
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Robert Nicholls  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am writing to state I agree with the recommendations for Shepreth to now belong to the Duxford Division.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
19 June 2016

Dear Sir,

Having looked at your final draft of boundary proposals for Soham, I disagree with what you propose.

Soham is the second largest town in East Canbridgeshire after Ely and as such needs its own councillors. It makes no sense to group Soham North with Littleport - these two settlements have little in common and unlike Soham and Fordham Soham and littleport do not have close ties such as shared schools etc.

Soham has a large enough population to warrant its own councillor or councillors.

I would prefer to see the current Soham North and Soham South wards combined and made into one ward with one councillor, with the surrounding villages being combined in another ward with their own councillor

Yours faithfully

M R Rose
Dear Sir

I wish to express my concerns regarding the proposed plans to reduce the number of County Councillors. Whilst I appreciate the need to reduce the numbers, I have grave doubts about the wisdom of splitting a village in half with all the additional bureaucracy this would cause. Both our Parish Council and our councillor, Lorna Dupre have expressed their concerns but these appear to be being ignored. Sutton is a village that has a strong sense of community, with individuals supporting the various different groups within it. As a newcomer to the village, this has been one of the things that impressed me and made me feel part of the community.

County councillor Maurice Leeke has made what I consider to be a sensible proposal that keeps the whole of Sutton together in one county council area, with the villages it is already connected with, and simply adds on Witchford and Wentworth. Overall this proposal gives the Commission the eight county councillors for East Cambridgeshire that the Commission wants; it doesn’t split any parishes at all; and it respects Sutton’s community identity and keeps it together. It gives us one county councillor to represent the whole village.

This would seem to be the perfect solution and I appeal to the Commission to accept Mr Leake’s suggestion. I look forward to reading your response.

Yours faithfully

Hilary C Sanderson (Mrs)
Dear Sir/Madam

Please be advised we do NOT support the proposed changes as far as the concern Sutton parish. We see no logic behind the proposal to split our small village between two county councillors and link us with other villages, or parts of other villages, which are not in our immediate vicinity.

We believe Sutton should continue to be linked with the other local parishes we have historically been represented with by one councillor plus Witchford and Wentworth. This achieves the size the commission is looking for without splitting our village in two.

Regards

Irene & Terry
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Jeremy Schwartzentruber
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I object to Queen Edith's and Trumpington being merged into a single voting division. I feel that Queen Edith's has more in common with Cherry Hinton than with Trumpington. Moreover, the Trumpington area is growing rapidly and has many new developments, which would add to the large number of people in a merged Queen Ediths/Trumpington district. I suggest a line down Hills Road as a division, as proposed by Lib Dem councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
This new boundary will be cutting our community in two ....Please reconsider leaving it where it is and leaving our community in tact.

With thanks
Glenys Self
From: Alan Shepherd
Sent: 14 June 2016 15:46
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Review of the Electoral Division boundaries for the County of Cambridgeshire

From: Alan Shepherd,

I submit the following observations.

1) I broadly support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 by 6 effectively reducing the number to 63. However it must be recognised that this action will increase the number of electors to councillors presenting an potential extra work burden per councillor.

2) I maintain that it is essential that councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions. This is necessary to maintain the best contact means between councillors and electors.

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

4) EC-8 & EC-9 I agree that the village of Lode should be moved from Wodditton and placed in Burwell. This gives a better balance.
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Shepherd
E-mail: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I cannot see any affinity between Trumpington and Queen Ediths - why on earth should these two be combined? Local elections are for local councillors who should be within easy walking distance of their electorate for urban constituencies. It seems pretty obvious that this is not the case for Trumpington and Queen Edith’s... It is a massive, broad sprawl across South Cambridge.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Sims
E-mail: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I believe that combining the Queen Edith's and Trumpington divisions will result in less accountability of appointed councillors. It will diminish the local knowledge of councillors and mean that the workload of those appointed is unmanageable given the proposed size of the division. Local councillors have done an amazing job over the last many years for very little reward; it is inconceivable that the service that we would receive under the proposed plans would be an improvement.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: James SW
Sent: 20 June 2016 20:34
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Cambridge Abbey/Petersfield Division objection

Dear Sir/Madam

We object to the movement south of the boundary between Abbey and Petersfield in Cambridge. This is because we live on the boundary but have much more affinity with the people of Petersfield.

This task must be a difficult one as it seems more about voter numbers than the real identifies of the people in these communities.

We share more interests and activities with the people of the Petersfield area and our children enjoy the parks and public realm of the area running up to Mill Road.

The logical location of the boundary between these two wards should be Newmarket Road. This makes sense both from physical and a community spirit perspective. The boundary has already been moved southwards once in the past and we really don't want it moved further.

Our Councillors say that the numbers also no longer stack up due to the rapid growth of new developments in Abbey.

