

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 63

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 63

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SOUTH
CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT IN THE COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of South Cambridgeshire in accordance with the requirements of section 63 and schedule 9 to the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements of that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 13 May 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the South Cambridgeshire District Council, copies of which were circulated to the Cambridgeshire County Council, Parish Councils in the District, or the Chairman of the Parish Meeting where the parish has no council, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and to the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. The South Cambridgeshire District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish

details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. On 24 September 1974 the South Cambridgeshire District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. In accordance with section 7(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, they had exercised an option for elections by thirds and they proposed to divide the area of the district into 41 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a council of 55.

5. We considered the draft scheme submitted by the Council together with the comments which had been made upon it. We noted that the draft scheme complied with the rules in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and our own guidelines but were unhappy about the council's proposed Ickleton ward since it comprised parishes which were not contiguous. We, therefore, proposed that the ward should be split, the parishes of Ickleton and Hinxton being added to the proposed Duxford ward and the parishes of Heydon and Great and Little Chishill to the proposed Melbourn ward. In order to achieve a more even standard of representation between the council's proposed Cottenham and Willingham wards we decided to transfer the parish of Rampton from the former to the latter and to increase the representation of the Willingham ward to 2 councillors. Finally we decided to adopt a suggestion that the council's proposed Barrington ward should be re-named "Barrington and Shepreth". We formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

6. On 4 November 1974 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us not later than 20 December 1974.

7. There was a considerable response to our draft proposals, including comments which supported the idea that Willingham parish, by itself should constitute a single-member ward and that Cottenham and Rampton parishes should be combined to form a two-member ward.

8. Comments were also received which suggested that Melbourn parish be placed on its own as a two-member ward, that Duxford parish also be on its own as a single-member ward, and that the parishes of Great and Little Chishill, Heydon, Ickleton and Hinxton be combined in a single-member ward to be called Ickleton.

9. Concerning the Gamlingay ward, it was suggested that the parish of Gamlingay should become a single-member ward and that the parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Little Gransden, Hatley and Tadlow, be combined in a single-member ward.

10. It was suggested that the parish of Pampisford be detached from Great Abington, Babraham and Little Abington and added to the proposed three-member Sawston ward.

11. Opposition was received to our proposals under section 7(7)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 for the order of retirement of councillors. We had proposed that in wards represented by 2 councillors each councillor should retire in separate years. There was a further suggestion that in a 2-member ward both councillors should be elected in the same year, the order of retirement to be modified so that one third of the whole council would retire each year.

12. We felt, in view of the comments received, that we were unable to proceed to our final proposals without further information. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act, and at our request you appointed Mr R E Millard CBE as Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting.

13. Notice of the local meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally on notice boards and in the local press.

14. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at South Cambridgeshire District Council offices at Great Eastern House, Cambridge on 12 March 1975 and visited the areas which were the subject of comment. A copy of his report is attached at schedule 1 for your information.

15. In the light of the discussion at that meeting and of his inspection of those areas concerned, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the parish of Willingham should be a single-member ward on its own, and that the parishes of Cottenham and Rampton should be combined to form a two-member ward, to be called Cottenham, and that the parishes of Melbourn and Duxford should each form separate wards, returning two members and one member respectively and that the parishes of Ickleton, Hinxton, Heydon and Great and Little Chishill should be combined to form a single-member ward, to be called Ickleton. He also recommended that the parish of Gamlingay should form a single-member ward on its own and that the parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Little Gransden, Hatley and Tadlow should be combined to form a single-member ward, to be called Arrington. He had sympathy with the suggestion that each member in a two-member ward should be elected in different years, but made no recommendation except that the Commission might give the matter further consideration.

16. During the course of the meeting the Clerk of Bar Hill Parish Council appeared before Mr Millard to object to our proposal that the parish be linked in a 2-member ward with the parishes of Oakington and Westwick. The parish had not made written representations about our draft proposals but they had previously written on the same point in relation to the district council's scheme, and Mr Millard agreed to listen to their case. After due consideration however he decided not to recommend any change in our proposed arrangements for this area.

17. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded^{that}/the alterations recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted. We noted his remarks about the order of retirement of councillors. The 1972 Act requires that, where an option has been exercised for retirement by thirds, each 3-member ward should have an election in each of 3 years. In view of this provision, we took the view that it is within the intentions of that Act that, if a ward has 2 members, an election should be held in 2 out of the 3 years. Subject to the adoption of the Assistant Commissioner's recommendations, we therefore confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

18. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each ward. Schedule 3 shows our proposals for the order of retirement of councillors for the wards we propose, indicating those wards where the parish council elections will need to be held in years other than the ordinary year of parish council elections if expenses are to be shared with a district council election. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the map.

PUBLICATION

19. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report together with a copy of the map, is being sent to South Cambridgeshire District Council and will be made available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without the map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the map, is set out in Schedule 4 to this report.

L.S.

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R. SMITH (Secretary)

12 June 1975

TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

1. I have to report that on the 12 March 1975, I held the local meeting to hear representations about the Commission's draft proposals for the electoral arrangements in South Cambridgeshire District. The meeting took place at the District Council's offices at Great Eastern House, Cambridge.
2. The names and addresses of those who attended the meeting, and of the interests they represented, are contained in Appendix 1 to this report.
3. The Commission's draft proposals for the electoral arrangements for the District are set out in Appendix 2, with the detailed composition of the proposed wards in Annex A and the suggested order of retirement in Annex B.
4. The great majority of the Commission's draft proposals, which were largely the same as those of the District Council, evoked no objection either in writing beforehand or orally at the local meeting, and may be taken to be generally acceptable. Those to which objection was raised are considered in detail in the following paragraphs. Almost all those who appeared and spoke at the meeting had submitted written representation but these are not specifically referred to as their substance was repeated orally. Reference is however made to the contents of the written representations of those who did not appear.
5. It is perhaps worth making a general preliminary point about the ratio of electors to the number of councillors which Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972 requires to be the same, as nearly as may be, in every ward of a district. Section 78(2) requires this and the other rules in the Schedule to be complied with "as far as is reasonably practicable". The Schedule also requires that an unwarded parish shall not be split between wards of the district. South Cambridgeshire, with its very large tracts of sparsely populated countryside,

and few if any warded parishes, is an area where strict compliance with the ratio rule is often not "reasonably practicable", as indeed the figures for the Commission's own draft proposals illustrate.

A. COTTENHAM AND WILLINGHAM WARDS

The Commission's draft proposals provide for the parishes of Willingham and Rampton to be combined in a two-member ward and for the parish of Cottenham to constitute a two-member ward on its own. The District Council's draft scheme provided for Willingham by itself to constitute a single-member ward and for Cottenham and Rampton to be combined to form a two-member ward.

The statistics of the two proposals are as follows:-

Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>1974</u>		<u>1979</u>	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Willingham (with Rampton)	2	2166	1.78	2390	1.75
Cottenham	2	2755	2.24	2970	2.17

District Council's Draft Scheme

Willingham	1	1915	1.57	2130	1.56
Cottenham (with Rampton)	2	3006	2.47	3230	2.36

There was a number of objections to the Commission's proposals, all of which preferred the original proposals of the District Council.

The District Council stated that the Commission's proposals ran counter to the local links, which were between Cottenham and Rampton; they strongly supported their own proposal and were satisfied that three members for the two wards was adequate:

Mr S M Wilkins, one of the existing district councillors for Cottenham and Rampton who was supported by his fellow member, Mr R C Bartingale, was strongly opposed to the Commission's proposals. He stressed the links between Cottenham and Rampton which included a joint Council of Churches; a Rampton union under the Cottenham churches; Rampton participation in the Cottenham Salvation Army

branch; Rampton children going to Cottenham schools; a Cottenham-Rampton Branch of the Royal British Legion; an over 60's club at Rampton used by Cottenham members; a mother and baby clinic for Rampton at Cottenham; a joint ploughing Society; Rampton people shopping in Cottenham and Cottenham butchers serving Rampton.

The Reverend J D Thomas, Rector of Rampton, said he had only been there six months but had found tremendous links between Rampton and Cottenham. He underlined all Mr Wilkin's points and said that it was easy to walk from Rampton to Cottenham. His Parochial Church Council (of which the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council were members) had resolved unanimously on the 11 March to ask the Commission to reconsider their proposal.

Mr E B Rose, the present district councillor for Willingham said that, while he would welcome a second Willingham member, he had every sympathy with Rampton. He thought that combining Rampton with Willingham would in practice debar Rampton from ever having their own member.

