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Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are writing to object to the proposed redrawing of Cambridge ward boundaries, and in particular to the changes to the Petersfield/Abbey boundary. We are residents of the part of Norfolk Street that the proposal would remove from Petersfield into Abbey ward.

Petersfield is a close-knit community, and Norfolk Street is at the heart of the community. Norfolk Street is home to independent businesses that serve the ward as a whole, as well as community facilities such as St Matthew's School and the Jubilee Gardens. Historically, Norfolk Street has hosted events organised by the Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT), including the Norfolk Street Party and the Queen's 90th birthday tea. The local church and polling station are on St Matthew's Street, which would also be removed.

We identify ourselves strongly as residents of Petersfield. We regularly attend PACT events and would feel disenfranchised by the proposed change. Petersfield coheres well and there is a real sense of community here. Given our proximity to Cambridge station, and the proliferation in the area of housing aimed at commuters into London, this is no mean feat. The suggested boundary would cut across the heart of our community. We understand (although the consultation material does not make it wholly clear) that the current proposal applies to County divisions only, and not to Cambridge City wards, however, any changes that undermine the strong sense of community identity and purpose in the current Petersfield ward are unwelcome. Excluding several streets currently in Petersfield, including our own, and extending the westward boundary as far as Lensfield Road, may have that effect, and could set a worrying precedent should City ward boundaries come under review. Moreover, the issues that have been, and continue to be, faced by the affected streets (for example, issues with parking due to our proximity to the Grafton shopping centre) are aligned with those of Petersfield as a whole. We feel that there is a risk that if we were removed from Petersfield into Abbey, our views and interests would not be properly represented.

Local residents feel the proposals to be a direct attack on our community. Please reconsider.

Yours faithfully,

Nick Tamkin
Sian Thomas
Dear Review Officer,

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes which would result in part of the current Petersfield Ward moving into Abbey Ward, for these reasons:

1. The changes would split our community in the St Matthews area. We are very fortunate to have a sense of community, and to be served by our own local councillors. It would diminish this community sense if part of St Matthews were moved to Abbey Ward.

2. According to the Boundary Commission's figures, the move is not necessary in numerical terms: the 2016 figures show Petersfield now has more than 1,300 fewer voters than Abbey.

Please keep this established community together.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Trudi Tate

T. Tate
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Dianne Taylor
E-mail: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

Merging Trumpington with Queen Edith’s seems to me a huge mistake. The two communities are very different and don't use the same shops, schools or churches. The resulting area would be huge, with a population of 16,000 people. Even with two councillors, this would be difficult. The new division would be a muddle, different to the City Council voting ward, with two MPs and police teams. Why join them together? A better solution would be a dividing line down the middle of Hills Road.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: john taylor

Comment text:

Trumpington and Queen Edith's is much too extensive, especially from east to west, combining regions with not much in common. Hills Road would be a natural boundary.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am extremely concerned about the proposed boundary changes to the Petersfield ward in Cambridge. I would like to object to the proposal on the grounds that it will divide our community, there are many local issues that unite the community and which we work together on, this proposed change will split this community in half.

Moving Petersfield residents into Abby is not justified by the figures relating to numbers of residents.

Yours,

Matthew Tennant
Dear Mr Buck

Thank you for alerting me to the opportunity to submit my formal opposition to the proposed ward boundary changes with the City of Cambridge, affecting Petersfield. I list below my concerns.

Objection to proposed ward boundary changes affecting streets in Petersfield (12 May 2016)

I strongly object to the proposed ward boundary changes. The electorate projections influencing proposals for Petersfield and Abbey do not outweigh the real and negative impact the proposed change would have on the residents and community of Petersfield.

- The sense of identity should not be underestimated that we have for the local area around St Matthew’s and Norfolk Street, which is all within our natural walking space. The barriers to access formed by the main arteries of Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane mean that the large geographical ‘hinterland’ of Abbey is not easily or frequently used by us.

- Changes are sometimes necessary, but the boundary lines as proposed lack sense, and bearing in mind the rapid nature of change in the City somewhat ‘knee jerk’. There are a number of residential dwellings being developed on Newmarket Road, as well as residential proposals for other part of Abbey that will change the electorate population there.

- Petersfield residents should not be penalised for the success of the area in increasing its population due to strategic developments in the City.