Please double check your figures and do what you can to keep this community together.

Yours faithfully

James and Rebecca Sims Williams

--

James
Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to express my objection to the Petersfield boundary change. I have lived in Petersfield for 20 years and feel strongly that the community should not be broken up. We live on Sturton Street and splitting it into two wards does not make any sense. We attend St Matthews church and this is very much part of our community. It would be very strange for our local church to be changed to being in a different ward. This is our community and we see it as one neighbourhood.

Please reconsider.

Kind regards,
Dr Caroline Sivasundaram

From Sujit’s iPad
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Catherine Smart
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The Local Government Boundary Commissioners - Cambridgeshire Consultation. As a resident and former City Councillor for Romsey ward, I wish to comment on the proposals for the boundaries for the County divisions in Cambridge. Firstly, I would like my previous comments to be taken into account. In particular, I welcomed the northern boundary of Romsey with Abbey being on the natural boundary of Coldhams Common and the railway line. Secondly, I believe the proposals made in February are much better than the ones proposed earlier in the process in that they respect natural boundaries and keep settled communities together much better. As well as the Romsey/Abbey boundary, the February proposals keep the city centre together. However the line that has been drawn between Abbey and Petersfield is not very satisfactory but it could be improved if Edward Street, Upper Gwydir Street, Norfolk Street and St Matthew’s Street south of Vicarage Terrace remained in Petersfield. There is no natural break in the area but this would be less divisive of the community. Likewise, a minor change on the division between Newnham and castle would improve community coherence. The proposed boundary in the vicinity of the east-west section of Storey’s Way was placed at the rear of the gardens of the houses on the south side of that road. As many of them are now owned by Churchill College and occupied by its members that part of the boundary should run along the centre of the east-west section of Storey’s Way. It has no houses on the north side. Thirdly, the most unsatisfactory aspect of the February proposals is the double member division which, I believe, breaks one of your criteria. After all, one of the questions you suggest we should ask is “are any of the proposed divisions too large or too small to be represented effectively?” Without a doubt, the answer to double member divisions is always “yes, too large”. I therefore object to the two member ward of Queen Ediths and Trumpington. It would be an impossible position if the City ward boundaries followed this line so it will have to be resolved then - so why not now? There are several ways that the split could be made but the one devised by County Councillor Maurice Leeke looks perfectly satisfactory. I would like, therefore, to endorse Cllr Leeks’s suggestion of making two separate divisions from the suggested double member division of Queen Ediths and Trumpington.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Teresa Smith
E-mail: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I agree with the new boundary change. I know our current County Councillor has said in our Parish Council meetings that we should remain in with Meldreth, but I disagree with her statement. Some of the village children from Shepreth go to Barrington school, but most attend at Foxton due to parental choice. Our parish church is linked in with Foxton, Fowlmere and Thriplow so there are close links there too. When Shepreth has any issues that conflict with Meldreth or Melbourn we are sidelined in the favour of Meldreth and Melbourn. I think the new ward will be fairer to all. The Links with Foxton and Fowlmere are far stronger for Shepreth than links with Meldreth and Melbourn. Melbourn has a village college which some senior school age children from the village attend, however some children attend Bassingbourn and Sawston and also St Bedes in Cambridge. A high number of our village senior school age children attend Private schools in Cambridge. I think the boundary commission has thought these changes out well and has taken constituents views into consideration when drawing up these new boundary changes in the previous consultation. The only reason I found out about this consultation was through the South Cambs District Council magazine. Little has been said by our Local members other than they could lose their positions. I think that speaks volumes. I am personally tired with the lack of choice for local government and I totally agree with the new boundary proposed for my home village.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Boundary Commission,

may I object to the pondered break-up of the Petersfield Ward by moving my residence into Abbey Ward. This will have negative consequences for the community spirit in Petersfield. My understanding is that the consideration of break-up is based on shaky statistics.

Best wishes - Volker Sommer

Prof Volker Sommer
Dear Sirs

I object to the proposed changes to the boundaries in my street.

I have lived here for more than twenty years and see no need to change anything.

Cambridge is full of building sites so are you suggesting we change everything every time a new block of flats is built?

Petersfield is local community, not just a locality, and that should be a matter for consideration rather than simply an arbitrary line on a a constantly changing map.

Yours

Charles Southall
How are we doing? Click here to give us your views.