The Cambridgeshire Labour Party also opposed the Commission's proposal and supported the District Council.

The Cambridgeshire County Council took the same line and said that their provisional proposals for County electoral divisions combined Rampton with Cottenham and placed Willingham in a another division.

I visited the area. Driving from Willingham through Rampton to Cottenham, it was apparent that Rampton was much nearer to Cottenham than to Willingham. I was told that, whereas Rampton was $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles from the centre of Cottenham, it was two miles from the outskirts of Willingham and a further mile from the centre.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The objections to the Commission's proposals were impressive and no one appeared to support them. I have no doubt that there are very strong links between

Rampton and Cottenham and no similar links between Rampton and Willingham. This seems to me to be a clear case for the application of paragraph 3(3)(b) of Schedule 11 of the Act, which says that regard shall be had to any local links which a proposal might breach.

I accordingly recommend that Willingham should be a single-member ward on its own and the Cottenham and Rampton should be combined to form a two-member ward.

B. DUXFORD AND MELBOURN WARDS

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals provide for the parishes of Melbourn, Heydon and Groat and Little Chishill to be combined in a two-member ward and for the parishes of Duxford Ickleton and Hinxton to be combined in a single-member ward. The District Council's draft scheme provided for Melbourn on its own to be a two-member ward, Duxford on its own a single-member ward and the other five parishes to be combined in a single-member ward.

The statistics of the two proposals are as follows:-

Boundary Commission's Draft Proposals

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>1974</u>		<u>1979</u>	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Melbourn (including Heydon & Gt & Lt Chishill)	2	2588	2.13	3005	2.20
Duxford (including Ickleton & Hinxton)	1	1735	1.43	1950	1.43

District Council's Draft Scheme

Melbourn	2	2135	1.76	2500	1.83
Duxford	1	1114	0.92	1280	0.94
Ickleton (including Hinxton, Heydon and Gt & Lt Chishill)	1	1074	0.88	1175	0.86

There was a considerable volume of opposition to the Commission's draft proposals, and in favour of the District Councils alternative. The District Council were strongly of the opinion that the five smaller parishes have more in common with each other than with the larger parishes : there was little affinity between Melbourn and the hill villages or between Duxford and Ickleton and Hinxton. It was for this reason that the District Council's proposals, departed from the combinations of parishes which had existed only since reorganisation.

The Cambridgeshire County Council supported the District Council : the Commission's proposals also conflicted with the proposed County electoral divisions which contemplated Melbourn being in a different division from Heydon and the Chishills.

Mrs R Cannon, the present member of the District Council for Duxford, Ickleton and Hinxton, felt strongly that the two latter parishes need separate representation from Duxford; She finds that Duxford problems dominate her work. Furthermore, the inhabitants of Ickleton and Hinxton do not look towards Duxford : they mostly work locally or in London, they shop in Saffron Walden and not Duxford and, though some distance from Heydon and the Chishill, they share the same social and other problems as those villages.

Mr K C Price, Chairman of Duxford Parish Council agreed with Mr Cannon : he mentioned that, inter alia, Duxford has a large number of council houses which give the local member much time consuming work.

Mr E G Gough, a member of Ickleton Parish Council who was a former member of both the District and County Councils, also endorsed Mrs Cannon's views. He pointed out that, before reorganisation Heydon and the Chishills and Ickleton and Hinxton each had one member on the District Council.

Mr S G Harvey (who lives at Heydon) and Mr M Lupton, the two district councillors for Melbourn, Heydon and the Chishills, also supported the District Council's alternative and stressed that Melbourn was a growing village with increasing industry.

Mrs M J Shaw, the County Councillor for South Cambridgeshire No 2 Division (which includes all the relevant parishes except Melbourn), spoke strongly in favour of the District Council's alternative proposal and emphasised that this was also the view of all the district and county councillors concerned. She stressed that a large, semi-industrialised village, grouped with rural villages, can dominate the voting strength and thinking of the division; the smaller villages should not be swamped in this way. For instance, it was probable that both members could come from Melbourn, Mr Harvey, as a well-known figure, being an exception. Again, the problems of Melbourn and Duxford were such that it was an unreasonable burden on members to have to look after rural parishes as well. Heydon and the Chishills were about six miles from Melbourn. Finally the five hill villages had an identity of interest and their views should be properly represented.