Key points of concern:

- Primary concern is community integrity and sense of belonging within the compact network of streets and local businesses within Petersfield
- As residents in Petersfield, the identity with the area is reinforced through the local shops, restaurants and recreational areas, with the parish church and the green space of St Matthews Piece
- Petersfield is a compact area of similar local roads and streets fully accessed through walking and cycling
- Abbey is a large geographical area with no natural focal point for Petersfield residents and not readily accessible by foot or bicycle from Petersfield
- Extending Abbey boundaries through seemingly arbitrary and random lines negatively impacts on community cohesion both in Petersfield and Abbey.
- Understandable boundaries might be around Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane.
- Possible more coherent boundaries (if necessary) might be through New Street, down a straight line on the east side of York Street (see attached map)
- For some cohesion to remain in the area it is important to avoid splitting Norfolk/St Matthew’s/Sturton Streets, Abbey Walk and Fairsford Place from the Petersfield core, and to maintain the core of the green space of St Matthews Piece within Petersfield.

Chasing the variance of electorate to representatives is speculative and subject to change. Across the County the projected variances remain very diverse, with no perfect model. Within the City of Cambridge particularly, the volatile and dynamic nature of the population makes the attempt to chase balancing variances even more like ‘crystal ball gazing’.

Nigel Thomas
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Martin Thom
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Having looked at the proposed merging of Queen Edith's with Trumpington I take the view that this proposed redrawing of boundaries would damage local democracy by giving the suggested number of 2 councillors far too many people to represent. I would suggest that the many new housing developments within Queen Edith's, several of them somewhat hidden and inaccessible, and in some cases gated, mean that there are many citizens effectively out of reach of their elected representatives. To add to the already growing population to be represented the huge numbers, present and future, based in Trumpington, will make local democratic representation ever more fragile and incomplete. In a period of huge building programmes locally, representation by our local councillors matters deeply. I urge you to reconsider, and to revise the proposed boundaries. A natural boundary might, I think, be the Hills Road, either running down the middle, or including both sides.
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None Uploaded
From: Sheila thompson
Sent: 20 June 2016 17:19
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: proposed Boundary changes to Petersfield Ward, Cambridge

Dear Sirs,

I write to lodge my objections to the proposed changes to the boundaries which affect Petersfield Ward, Cambridge.

I have lived at the same address for nearly 60 years and there is a strong community bond, which in recent years has become even more vibrant due to the efforts of the local Petersfield Area Community Trust, and I am very concerned that this area will be completely split in two by the proposed changes. This will completely change the community, breaking it up from one end of the street to another.

Apart from the dissection of our community physically, this will also remove St Matthew's Piece from Petersfield which is the only viable open space in the area. We have no community centre and very little other provision, so removal of this open space is totally detrimental to our ward.

The other considerations relate to numbers of people within the ward which have changed significantly recently. Latest figures show Petersfield has 1,330 fewer voters than Abbey Ward already, so the proposed changes do not seem to be sensible from this point of view.

These proposals are totally against the best interests of this community, and I strongly urge you to reconsider.

Yours faithfully,

Sheila Thompson
I understand that there is a proposal to include Eaton Ford (where I live) with the Priory and Paxton Division.

I feel this is most illogical as Priory Park is the other side of the town and river Ouse and does not have anything in common with us.

Little Paxton is a separate entity with approximately 2 Km of farm land between us.

Our area has long been known as “The Eatons”.

I hope you will take account of my comments,

Eileen Thorn
I think that the proposed boundary change to put Eaton Ford with Little Paxton and Priory Park is totally nonsensical.
I have lived in Milton Ave, Eaton Ford for 10 years, and in that time I have visited Little Paxton on 4 occasions. One of those was to visit an open garden, the other to visit the Nature reserve. There is nothing there which would cause me to go there, apart from the fencing supplier there which was why I went twice!

I have been to Priory Park itself on several occasions, but have never ventured into the estate, I have no reason to do so.

Eaton Ford has its own shop, doctors, community centre, schools so why should we go to Paxton or Priory Park

Please reject this proposed boundary change as it is illogical and would put totally disparate districts together.

Thank you,

Roger Thorn
-----Original Message-----
From: Elise Townshend
Sent: 09 June 2016 07:23
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: I WISH TO MOVE to ABBEY

Good morning

When I was going around before election Abbey road were very well looked after by labour candidates

I mean labour who are there made street there to be very well looked after .

I will be very pleased for Edward Street to belong to Abbey so our street can be looked after .