-----Original Message-----
From: wendy sporle
Sent: 18 May 2016 17:23
To: Buck, Richard <richard.buck@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: CCC boundary

Dear Sir,
David Harty showed contempt for Eaton Ford by not signing the papers last year, bearing in mind he lives in the Eatons, he now wishes to lump us with Priory Ward, we have always been split from them by River Ouse, why should we change?
Barry Sporle

Sent from my iPad
Dear sirs,
I am writing to object about the current position of CCC trying to hive off the Milton Ave. Crosshall red and savilles close and put us with Priory district. I have lived here over 40 years and this is despicable, we are a community on our own.
Wendy Sporle

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir

I am writing to express dismay at the proposed split of St Matthew’s neighbourhood from Petersfield Ward in Cambridge. The proposal seems to make very little sense in terms of the numbers of voters: although I am always in favour of fair ward boundaries, the published numbers do not justify this change. More importantly, the proposal would have the effect of dividing and weakening our community: I and my family worked very closely with PACT in improving our shared community; the proposed changes will only weaken our community voice and work.

I very much hope these proposals will *not* be accepted: they’ve been drawn up without due thought or consultation, and they would have a devastating effect on our precious community life.

Yours faithfully,
Michael Squire

Dr Michael Squire
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Sarah Squire
E-mail: 
Organisation Name: retired private citizen

Comment text:

I write from I am very concerned about the prosed mega division of a merged trumpington and Queen ediths. South Cambridge is growing at a furious rate - but even without this growth the proposed new division would be far too large to foster the sort of local knowledge and connection that we need and expect in our locally elected political representatives.
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Personal Details:

Name: Morna Stacey

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

The proposal to combine the Trumpington ward with Queen Edith’s would make an absurdly large ward. The two areas are also very different in character. Bigger is not always better, and I can see no advantage in bringing the two together.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Commission

The idea of splitting SUTTON into two halves to be divided between 2 councillors is ridiculous. Sutton is a strong community minded village and does not need the division which was rejected last year. Why is this unpopular proposal reading its head again?

Please accept this email as my objection to this proposal. Could you also advise me on the reasons behind it, and what public consultation you are carrying out.

Thanks

COLIN STEVENS
Hello

I live in Sutton and the village has a strong sense of community.

I feel cutting Sutton up i.e. having two Councillors, would harm the sense of community we feel in Sutton.

Please do not let this happen.

Your Sincerely,

Mrs Sharon Stone

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to register my strong objections to streets in St. Matthews neighbourhood being moved to Abbey Ward.

1. This would break up a community which has been together for over 40 years.

2. This would waste a lot of money for no good reason.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Stringer


Everything you want's a dream away. Under this pressure under this weight we are diamonds taking shape. (Coldplay)
I am writing to oppose the proposal to move my road, Lichfield Road, into Queen Edith's ward for County Council elections. This last-minute proposal has every appearance of a quick fix and we have had no proper consultation. As a resident of Lichfield Road, I do not use the same schools, shops, parks or community facilities as the majority of those in Queen Edith's ward. Queen Edith's residents do not share our concerns about HMOs or commuter parking.

Hilary Sutton.
Dear Sir or Madam

I live in Sutton in the Isle, and wish to register my protest at the proposal that the village I live in will be cut in half by the proposed changes to the electoral boundaries. The village has a strong community spirit, with a strong local ethos, and I believe this would be damaged by being represented by different county councillors, or indeed, district councillors. I also understand that Sutton Parish Council is against this measure, and I support them fully.

I agree with the submission from county councillor Maurice Leeke. This proposal keeps the whole of Sutton together in one county council area, with the villages it is already connected with – and just adds on Witchford and Wentworth. Overall this proposal gives the Commission the eight county councillors for East Cambridgeshire that the Commission wants; it doesn’t split any parishes at all; and it respects Sutton’s community identity and keeps it together.

It gives us one county councillor to represent the whole village. Lorna Dupre has only been a county councillor a short time, but she listens to the local people and she has listened to me when I have raised local Sutton concerns. She should be allowed to do her job effectively, and the best way to achieve this is not to divide her excellent work with another councillor, twice the councillors = four times the discussion (or worse!)

Thank you

Mary Sutton (Mrs)

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Jean Swanson
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I continue to be very concerned about the proposed double division of Queen Edith’s and Trumpington. I understand that Trumpington is not large enough to stand alone but if Hills Road is divided down the middle, possibly including Babraham Road it might work, as that was the situation some years ago. Worts Causeway needs to stay within Queen Edith’s, which your first proposal did not allow for. Trumpington is growing all the time so will soon be able to stand alone. A huge double division like this is very difficult for councillors to manage and reduces any sense of community. The two areas use completely different shops, churches and schools and do not share an identity. There are two constituencies involved, which again affects identity. I fear it could alienate voters and reduce the benefits of local democracy. This Boundary Review has taken so long that the selection of candidates for next year’s County Council election could be seriously affected with uncertainty across the whole county. As the Government have also introduced the idea of devolution for the Eastern Region I suggest this review is suspended until after the County Council elections in 2017, so keeping the existing divisions and allowing the devolution proposals to be clarified. Starting the process again in 2017 could lead to a more effective outcome.
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