The Cambridgeshire Labour Party came out strongly against the Commission's proposals and in favour of the District's. The linking of Melbourn with Heydon and the Chishills would produce a social imbalance, and Ickleton had nothing in common with Duxford. On the other hand the combination of the five villages would produce a group with almost identical backgrounds.

The only mildly conflicting views came from Mr H C Rider, a County Councillor representing an adjoining division and from the Ickleton Parish Council, who had written to the Commission but did not appear. Mr Rider stressed that excessive weight should not be given to rural representation : the Parish Council, while pressing for two members to represent Duxford, Ickleton and Hinxton, because one member was quite unable to do this, preferred a combined division, as there are "considerable family and business connections between these villages".

The impressions gained from an inspection of the area were striking : driving from Melbourn to Heydon, one crosses five miles or more of virtually uninhabited agricultural land, which underlines the remoteness of the latter from the former. Heydon and the Chishills are hill villages on the Essex-Herts border, as are

Ickleton and Hinxton : the latter two are some distance away and much nearer Duxford, although well separated from it. The area of Essex, which separates Ickleton and Heydon, is again largely uninhabited agricultural land and gives no impression of a pronounced physical break; the District Council saw it as no problem.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This is a proposal which appears logical on a map but which takes on quite a different complexion on the ground and in the light of local views. I am quite clear that Melbourn and Duxford have entirely different problems and interests from the hill villages. Although Ickleton and Hinxton are quite near to Duxford, I am satisfied, in spite of the comment of Ickleton Parish Council, that they have far more affinity with the other three hill villages. For these and the other reasons so cogently put to me, I think it is preferable to combine the five hill villages in one ward and to leave each of the larger villages as a separate ward. In view of the nature of the terrain, I do not regard the physical separation of the two parts of what would be the District Council's Ickleton ward as a fundamental objection.

I accordingly recommend that the parishes of Melbourn and Duxford should each form separate wards, the former with two members and the latter with one, and that the parishes of Ickleton, Hinxton, Heydon and Great and Little Chishill should be combined to form a third single-member ward.

C. GAMLINGAY WARD

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals and the District Council's draft scheme both provide for the parishes of Gamlingay, Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Little Gransdon, Hatley and Tadlow to be combined in a two-member ward. An alternative proposal, providing for the parish of Gamlingay to be a single-member ward and for the other six parishes to be combined in a second single-member ward, was put forward by a number of bodies and individuals.

The statistics of the two proposals are as follows:-

Boundary Commission's and District Council's Proposal

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>1974</u>		<u>1979</u>	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Gamlingay (including parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Lt Gransden, Hatley & Tadlow)	2	2807	2.31	3115	2.28
<u>Alternative Proposal</u>					
Gamlingay	1	1893	1.55	2110	1.54
Parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Lt Gransden, Hatley and Tadlow)	1	914	0.75	1005	0.73

A number of bodies and individuals appeared to support the alternative proposal and there were also several letters to the same effect from people who did not appear.

The District Council explained that the alternative proposal would retain the existing warding arrangements in this area. The Council had great sympathy with those who advocated the alternative but had felt that the guidelines in Schedule 11 of the Act, as to equality, as near as may be, in the ratio of electors to councillors in every ward, precluded them from retaining the existing arrangement. The Council accepted that Gamlingay was different in character from the rest of the proposed ward.

The Cambridgeshire County Council supported the alternative : they pointed out that the proposed county electoral divisions would divide the ward suggested by the Commission and the District Council, and that the catchment area of the village college at Gamlingay did not include a large part of the ward.

Mr D Sells, as Chairman of Tadlow Parish Meeting, strongly favoured the alternative. He said there is no link between Gamlingay and the other villages : there is no bus service linking them : and the people of Gamlingay shop in Bedford whereas those in the other villages do so in Cambridge and Royston. Mr Sells

stressed that even the type of agriculture was different : Gamlingay had market gardening on light soil, whereas the rest of the area was general agriculture on heavy Cambridge clay. He went on to point out that the needs and problems of the other villages were very different from those of Gamlingay and that the small villages need their own local champion, which they were unlikely to get as the two members selected for the proposed ward were both likely to come from Gamlingay. If it was only a problem of numbers, he suggested that Shingay should be added to the other villages, as it was before reorganisation. He also suggested that the population of Tadlow was underestimated in view of proposals for development there.