Labour Councillors in Abbey repairs Street UNCONDITIONALLY

When is the last time Edward Street was surfaced ?
So it is time Edward Street become ABBEY

Your sincerely
ELISABETH Townshend

Sent from my iPad
From: Elise Townshend
Sent: 09 June 2016 07:49
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Some of the photo of edward street .it is time we become ABBEY

Edward street needs some caring people.
Just see some of the photo of Edward street.
Would you call it being looked after?

Your sincerely
ELISABETH Townshend
A submission for Cambs...

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: Lesley
Sent: 19 June 2016 18:08
To: Buck, Richard <richard.buck@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Re: Changes to Petersfield Ward Boundaries

Dear Mr Buck,

I wish to formally object to the new boundaries proposed for Petersfield, Cambridge.

With reference to your document ‘final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council - electoral review - February 2016’, item 25 states ‘We consider ...... and reflect community identities and interests in Cambridge’ . The changes as proposed for Petersfield do not reflect the community identity; something the residents of Petersfield strive to maintain against difficult odds; these proposals are a serious threat to our community.

To maintain a vibrant and effective community of Petersfield I would suggest the following changes to the proposals:

- Young Street, Petworth Street, Geldart Street, Vicarage Terrace, Edward Street, Abbey Walk, Fairsford Place and St Matthews Street should all be brought back into Petersfield.

- Evening Court, Kingsley Walk and Brunswick House to be moved from Market to Abbey ward. This makes more sense because they are linked with Abbey via the river.

- the proposed southern boundaries of Petersfield do not reflect the community and are distant from the heart of Petersfield.

Finally, if nothing else, St Matthew's Piece should remain within Petersfield, especially since there are no voting numbers attached to it. St Matthew's Piece is a much valued piece of open green space, for children and adults alike, easily accessible for residents in the surrounding terraced streets. To include it in Abbey Ward makes no sense being at a distance from the heart of Abbey it is of no interest to their residents.

I trust that the Lgbce's current proposals can be reconsidered, and hope that the present Petersfield community can be retained.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Tubb

Sent from my iPad
I wish to comment on the proposed change to the boundaries of these wards.

As a Petersfield and St Matthews resident, I consider it absurd that St Matthews Piece and St Matthews Church should be placed outside the Petersfield ward, along with various other neighbourhood streets, cutting the St Matthews community in two.

The obvious boundary with Abbey is the Newmarket road, and if adjustments have to be made, they should be made north of and east along that road, not south of it.

Residents of this area constantly use St Matthews Piece, and I am deeply suspicious of its inclusion in Abbey ward, most of whose inhabitants will have no concern over its fate. This is an area where many children play, and where St Matthews’ residents can spend recreational time in an informal setting. Being part of Petersfield cements the public local use of the space, which has been enjoyed for over a hundred years and continues to do so at the present.

This area, and other smaller green spaces in Petersfield are appropriate for our use, while something as far away as the Botanical Gardens has very little to do with Petersfield residents on a daily basis.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Underwood
From: Malcom Underwood
Sent: 11 June 2016 14:22
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: change of ward boundaries

I have already registered opposition to the proposed changes to ward boundaries involving Petersfield and Abbey wards Cambridge. I wish to reiterate my objections with an additional objection.

1) Splitting Streets, and moving a parish Church (St Matthews), which is also actually a local polling station, out of its neighbourhood ward makes no demographic or community sense.
2) Moving St Matthews’ Piece, the immediately local recreation area, out of its neighbourhood ward makes no sense.
3) Depriving us of a single local identity and our own local councillors is injurious to people’s ability to communicate directly with their local government.
Additionally:
4) The comparative ward numbers do not justify the rearrangement: in 2014 Petersfield had 600 more voters than Abbey ward.
In 2016, following a new registration system which revealed a big change in numbers, there are now shown to be 1,330 fewer voters in Petersfield than Abbey ward.

Malcolm Underwood
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Moira Upton
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I would like you to take my previous comments into consideration. Namely having boundaries that 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 it’s important to use the natural boundary over the common so Romsey is not split up.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir

I know when my son mentioned this before he died, I didn’t take a lot of notice, however as he felt strongly about it I asked a few neighbours and was told that a few streets, including where I live were going to be hived off to Priory Park. Why? I assume I shall lose my democratic right to vote for my local councillor who understands the issues of the Eatons. Why someone over the river on the other side of town with totally different issues would want to be given the responsibility for a small part of Eaton Ford confuses me. I want to talk to my local councillor whom I know. I assume whoever voted for this has no direct interest in the Eatons, which is a longstanding community with its own associations and church and community centre. Please do not leave me without a local Eatons councillor. I do not know anyone in Priory Park or know of their issues, but I do know what matters in the Eatons. Please stop this nonsense.