The Cambridgeshire Labour Party said they had canvassed the villages and found that there was a strong feeling that they should have their own member separate from Gamlingay.

Mr G R M Barford, for Arrington Parish Council and the Arrington and District Conservative Association, Mr P W Powles, the County Councillor for part of the area and Mr B E Newton, a resident of Arrington, supported the other speakers in favour of the alternative.

The letters whose signatories did not appear, were in common form and from residents in the smaller villages (although some did not give their addresses.) Their purport was opposition to the Commission's proposal on the ground that it was against the interests of the inhabitants and that Gamlingay was a comparatively urban area looking towards Bedford, whereas the rural villages have associations with Royston and Cambridge.

The Gamlingay Parish Council had submitted no written representations and did not appear.

I toured the area of the proposed ward. Gamlingay is near the western edge and is a substantial village with an electorate of nearly two thousand. The other seven

villages (there are two Hatleys) are tiny with electorates varying from 77 to 250 : they are widely spread in a very large, otherwise almost uninhabited, agricultural area. Distances are considerable; for instance Arrington is 6 or 7 miles from Gamlingay. Although the area is bordered by two main roads, none of these leads to Gamlingay and the roads transversing the area are minor. There is thus no impression of Gamlingay being in any way a focal point.

CONSLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I was left in no doubt after what I heard and from my inspection that there are virtually no links between Gamlingay and the rural parishes, and that it would clearly be in the interests of the inhabitants for the latter to be represented separately from Gamlingay on the District Council.

There is however the problem of the guidelines as to equality in the ratio of electors to councillors, which had inhibited the District Council from putting forward the alternative proposal in their draft scheme. If the alternative were adopted, Gamlingay would be rather under-represented, with 1 member for 1893 electorate, whereas the rural parishes would muster only 914 electors now. This would be the lowest number for any ward under the Commission's proposals but only six less than the next lowest. I nevertheless feel that the compelling considerations which I have described would justify splitting the proposed Gamlingay ward, as suggested in the alternative, even though this means establishing two wards with such dissimilar electorates. In short, this seems to be a case where strict adherence to the guidelines would hardly, in my view, be "reasonably practicable" within the meaning of Section 78(2) of the Act.

I therefore, recommend that the parish of Gamlingay should form a single-member ward on its own and that the parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Little Gransden, Hatley and Tadlow should be combined to form a separate single-member ward.

D. ABINGTON WARD

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals and the District Council's draft scheme both provide that the parishes of Great Abington and Pampisford should be combined with two other parishes to form a single-member ward. An alternative proposal, providing for the parish of Pampisford to be detached from Great Abington and the other two parishes and added to the proposed three-member Sawston ward, was put forward by the Great Abington Parish Council.

The statistics of the two proposals are as follows:

Boundary Commission's and District Council's Proposals

<u>Ward</u>	Councillors	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Sawston	3	3884	3.19	4460	3.26
Abington (including Pampisford)	1	1212	1.0	1300	0.95

Alternative Proposals

Sawston (including Pampisford)	3	4125	3.39	4725	3.45
Abington (remainder of ward)	1	971	0.80	1035	0.76

Only the Great Abington Parish Council appeared to support the alternative proposal. They contended that Pampisford is actually joined to the village of Sawston, with which it is associated in all respects, and that Pampisford has little or no association with the Abingtons. Pampisford was joined with Sawston for electoral purposes until 1973.

The District Council stated that the sole reason for combining Pampisford with Sawston was to comply with the guidelines as to equality in the ratio of electors to councillors in different wards.

The parishes of Sawston, Pampisford and Great Abington are grouped together with two other parishes in one proposed County electoral division.

No one else appeared or commented in writing on this proposal.

I did not inspect this area, as it was common ground and apparent from the map that Pampisford is virtually joined to Sawston on the ground.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is obvious merit in the contentions of the Great Abington Parish Council, but the adoption of their alternative would hardly be in accord with the guidelines as to equality in the ratio of electors to councillors in different wards. In the absence of supporting representations from Pampisford or the other parishes concerned, and of any strong reasons such as breaking local ties or those that have emerged in other cases, there seems no justification for not following the guidelines as strictly as possible in this instance.

I accordingly recommend that there should be no change in the Commission's draft proposals for combining Pampisford with Great Abington and two other parishes in one single-member ward.

E. MELDRETH AND ORWELL

The only objection to the Commission's proposals for the Meldreth and Orwell wards came from the Orwell Parish Council in their letter of the 17 December 1974 (which contained a curious reference to the Bassingbourn ward). I was told by the District Council that the objection relates solely to a tentative proposal for County electoral divisions. It had therefore been withdrawn and the Parish Council did not appear.

F. BAR HILL

The Clerk of the Bar Hill Parish Council appeared before me to object to the Commission's proposals in relation to Bar Hill. Although his Council had made no written representation about the Commission's proposals, they had written to the Commission about the District Council's draft scheme on the 23 September 1974. I accordingly allowed him to state his case.

The Commission and the District Council both proposed that the parish of Bar Hill should be included in a two-member ward with the parishes of Oakington and Westwick : the electorate in 1974 was 1783 and is expected to be 2870 by 1979.

The Parish Council objected to their parish being combined in one ward with the other two and contended that, as a completely new village, it often had unique problems and should be separately represented by one or two members on the District Council. In any case Bar Hill had no real relationship with Oakington.

The District Council while having some sympathy with Bar Hill, explained that this was an example of the usual problems, namely what should be done with Oakington and Westwick if they were not combined with Bar Hill. The other two parishes have a combined electorate of only 788, expected to rise to 890 by 1979.

Neither the Oakington nor Westwick Parish Councils made any written representations or appeared before me.

I saw both Bar Hill and Oakington, which is a mile or two distant. Bar Hill is in fact an entirely new, compact village built within the last ten years or so.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There would be obvious merit in Bar Hill being separately represented, but it would be rather small for one member now and would not rate two members in 1979.

Oakington and Westwick by themselves would, however, be too small to constitute a single ward and could not readily be combined with any other parishes. As neither of them has objected to being linked with their larger neighbour, there seems to be no justification for altering the Commission's draft proposals.

I accordingly recommend that there should be no change in the Commission's draft proposals for combining the parishes of Bar Hill, Oakington and Westwick in one two-member ward.

G. ORDER OF RETIREMENT OF COUNCILLORS

The Commission's draft proposals include a table of the suggested order of retirement of councillors which provides that wards represented by more than one councillor should elect one councillor at a time in separate years. The District Council's draft scheme provided that all the councillors for each ward should be elected in the same year but that wards should hold their elections in different years, so that one third of the whole Council retire each year in accordance with the resolution passed by the Council under Section 7(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

The District Council, Mr M Mason, a member of the Council and the Cambridgeshire Labour Party appeared in opposition to the Commission's proposal. The Girton, Milton, Impington and Histon Parish Councils had also objected in writing to the proposal but did not appear.

Before hearing the representations, I explained that Section 7(9)(c) of the Act provided explicitly that, where there was a resolution under Section 7(4)(b), one councillor must retire in each ordinary year of election of councillors where there were three members for a ward. I indicated that there was no similar statutory requirement where there were two councillors for a ward but that the Commission considered it desirable that each of such councillors should retire in different years.

Those appearing accepted the statutory requirement in the case of the two three-member wards but argued strongly that, in two-member wards, both members should be elected in the same year. They stressed that, in rural areas particularly, the poll at district council elections was low and argued that it would be even lower if elections for two members in the same ward were held in different years.

They also explained that, although both the district councils, whose areas had been combined to form South Cambridgeshire, had elections by thirds in each year, the whole of the members in each ward had been elected in the same year; the new proposal would thus be difficult for the electors to understand.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the views of the District and Parish Councils, it seems unfortunate that the District Council resolved in favour of elections by thirds, a decision which they cannot reverse for ten years. Clearly nothing can be done about elections in the two three-member wards, but, in view of the strong views expressed and particularly the fear of very low polls, it may be worth considering whether the local views cannot be met in the two-member wards. This is, however, essentially a matter of policy for the Commission.