Yours faithfully

Anne Van De Kerkhove
Sir

My family have lived in Eaton Ford since 1983. Our children grew up here and my daughter and family live in Eaton Socon. My late son was a County, District and town Councillor who had strong views regarding the proposed boundary changes. We have connections with the church at Eaton Socon and with the Community Association. We therefore expect to be able to vote for a councillor who will represent us and where we live. There is no relevance to us to vote for a Councillor for Priory Park and Little Paxton. Giving such a person responsibility for a few streets in Eaton Ford defies logic. What is even more frustrating is that we shall be unable to vote for our local Councillor for Eaton Ford. Cutting us off from the rest of Eaton Ford is illogical as we will share the same interests and issues. To amputate us from Eaton Ford and sticking us on Priory Park would be like a surgeon amputating someone’s leg and sticking it back on a cow, it doesn’t fit and will be of little use either to the donor or the recipient. PLEASE THINK AGAIN! Disenfranchising us voters to save a little bit of money is hardly democratic!

Yours faithfully

Michael Van De Kerkhove
Dear Mr Jackson,

The Local Government Boundary Commission’s consultation on new boundary proposals in Cambridgeshire was initially more or less reasonable, including even the radical suggestion to split the Petersfield ward of Cambridge into St Paul’s and St Matthew’s areas. In of itself this would not have damaged local democracy or the provision of services.

However, the final recommendations are a completely different matter. The currently proposed new northern boundary for Petersfield wanders randomly down to Norfolk Street is preposterous.

It slices a jagged line (see below) across the heart of the historic St Matthew’s parish. I have lived on Edward Street in the St Matthew’s part of Petersfield, Cambridge since 1980. This is absolutely NOT part of Cambridge’s Abbey Ward!

Whatever problem this idiotic and incompetent sudden proposal is attempting to address needs a different and much better solution. To send these proposals to parliament would be absolutely wrong.

I am writing to you as Chief Executive of the LGCB to bring this to your attention. It is essential that this ludicrous proposal be withdrawn and that there be a further round of consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Dr J. V Neal  

cc Chair, Petersfield Area Community Trust,  
Daniel Zeichner, Cambridge MP  
All City and County Councillors for Petersfield Ward
Dear Mr Buck,

I have explored your link (and its incomprehensible, unwelcoming, labyrinthine, corporate gobbledygook-infested pages) below.

Your New draft recommendations are exactly as terrible as your Previous draft recommendations.

On these web pages I see NOWHERE for any member of the public to register their objections to these ghastly proposals.

How on earth does this remedy the acknowledged previous failures to allow enough people to participate in commenting on these?

My own objections remain, as sent to you on 6 March 2016, and as repeated at the foot of your message - including:

“The currently proposed new northern boundary for Petersfield that wanders randomly down to Norfolk Street is preposterous.
It slices a jagged line (see below) across the heart of the historic St Matthew’s parish. I have lived on Edward Street in the St Matthew’s part of Petersfield, Cambridge since 1980. This is absolutely NOT part of Cambridge’s Abbey Ward! Whatever problem this idiotic and incompetent sudden proposal is attempting
to address needs a **different** and **much better** solution. To send these proposals to parliament would be absolutely wrong.”

**So yes, you can use my comments from 6 March 2016 but ADD to them ALL of the following:**

"These outrageous proposals would divide St Matthew’s Primary School from St Matthew’s Church, also and from St Matthew’s Piece.

St Matthew’s Piece is the **only** publicly accessible meaningful area of public open space in the St Matthew’s part of Petersfield Ward.

This ludicrous dividing line would shatter a close-knit and harmonious community that has evolved organically over hundreds of years.

Such a division would undermine and make irrelevant my personal relationships with local ward councillors that have grown and matured over a period that exceeds 30 years. This two-way communication is most valuable, as current intense collaboration over an urgent planning matter demonstrates.

If my home is moved into Abbey Ward, I and my community will lose the benefit of years of community-based collaboration with my Petersfield Ward Councillors. The Abbey Ward Councillors are entirely unknown to me, and I to them.

This change would **absolutely** undermine my participation in local democratic processes.

**Don’t do it."**

Please email me to clarify exactly where I will be able to view online my full objections and the continuing development of this issue.

Yours most sincerely,

Dr J V Neal
Dear sir or madam

Loran Dupre has made community members aware of the proposal to split Sutton for the purposes of local boundary changes. I would like to register my objection to this. Sutton is a relatively small village and has a cohesive community identity. It definitely should not be the only village to be split in this way. I feel the way the split is being proposed would distort the balance of the community for the purposes of local decision making.