I accordingly recommend that, if the Commission are prepared to consider any relaxation of their view that each member in two-member wards should be elected in different years, they should look with favour at the request for such a relaxation in the South Cambridgeshire District.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

27 MARCH 1975

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AT LOCAL HEARING

12 March 1975

NAME IN BLOCK LETTERS	ADDRESS	WHOM YOU REPRESENT
MRS J RUNHAM V J GRIFFITHS	6 Granta Vale, Linton 82, High Street, Great Abington	Linton Parish Council Great Abington Parish Council
B VIALLS MARY LUPTON	4a South Road, Histon 27 High Street, Melbourn	Impington Parish Council South Cambs District Council (Rep Melbourn Chishill & Heydon)
H J BALLINGER W F SMITH J ROY UPSHAW DAVID SELLS E G GOUGH ROBERTA CANNON K C PRICE	31 High Street, Girton 3 Knapp Rise, Haslingfield 6 Tower Road, Sawston Tadlow, Royston, Herts Wellington House, Ickleton Moorfield House, Duxford Moonrakers, Royston Road, Duxford	Girton Parish Council County Labour Party County Labour Party Tadlow Parish Meeting Ickleton Parish Council South Cambs District Council Duxford Parish Council
L A WITHAM	Shire Hall, Cambridge	Deputy Socy, Cambridgeshire County Council
T J BARNETT J MITCHAM E B ROSE B E NEWTON G R M BURFORD	- do - 12 Station Road, Swavesey 22 Rockmill End, Willingham Church Farm, Arrington The Hardwicke Arms Hotel Arrington	Admin Officer - do - Chesterton No 1 Electoral Division Willingham, South Cambs Member Myself Arrington District Conservative Assn Arrington Parish Council
M F PETTIT	28 Acorn Avenue, Bar Hill, Cambridge	Bar Hill Parish Council (Clerk)
S W WILKIN	246 High St Cottenham	Rural Councillor for Cottenham & Rampton
R C BARTINGALE J DEGWEL THOMAS S J FLINT	30 King St, Rampton The Rectory, Rampton Gt Eastern House, Tenison Road, Cambridge	" " " " Rampton Parish Church. South Cambridgeshire D C (Chief Executive)
M J MASON	16 Merton Road, Histon, Cambridge	Member South Cambridgeshire DC
MARGARET S SHAW D J L ALLEN P W POWLES	Gowards House, Thriplow 101 High St Girton The Court, 120 High Street, Meldreth	County Councillor S Cambs No 2 South Cambs District Council. County C. S Cambs 3 Rep Longstowe PC
H C RIDER S G HARVEY WM TWEED M G TWEED	29 Hillside, Sawston Hill Farm, Heydon 3 Matthew Parker Close " " " "	South Cambs No 4 CC S Cambs RDC Sandbach "

DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE: NAMES OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ABINGTON	1
ARRINGTON	1
BALSHAM	1
BAR HILL	2
BARRINGTON AND SHEPRETH	1
BARTON	1
BASSINGBOURN	2
BOURN	1
CASTLE CAMPS	1
COMBLERTON	1
COTON	1
COTTENHAM	2
DUXFORD	1
ELSWORTH	1
FOXTON	1
FULBOURN	2
GAMLINGAY	1
GIRTON	2
GREAT SHALDON	2
HARDWICK	1
HARSTON	1
HASLINGFIELD	1
HISTON	3
ICKLETON	1
LINTON	2
LEBBEL SHIFFORD	1
LONG STANTON	1
MELBOURN	2
MELDRETH	1
MILTON	1
ORWELL	1
OVER	1
PAPWORTH	1
SAWSTON	3
STAPLEFORD	1
SWAVESEY	1
TEVERSHAM	1
THE MORDENS	1
THE WILBRAHAMS	1
WATERBEACH	2
WHITTLESFORD	1
WILLINGHAM	1