Thank you in advance for reconsidering.

Fiona Walker-Buckton
Dear Review Officer

I am very concerned about the proposed boundary changes to my ward, Petersfield.

The map shows that a large section of the ward - south of Young Street - has been moved to Abbey, yet it is is surrounded on 3 sides by Petersfield and is clearly similar in housing and social composition.

The net result is to make Petersfield 1330 voters smaller than Abbey.

If the aim to equalise the size of wards and keep social areas intact, this seems extremely illogical. What is the reason?

The local community of St Matthews has now been arbitrarily divided in 2.

This could easily be rectified by connecting Young Street to York Street as the northern boundary. This would:

1. avoid cutting through local ties
2. give more equal numbers of households in the 2 wards.
3. be a much simpler shape for the two wards

Please let me know your response.

Bronwen Walter
Dear Mr. Hinds

I am writing to you to express my disagreement with the Cambridgeshire County Council's decision to move the Milton Avenue Estate of Eaton Ford into the Little Paxton and Priory Ward. It seems the Councillors collectively have allowed their pursuit of an arbitrary "numbers game" (a County Councillor's words) to cloud their sensible judgement. Inevitably this has led to a totally unsound proposal.

A simple look on a map shows that there is no geographical connection with either Little Paxton or the Priory area, nor do they have anything in common. The whole of the St Neots town centre and the river Ouse isolates the Milton Road area from both the other areas. Furthermore historically the Milton Estate has always been the main part of Eaton Ford and this can clearly be seen on the OS map of the area in 1882!

On the ground, the differences are even more obvious. Little Paxton is a self contained village dominated by the quarry. The Priory has a completely different mix of housing and commercial properties to the Milton Road Estate, as well as being an area in transition as it grows in size and expands towards Little Paxton. By contrast the Milton Road area has a settled community with no commercial interests and strong traditional and religious connections with Eaton Ford. Under these conditions the Milton Avenue Estate will at best be peripheral to the main body of the proposed ward, and will therefore not be properly represented by any Councillor. This will be a denial of democratic rights, which the Councillors are supposed to be protecting.

I doubt very much that the Councillors who made the decision have walked the areas otherwise they would have perceived how different the environments are. We in the Milton Road area use all the facilities of Eaton Ford and Eaton Socon, such as the Village Green, Sudbury meadow, and Regatta meadow, as well as other services such as Doctors, and community halls. So if a problem arises in our area any Councillor representing Little Paxton would in future have little or no influence in correcting issues in our surroundings. In no way do we use any facilities in Little Paxton or the Priory in our daily lives.

Here is a typical difficulty. Where will people in the Milton Road Estate vote as part of this new arrangement? At the moment we vote in the Scout Hall in Eaton Ford which is close and convenient for voting. Being in the new ward could mean having to go to Little Paxton or the Priory area to vote. This is inconvenient and an effective barrier to voting. This is contrary to the democratic process, which the Cambridgeshire County Council should be upholding. If we will still vote in the Scout Hall in Eaton Ford, then this is surely the greatest admission that the Milton Road area is part of, and should remain in, Eaton Ford.

I formally request that you use your powers to prevent this travesty of democracy and oppose and countermand the Cambridgeshire County Council decision and ensure the Milton Road Estate, and Crosshall Road areas remain in Eaton Ford.

With thanks

18 May 2016
Yours sincerely

Peter Walter
Good morning,

With regard to the current public consultation open for the Cambridgeshire County Council's decision to move the Eaton Ford Estate, and Crosshall Road into the Little Paxton and Priory electoral wards, I would like to object for the following reasons:

This purely for voting reasons and not for any community benefit

We want to stay in Eaton Ford

Geographically, we are completely separate from Little Paxton and the Priory Area

We have nothing in common with Little Paxton or the Priory area

Our area has different needs than the other areas

We would not be properly represented because, as voters, we would be in the minority.

Please record my objections and consider these points with a view to blocking the proposed move.

Many thanks

Robert Walter
Sent from iPhone 6 Plus
Dear Sir,

I would like to object to the proposed constituency boundary change that would see Eaton Ford, St Neots, Cambridgeshire linked with Priory and Paxton Division.

Eaton Ford is a distinct separate community, physically separated by the river Great Ouse. This means there is little interaction between the two communities. Eaton Ford has its own character, community centre, shops and parks.