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
ELECTION BY THIRDS - SUGGESTED ORDER OF RETIREMENT

NAME OF WARD	NO. OF COUNCILLORS REPRESENTING WARD	1ST YEAR	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR
Abington	1	1 PE		
Arrington	1			1 PE
Balsham	1	1 PE		
Bar Hill	2	1 PE		1
Barrington and Shepreth	1	1 PE		
Barton	1	1 PE		
Bassingbourn	2	1 PE		1
Bourn	1	1 PE		
Castle Camps	1		1 PE	
Comberton	1		1 PE	
Coton	1		1 PE	
Cottenham	2	1 PE		1
Duxford	1		1 PE	
Elsworth	1		1 PE	
Foxton	1		1 PE	
Fulbourn	2	1 PE		1
Gamlingay	1	1 PE		
Girton	2	1 PE		1
Gt Shelford	2	1 PE		1
Hardwick	1		1 PE	
Harston	1		1 PE	
Haslingfield	1		1 PE	
Histon	3	1	1 PE	1
Ickleton	1		1 PE	
Linton	2	1 PE		1
Lt Shelford	1			1 PE
Longstanton	1			1 PE
Melbourn	2	1 PE		1
Meldreth	1		1 PE	
Milton	1		1 PE	
Orwell	1		1 PE	
Over	1		1 PE	
Papworth	1		1 PE	
Sawston	3	1	1 PE	1
Stapleford	1			1 PE
Swavesey	1		1 PE	
Teversham	1		1 PE	
The Mordens	1			1 PE
The Wilbrahams	1			1 PE
Waterbeach	2	1 PE		1
Whittlesford	1			1 PE
Willingham	1	1 PE		
	55	18	19	18

PE = Parish Elections

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT

ABINGTON WARD

The Parishes of Babraham, Great Abington, Little Abington and Pampisford

ARRINGTON WARD

The Parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Longstowe, Little Gransden, Hatley and Tadlow

BALSHAM WARD

The Parishes of Balsham, Carlton, Weston Colville and West Wrattling

BAR HILL WARD

The Parishes of Bar Hill, Oakington and Westwick

BARRINGTON AND SHEPRETH WARD

The Parishes of Barrington and Shepreth

BARTON WARD

The Parishes of Barton and Grantchester

BASSINGBOURN WARD

The Parishes of Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth and Litlington

BOURN WARD

The Parishes of Bourn, Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley

CASTLE CAMPS WARD

The Parishes of Bartlow, Castle Camps, Horseheath, Shudy Camps and West Wickham

COMBERTON WARD

The Parish of Comberton

COTON WARD

The Parishes of Coton, Dry Drayton and Madingley

COTTENHAM WARD

The Parishes of Cottenham and Rampton

DUXFORD WARD

The Parish of Duxford

ELSWORTH WARD

The Parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Conington, Elsworth, Fen Drayton,
Knapwell and Lolworth

FOXTON WARD

The Parishes of Fowlmere and Foxton

FULBOURN WARD

The Parish of Fulbourn

GAMLINGAY WARD

The Parish of Gamlingay

GIRTON WARD

The Parish of Girton

GREAT SHELFORD WARD

The Parish of Great Shelford

HARDWICK WARD

The Parishes of Caldecote, Hardwick and Toft

HARSTON WARD

The Parishes of Harston and Newton

HASLINGFIELD WARD

The Parishes of Haslingfield and Harlton

HISTON WARD

The Parishes of Histon and Impington

ICKLETON WARD

The Parishes of Ickleton, Hinxton, Heydon and Great and Little Chishill.

LINTON WARD

The Parishes of Hildesham and Linton

LITTLE SHELFORD WARD

The Parishes of Hauxton and Little Shelford

LONGSTANTON WARD

The Parish of Longstanton

MELBOURN WARD

The Parish of Melbourn

MELDRETH WARD

The Parishes of Meldreth and Whaddon

MILTON WARD

The Parish of Milton

ORWELL WARD

The Parishes of Great Eversden, Kingston, Little Eversden, Orwell and Wimpole

OVER WARD

The Parish of Over

PAPWORTH WARD

The Parishes of Graveley, Papworth Everard and Papworth St Agnes

SAWSTON WARD

The Parish of Sawston

STAPLEFORD WARD

The Parish of Stapleford

SWAVESEY WARD

The Parish of Swavesey

TEVERSHAM WARD

The Parishes of Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Teversham

THE MOPDENS WARD

The Parishes of Abington Pigotts, Guilden Morden, Steeple Morden and Shingay cum Wendy

THE WILBRAHAMS WARD

The Parishes of Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham and Stow cum Quy

WATERBEACH WARD

The Parishes of Landbeach and Waterbeach

WHITTLESFORD WARD

The Parishes of Thriplow and Whittlesford

WILLINGHAM WARD

The Parish of Willingham