Linking these areas would not be the best way to serve Eaton Ford’s community and interests.

Yours Faithfully

Tim Watling
Dear Sir or Madam

May I join my voice with others in the plea, for us to remain in Coleridge Ward.

In yesterday's elections, Coleridge is confirmed as Labour, Queen Edith's is confirmed as Lib Dem. In Coleridge we have Labour Councillors who have a proven track record of being on the side of the residents of the sheltered housing area of Lichfield Road, and Neville Road.

We don't want the developers here - this has been solidly expressed in various public meetings, and Labour Councillors are the only ones I and others in this area, trust to take the local residents wishes, expressed very clearly, against the re-development of this area, seriously.

Yours very sincerely, Elizabeth S Wells
Resident Sheltered Housing Scheme, Lichfield Road.
I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed ward boundary change which would effectively move part of Petersfield in to Abbey Ward.

Petersfield enjoys a strong and well established local identity. I object in principle to the idea of breaking up our community in this way.

Furthermore, I understand that the original reason for the proposal was to even up numbers of voters in each area. In reality, however, the figures do not justify this change. Petersfield had 600 more voters than Abbey Ward in 2014 whereas latest figures in 2016 show Petersfield has 1330 fewer voters than Abbey.

I urge you to take these points in to consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Nick Welsh
From: White Christopher  
Sent: 27 June 2016 18:40  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Proposed change to Cambridge ward boundary

Dear Sir or Madam,

I strongly object to your proposal to move me from Petersfield Ward to Abbey Ward. Petersfield is an established community to which I belong. It appears that the original reason for changing the boundary (to even up the number of voters) is no longer valid as Abbey Ward is now much larger than Petersfield Ward. Also, the proposed boundary seems quite arbitrary and it does not form a natural geographical boundary.

Yours faithfully,

Chris White
Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to record my objection to the proposed change of ward boundaries in Cambridge, by which part of the Petersfield ward would be reallocated to the Abbey ward. I live in the affected area. As I understand it, this change is based on a now outdated count of electors, which (in 2014) showed that Abbey ward had 600 fewer voters. In fact the latest figures (2016) show that Abbey ward has over 1300 *more* voters, making the change numerically illogical. It is also geographically and socially illogical: Petersfield has a strong sense of community and a straightforward demarcation by main roads and the railway line. The proposed boundary change would break that community in half.

I urge that this proposed boundary change be reconsidered.

Yours faithfully

Dr Christopher Whitton
From: Dianne Hinds Williamson
Sent: 16 June 2016 12:38
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary review of Petersfield ward

To whom it may concern

As a resident of St. Matthew's Gardens (name: Dianne Hinds Williamson), I am seriously concerned about the proposed boundary changes around this locality. This area has become seriously challenged by the number and changes in the occupants of the area since I bought this house in 2005. Increasingly owner occupiers have moved out and tenants have moved into homes previously occupied as single family dwellings, so there are tenants in multiple occupation.

This, in conjunction with the marketing exploits of local Anglia Ruskin University means that the nature of the area is far more fluid than previously, with a far greater itinerant population. Remaining in the Petersfield Ward is an important element of maintaining a coherent community presence around the locality. Since the Boundary Commission state that they aim to keep established communities together, this somewhat arbitrary proposal presents as being, in my view, totally undesirable.

Sincerely,

Dianne Hinds Williamson
As a resident of Newtown in the Trumpington/Newtown ward, I would like to register a strong objection to the merging of our ward with Queen Edith’s. The two wards are so different that they would lose rather than gain from such a merger. I also object to reducing the number of Councillors representing the people of Cambridge. Newtown has been badly served in the past when for Parliamentary purposes it was part of South Cambridgeshire when it clearly belongs to the city. Let us not go down that road again. Denying one ward its proper role in the city is not only bad for the ward, but bad for Cambridge.

Clive Wilmer
From: benjamin wood
Sent: 18 June 2016 13:4
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: wards changes/boundary cambridge

dear sir/madam

I would like to object to the proposed ward changes to Petersjield ward cambridge. I'm objecting because it is arbitrary breaks up a community and the figures do not justify this change. moreover we have a sense of belonging in a place which has a high turn over of students and others who stay for a few years. its vitally important we continue as on ward united. otherwise the community we have will be fragmented.

2016 figures show petersjield have 1,330 fewer voters than abbey ward....so why change?

thanks
Ben wood
Mr Craig Woods

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Milbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

Re: Proposed Boundary Change for Eaton Ford, St Neots, Cambridgeshire

I am extremely unhappy about your proposed changes to the boundary to merge Eaton Ford, St Neots with Little Paxton and the Priory. I find the logic hard to understand because within the Towns logistics Eaton Ford is nowhere near The Priory & Paxton Division.

As part of the Eatons, Eaton Ford has a strong sense of community, amongst other things we have our own Community centre, Church, schools, clubs and associations.

I am told the reason for the proposal is due to the necessity to save costs and reduce the number of county councillors in St Neots from 4 to 3. If this is the case then why would Eaton Ford & Eaton Socon not be merged? As it stands already there is no clear boundary between the Eatons.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the boundary change.

Yours Sincerely

Craig Woods
Mr Joel Woods

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Milbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

Re: Proposed Boundary Change for Eaton Ford, St Neots, Cambridgeshire

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the boundary to merge Milton Avenue Estate, Crosshall Road and Saviles Close, Eaton Ford, St Neots with Little Paxton and the Priory

Within the Town Eaton Ford is nowhere near Little Paxton or the Priory. Little Paxton is about 3 miles away and takes me about 35 minutes to walk to. It is too far for me to attend clubs in the winter and does not feel a part of the area I live in.

Where as Eaton Socon is only a few streets away and takes me about 10 minutes to walk to. As part of the Eatons, Eaton Ford has a strong sense of community, amongst other things we have our own Community centre, Church, schools, clubs and associations.

It is very wrong to try to merge us with a district that is not near us and we do not share a community with.

Please do not change the boundary to merge Eaton Ford with Little Paxton.

Yours Sincerely

Joel Woods
Mr John Woods

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Milbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

Re: Proposed Boundary Change for Eaton Ford, St Neots, Cambridgeshire

I am extremely unhappy about your proposed changes to the boundary to merge the Milton Avenue Estate, Crosshall Road & Savles Close, Eaton Ford, St Neots with Little Paxton and the Priory. I find the logic hard to understand because within the Towns logistics Eaton Ford is nowhere near The Priory & Paxton Division.

As part of the Eatons, Eaton Ford has a strong sense of community, amongst other things we have our own Community centre, Church, schools, clubs and associations.

I am told the reason for the proposal is due to the necessity to save costs and reduce the number of county councillors in St Neots from 4 to 3. If this is the case then why would Eaton Ford & Eaton Socon not be merged? As it stands already there is no clear boundary between the Eatons.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the boundary change.

Yours Sincerely

John Woods
Mrs T Woods

Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Milbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

Re: Proposed Boundary Change for Eaton Ford, St Neots, Cambridgeshire

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary change to merge Milton Avenue Estate, Crosshall Road & Saviles Close, Eaton Ford with The Priory and Little Paxton. I believe this is the totally wrong thing to do.

As part of the Eatons, Eaton Ford has a strong sense of community, amongst other things we have our own Community centre, Church, schools, clubs and associations.

While I understand that it is necessary to save costs and reduce the number of county councillors in St Neots from 4 to 3. What I do not understand is why it would be proposed to merge Eaton Ford with The Priory and Little Paxton? when, in my opinion, it makes much more sense to merge Eaton Socon and Eaton Ford to become just the Eatons. In fact most people don’t even know exactly where the boundary changes between Eaton Socon and Eaton Ford.

Whereas there is a clear expanse of land between Little Paxton and The priory. In fact although on a map Eaton Ford looks fairly close to Little Paxton, that is using the A1 Road. But the only way to walk from Eaton Ford to Little Paxton it is 3 miles. There is no shared community between Eaton Ford & Little Paxton.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the boundary change.

Yours Sincerely

[Name]

Tracey Woods
Sirs,

I am writing as Party Agent and an officer of North East Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrats in regard to the proposed new County Council divisions in Cambridgeshire, and in particular in East Cambridgeshire District. I am also a resident of the village of Sutton in Cambridgeshire.

I oppose the boundary proposal submitted by East Cambridgeshire District Council.

The Commission's criteria for setting boundaries are based on numbers, polling districts and communities; they are not intended to give any particular political outcome. Nevertheless the proposal submitted by East Cambridgeshire District Council is intended to do just that: it is no less than gerrymandering. It is designed to split the parish of Sutton, which by no coincidence is the one village in East Cambridgeshire to have a Liberal Democrat District and County councillor. By splitting the village, and "diluting" it with the surrounding Conservative areas, the Conservatives who run East Cambridgeshire District Council (and their colleagues on Cambridgeshire County Council) hope to make it much harder for any other party to win a seat here. I believe this is the sole reason for this part of the Council's proposal.

Sutton is a village which is a real community, and has a Parish Council which actively represents the village, with members of all political parties and none. The Parish Council is strongly against the proposal to split the village. There is no good reason to do so if the Boundary Commission's objectives can be met in other ways.

You have received a proposal from County Councillor Maurice Leeke which divides the County without splitting any parish in Cambridgeshire (other than towns such as Ely and Cambridge which are too big for a single division). I endorse this proposal, and urge you to reject plans to split Sutton or indeed any other village parish.

Regards,
From: Emma Wright
Sent: 08 June 2016 23:02
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Changing Boundaries from Petersfield to Abbey

Dear Sir/Madam
I am writing to object to the proposal to move the election boundaries so that our street will be moved into Abbey ward. I live in St Matthews Gardens.
We are part of a wider community which works well - roughly speaking the current Petersfield ward has lots in common, similar housing issues, diverse highly mobile population etc.

Abbey ward seems completely different to Petersfield - there is no geographical connection, and they face different community issues.

It makes no sense to move the boundaries - you would be splitting an established ward and introducing the real concern that Abbey councillors will not be able to represent everybody fairly.

Kind Regards
Emma Wright
Hi Alex/Emily – A Cambridgeshire / South Cambs submission...

Richard Buck  
Review Manager  
LGBCE  
14th Floor Millbank Tower  
London SW1P 4QP  
0330 500 1271

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

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

From: Graham Wright  
Sent: 05 June 2016 20:54  
To: Buck, Richard <richard.buck@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Town boundary objection- St Neots

Hi Richard  
My wife and I have lived in Crosshall Road, Eaton Ford for over thirty years. The Eatons ( Eaton Ford and Eaton Socan have had a strong regional link for several centuries. We strongly object to Eaton Ford being split up and our part becoming part of another electoral Ward with no historical link the other side of the River Ouse.

Joan & Graham Wright
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Patricia Wright  
**Date:** 11 March 2016 13:55:36 GMT  
**Subject:** boundary changes Cambridge

Dear Jolyon Jackson

**Proposed Boundary Changes to Petersfield Ward, Cambridge**

I wish to protest most strongly to the proposal to move the streets abutting the east side of St Matthew’s Street to Abbey Ward.

The St Matthew’s area of Petersfield is a very strong community. We share and participate in local interests which is reflected in the setting up of the Petersfield Area Community Trust many years’ ago through which residents of all the existing streets pull together to get the best for our area.

To divorce some of these streets from this local St Matthews area and marry them with Abbey Ward, which has quite different concerns, would be to break the community apart.

When David Cameron took office, he stated that he recognised the value of local communities. To draw this line through the St Matthews area of Petersfield would seem to be as arbitrary as that drawn in the Middle East by Sykes/Picot.

I appreciate that changes in population require some redrawing of Ward boundaries. That said, I do strongly urge you to have a rethink in this case and to come up with an alternative that will preserve our community.

Thank you

H P Wright
Dear Madam or Sir,

With regard to the electoral boundary redrawing, we are now confident that the new proposal does not cut us off from our local community, identity and local interactions in Romsey. While the previous proposal would have severed these important links the new draft respects our local interactions on Coldhams Lane as part of Romsey. We therefore do no longer oppose the redrawn electoral boundaries under the current proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Daniel Wunderlich and Dr Wei Kiong Chin
The proposed boundary changes in Cambridge, to shift homes from Petersfield Ward into Abbey Ward are ill-conceived.

2016 figures show 1330 fewer voters in Petersfield than Abbey, and it does not make sense to increase the discrepancy - it is against the whole basis of the aims of the boundary review, which is to equalise voter numbers.

and do not want to be moved to another Ward.

Yours,

Bartow Wylie
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in regard to our concerns about the proposals to be put forward by CCC. Saviles Close, Crosshall RD, Milton Ave, will no longer be part of the Eaton but will instead become part of Little Paxton and Priory Park. This is outrageous and totally wrong - the Eatoons are a separate and distinct community. We have our own community association, church, schools, shops and community.

There is a natural boundary between the divisions which is the River Ouse, why on earth should we have to cross over the river to vote.

Please, please reverse this decision.

Yours Sincerely,
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Maria Carla Zipoli
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I object to the proposed boundary as it cuts through a community that is historically bound and gravitates to the south of the division you propose for shopping, medical services and leisure facilities, and to the north to the Church of St Matthews.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded