

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council

Electoral review

February 2016

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	6
Final recommendations	6
Detailed divisions	9
Cambridge City	10
East Cambridgeshire District	18
Fenland District	20
Huntingdonshire District	22
South Cambridgeshire District	27
Conclusions	32
Parish electoral arrangements	32
3 What happens next?	36

Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council	37
B Submissions received	42
C Glossary and abbreviations	46

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Cambridgeshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Cambridgeshire. Overall, 32% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%.

Our proposals for Cambridgeshire

Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 69 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a decrease in council size by eight to 61 members will ensure the Council can perform its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Cambridgeshire County Council's 61 councillors should represent 51 single-member divisions and five two-member divisions. One of our proposed 56 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Cambridgeshire by 2021.

We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements in Cambridgeshire.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Cambridgeshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during our consultation have informed our final recommendations. This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 October 2014	Decision on council size
28 October 2014	Division pattern consultation
12 May 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
7 July 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
3 November 2015	Further limited consultation for Cambridge City
9 February 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2014	2021
Electorate of Cambridgeshire	478,908	521,380
Number of councillors	61	61
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547

10 Under our final recommendations, one of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Cambridgeshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Cambridgeshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% by 2021. The highest proportion of this growth across the county is expected in Cambridge with significant development in the Arbury and Trumpington areas.

15 During our consultation on division arrangements, we received several queries from members of the public regarding the electorate forecasts. In each instance we raised these with Cambridgeshire County Council and, accordingly, made some changes to the projections for Cambridge City.

16 Having considered the further information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations. Given that we have undertaken a period of further limited consultation in the Cambridge City area, the publication of these final recommendations has been postponed until 2016. In light of this, the forecast needs to be for 2021 rather than 2020. We are content that the original figures can reasonably be regarded as an accurate reflection of forecast growth to 2021 and have referred to them as such in this report.

Council size

17 Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 69 councillors. The County Council submitted a proposal to decrease the council size from 69 to 63 members. The Liberal Democrat Group on Cambridgeshire County Council submitted a proposal to increase council size from 69 to 71. We requested further information from the County Council as to whether it had considered alternative council sizes and why any alternatives would be less effective than 63 councillors. The Council responded that it had considered alternative sizes based on 57, 59, 61 and 63 councillors.

18 Having considered both submissions, we decided the County Council's evidence was more persuasive. The County Council demonstrated that it could operate efficiently and effectively under its proposed council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 63 councillors.

19 As we developed our draft recommendations, we discovered that 63 councillors did not provide the best allocation of county councillors between Cambridgeshire's five districts. We examined alternative division arrangements under council sizes of between 64 and 61 members. We concluded that 61 councillors would ensure a good allocation of councillors across Cambridgeshire. As stated in our Guidance, we will use our discretion to vary the number of councillors from the figure previously agreed if we find that an alternative will provide 'a better fit' of divisions across the county. On this basis we put forward draft recommendations based on a council size of 61 members. On the basis of information received during consultation, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations in this respect as final.

20 A council size of 61 provides the following allocation between the district councils in the county. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of district and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Cambridge City – 12 councillors (36%)
- East Cambridgeshire – eight councillors (71%)
- Fenland – nine councillors (75%)
- Huntingdonshire – 17 councillors (62%)
- South Cambridgeshire – 15 councillors (62%)

Division patterns

21 During consultation on division patterns, we received 63 submissions. While we did not receive a submission from the County Council, the Cambridge Labour Group submitted a county-wide proposal. Cambridge City Council and the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association submitted district-wide proposals for Cambridge City and Fenland respectively. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of the county.

Draft recommendations

22 We received 253 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. We received submissions relating to each of the districts in the county. In particular, we received proposals for alternative division arrangements in Cambridge, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Fenland districts. We considered that the alternative division arrangements submitted for Cambridge City provided clear division boundaries while still ensuring good electoral equality. We therefore decided to further consult on this alternative division proposal for Cambridge City.

Final recommendations

Cambridge City

23 We received 105 submissions relating to our proposed electoral divisions in Cambridge. This included four city-wide proposals for electoral divisions that were notably different from our draft recommendations. The County Council, Cambridgeshire Labour Group, Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrat Group and a local resident each submitted city-wide schemes.

24 We considered that the divisions proposed by the Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrat Group and local resident would better reflect communities in the Market, Petersfield and Romsey areas of the city than the divisions proposed in our draft recommendations. They were further supported by strong evidence from local residents, local organisations and councillors in these areas of Cambridge. Given that this pattern had not been consulted upon previously, we decided to consult locally in Cambridge city on whether this new pattern of divisions should be adopted as part of our final recommendations.

25 We received 114 submissions during the period of further limited consultation in Cambridge, 52 of which supported the alternative proposals for Market and Petersfield divisions. We also received 32 submissions which supported the alternative proposals for Romsey division. We consider that the alternative proposals provide for good electoral equality, and reflect community identities and interests in Cambridge.

26 During the development of the final recommendations we discovered an error in the electorate count in the Abbey and Romsey areas. This would result in Abbey division having a 16% electoral variance. This has necessitated a boundary modification between the proposed Abbey and Petersfield divisions. Accordingly, the boundary between these two divisions has been moved further south, running along St Matthew’s Street, Norfolk Street and behind properties on Upper Gwydir Street, Fairsford Place and York Street in order to achieve good electoral equality for Abbey division. The electoral variances for Romsey and Petersfield divisions in the table below reflect the correct variances as a result of the changes made.

Further consultation variances	Final recommendations variances
Abbey (-9%)	Abbey (-9%)
Petersfield (8%)	Petersfield (1%)
Romsey (2%)	Romsey (9%)

27 We received objections to the proposed two-member divisions in Cambridge City from the County Council, City Council, political parties and local residents. We consider that persuasive evidence has been received to support two single-member Castle and Newnham divisions. We have also included Windsor Road in Castle division as we have received persuasive evidence that Windsor Road shares strong community links with adjoining roads in the Castle area. However, we are not persuaded by the evidence for two single-member divisions for Trumpington and Queen Edith’s. This would require either accepting a Trumpington division with an 18% variance or a Trumpington division which takes in adjoining areas where we have received support for our draft recommendations. We therefore propose no changes to Trumpington & Queen Edith’s division and confirm it as final.

East Cambridgeshire District

28 We received 38 submissions relating to East Cambridgeshire. The majority of local respondents and Stephen Barclay MP objected to our proposed two-member divisions of Fordham Villages & Soham South and Littleport West. We also received localised comments relating to Ely, Littleport and our proposals in the west of the district. In addition, we received alternative division patterns based on both eight and nine councillors for East Cambridgeshire. We are not persuaded that we have received sufficient evidence to change the allocation of councillors for East Cambridgeshire and have decided our final recommendations should allocate eight councillors for the district. Furthermore, we considered the alternative pattern of eight single-member divisions did not reflect the statutory criteria, particularly in Ely, Downham and Witchford as it created a division which did not reflect communities. We propose to confirm our draft recommendations as final subject to a minor amendment in Littleport to correct a defaced division boundary.

Fenland District

29 We received 29 submissions relating to Fenland. The majority of respondents and Stephen Barclay MP objected to our proposed two-member March North & Waldersey division and our proposals in the March, Wisbech St Mary and Whittlesey areas.

30 We received alternative division patterns based on nine and 10 councillors for Fenland. As in East Cambridgeshire, we are not persuaded that we have received sufficient evidence to change the allocation of councillors for the district and have decided our final recommendations in Fenland should allocate nine councillors. We considered the alternative pattern of nine single-member divisions did not reflect the statutory criteria, particularly in Christchurch, Elm, Manea and Wisbech St Mary parishes. In particular, the locally proposed Waldersey division comprising these parishes would not have clear boundaries. Furthermore, it would span a large geographical area that would combine disparate communities that would not appear to share community identities and interests. Therefore, we do not propose any changes to our proposed division arrangements in Fenland with the exception of Wisbech where we propose the divisions should reflect the district wards.

Huntingdonshire District

31 We received 47 submissions relating to Huntingdonshire, the majority of which objected to our proposed St Neots East & Gransden division. Local councillors and local residents argued against our proposals which included a large housing development in St Neots in a division with Abbotsley, Great Gransden, Great Paxton, Toseland, Waresley-cum-Tetworth and Yelling parishes. We have not made changes to St Neots East & Gransden division because we could not find a suitable alternative division pattern for St Neots that would meet our statutory criteria.

32 We also received objections to our proposed Somersham & Earith and Warboys & The Stukeleys divisions. After considering the evidence received, we have made some minor amendments to the draft recommendations and propose that Wyton-on-the-Hill parish be included in St Ives North division and that Broughton and Kings Ripton parishes be included in Somersham & Earith division to provide for good electoral equality. However, we could not find a suitable alternative division pattern which places The Stukeleys and Warboys parishes in different divisions.

South Cambridgeshire District

33 We received 34 submissions relating to South Cambridgeshire. A number of parishes provided evidence to support minor amendments to our draft recommendations for the district. We also investigated potential alternative division patterns for Northstowe & Over and Papworth & Swavesey divisions. However, we could not find a suitable alternative division pattern that would meet our statutory criteria.

34 We have decided to amend our draft recommendations by transferring Lolworth parish to Bar Hill division and transferring Boxworth, Childerley and Knapwell parishes to Papworth & Swavesey division. To improve electoral equality in Cambourne division, the team proposes to include Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes in Cambourne division. We have also created a two-member Sawston & Shelford division which keeps the parishes of Sawston and Shelford and adjoining parishes together in the same division.

Detailed divisions

35 The tables on pages 10–31 detail our final recommendations for each district in Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Cambridge City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Abbey	1	-9%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Barnwell community.	<p>The response to our draft recommendations for this division mainly consisted of local residents in Romsey who objected to being included in our proposed Barnwell division. We also received submissions from local residents in Barnwell supporting the responses of Romsey residents. We received a submission proposing that this division be named Abbey rather than Barnwell. We consider that this name better reflects the community within this division and so we are adopting this name change as part of our final recommendations.</p> <p>We received support for Abbey division during the further limited consultation. We consider this division reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality. We therefore confirm Abbey division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Arbury	1	-2%	This division lies in the north-west of the city and comprises the Arbury community.	<p>We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to our proposals for Arbury division. However, the alternative city-wide patterns received included proposals for Arbury division which were notably different from our draft recommendations. These changes were contingent on accepting substantial modifications in the Castle and Newnham areas of the city for which we had little evidence. We therefore did not make changes to Arbury division.</p> <p>We received four submissions specifically relating to Arbury division during the further consultation. A local resident proposed that Histon Road should be the division boundary between Arbury and Castle areas. A local councillor proposed that part of Victoria Road be transferred to Arbury</p>

				<p>division. A Residents' Association and two councillors proposed that Windsor Road be transferred to a division with the Castle area.</p> <p>We are unable to accommodate the proposals relating to Histon Road and Victoria road as this would require substantial modifications in the Chesterton and King's Hedges area for which we have no evidence. However, we consider the evidence to transfer Windsor Road to Castle division to be persuasive and have decided to make this change. We are satisfied Arbury division reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality. Subject to this minor change, we confirm our proposed Arbury division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Castle	1	-3%	This division comprises the Castle area of Cambridge.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 16 submissions relating to Castle & Newnham division. The majority of submissions objected to the proposals which included Castle and Newnham in a two-member division. We received alternative division patterns for two single-member divisions. However, the changes would require accepting substantial modifications in the Arbury, Chesterton and King's Hedges areas of Cambridge for which we had no evidence. We therefore did not make changes to Castle & Newnham division.</p> <p>Subsequently, we received 22 submissions during the further limited consultation relating to this division. The majority of respondents reiterated their objection to a two-member Castle & Newnham division. A political group and a local resident submitted alternative proposals which used Madingley Road as the boundary between two single-member divisions. We also received evidence that Windsor Road has close community links with Oxford Road,</p>

				<p>Richmond Road and other roads which access onto Huntingdon Road.</p> <p>The respondents argued that Castle has few direct road links with Newnham. Castle also has its own separate community facilities and does not look south in a community sense toward Newnham. We consider the evidence received provides a persuasive argument for a single-member division comprising Castle. Furthermore, the evidence to include Windsor Road in Castle division is supported by persuasive evidence and we have decided to make this change. A single-member division would provide for good electoral equality and reflect community identities. We therefore propose a single-member Castle division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Cherry Hinton	1	5%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Cherry Hinton community.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we did not receive any submissions specifically relating to our proposals for Cherry Hinton division. However, the alternative city-wide patterns received were similar to our draft recommendations.</p> <p>During the further limited consultation, we received a submission from a local resident relating to Cherry Hinton division. They proposed to move cul-de-sacs off Cherry Hinton Road, between Mowbray Road and Cherry Hinton Hall, into a division with Queen Edith's. They also proposed that Queen Edith's Way, adjoining roads as well as land to the east of Limekiln Road be transferred to Cherry Hinton division. We consider that insufficient evidence has been received to make this change. We have also received support for the proposed Cherry Hinton division. Subject to a minor change in the north of the division where we have used part of the railway as the boundary, we confirm our draft recommendations for Cherry Hinton division as final.</p>

Chesterton	1	5%	This division lies to the north-east of the city centre and is bounded by the River Cam to the south. The division comprises the Chesterton community.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we received alternative city-wide proposals for new division arrangements in Chesterton. The alternative proposals were substantially different from our draft recommendations. These changes would require substantial modifications in the Castle and Newnham areas of the city for which we had little evidence.</p> <p>We received a submission from a local councillor who objected to our proposals for Chesterton division. However, they did not put forward alternative for this division. As we have received support for Chesterton division and we consider the division reflects community identities, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
King's Hedges	1	5%	This division lies to the north of the city centre and comprises the King's Hedges area and parts of the East Chesterton community.	<p>During consultation on our draft recommendations we received alternative city-wide proposals for new division arrangements in this part of the city. The alternative proposals were substantially different from our draft recommendations. These changes would require accepting substantial modifications in the Arbury, Castle and Newnham areas of the city for which we had little evidence.</p> <p>We received support for King's Hedges division during further limited consultation. We consider this division reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality. We therefore confirm King's Hedges division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Market	1	-2%	This division comprises the centre of Cambridge, Cambridge University colleges and residential areas west of East Road.	In response to our draft recommendations we received submissions from local residents objecting to our proposals which divided this area using Mill Road. Alternative patterns were submitted which proposed a Market division with the division boundary following East Road and Lensfield Road.

				<p>Following further limited consultation we received 38 submissions relating to Market division. All but one of the submissions supported the alternative proposals which include most of the city centre and surrounding residential areas in Market division. We received persuasive evidence that Mill Road is a focal point where local residents on either side of the road share community interests and facilities. We consider that the alternative proposals better reflect the Market community. The division also provides for good electoral equality. Therefore, we propose this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Newnham	1	-12%	<p>This division comprises the Newnham area and Churchill College to the north of Madingley Road.</p>	<p>As noted in the Castle section of this report, we received a number of submissions relating to Castle & Newnham division during consultation on the draft recommendations. The majority of respondents objected to a two-member Castle & Newnham division. An alternative proposal was received for a single-member Newnham division; however, this would require accepting substantial changes in the north of Cambridge for which we had no evidence.</p> <p>During the further limited consultation, 22 submissions were received. The respondents reiterated their objections to Castle & Newnham division. Two political party respondents provided evidence that Newnham is a distinct and separate community from Castle. The Newnham area also has separate community facilities from Castle. It was further argued that a single-member division should include those residents to the north of Madingley Road and Churchill College.</p> <p>We consider the evidence on community identities received from respondents to be persuasive and, exceptionally, justifies a single-member Newnham division with a variance above 10%. The evidence clearly demonstrates Newnham is</p>

				a distinct community from Castle with few direct road links. We-propose a single-member Newham division as part of our final recommendations.
Petersfield	1	1%	This division comprises the Newtown and Petersfield areas of Cambridge.	<p>In response to our draft recommendations we received submissions from the local Residents' Association and local residents objecting to our proposals to use Mill Road as the division boundary between our proposed St Matthew's and St Paul's divisions. Alternative division patterns were submitted which proposed a Petersfield division with the division boundary following East Road and Lensfield Road.</p> <p>Following further limited consultation we received 15 submissions. All the submissions received supported the alternative proposals which use East Road and Lensfield Road as the division boundary between this division and Market division to the west. We also received submissions in support of Newtown being included in the division. A political group proposed a modification to Petersfield division which included an area to the south of the Botanical Gardens, and the Brooklands Avenue area in a single-member Trumpington division. However, we do not have sufficient evidence from respondents in Petersfield division to make this change. We consider our proposed Petersfield division better reflects the community than our draft recommendations. The division also provides for good electoral equality. We therefore propose Petersfield division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Romsey	1	9%	This division comprises the Romsey community between Cherry Hinton Road and the railway line.	In response to our draft recommendations we received over 50 submissions objecting to our proposals to include part of Romsey in Barnwell division. Alternative division patterns were submitted which proposed to include Romsey in a single division.

				<p>We received 33 submissions during further consultation relating to Romsey division. All but one of the submissions received supported the alternative proposals we put forward which keep the Romsey community in a single division. A political group proposed that the entirety of roads north of Cherry Hinton Road from Hills Road to Perne Road be included in Queen Edith's division. However, we consider that insufficient evidence has been received to make this change. It would also result in an electoral variance of greater than 10%. The alternative proposals for Romsey division better reflect the local community than that proposed in our draft recommendations. The division also provides for good electoral equality. Therefore, we propose this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Trumpington & Queen Edith's	2	-4%	<p>This division comprises the areas of Trumpington and Queen Edith's.</p>	<p>In response to the draft recommendations, we received 16 submissions relating to the areas of Trumpington and Queen Edith's. In Trumpington, a local Residents' Association objected to the proposed Trumpington division. In Queen Edith's, 15 respondents objected to the proposed Queen Edith's division. We received alternative division patterns for these areas which would both require substantial changes in other parts of Cambridge for which had no evidence. However, the evidence received persuasively argued our proposals divided communities. Therefore, we created a two-member division which included both the Trumpington and Queen Edith's areas. We put this proposed division forward during further limited consultation.</p> <p>In response we received 18 submissions relating to this two-member division. The respondents in both areas argued against the proposed two-member division. A political group and local resident proposed two single-member divisions. This proposal was supported by local residents and Residents' Associations in both areas.</p>

				<p>After considering the submissions received here, we are unable to accept the proposals for two single-member divisions. The proposals of the political group would require a substantial modification to Petersfield division. We have not received evidence in support of this modification from respondents in Petersfield division. In addition, the proposals of a local resident would place the boundary along Babraham Road. We are not persuaded that this proposal reflects communities and is not supported by persuasive evidence. We would rather put two distinct communities in the same division rather than divide them between multiple divisions in order to meet our statutory criteria. Therefore we have decided to propose no changes to Trumpington & Queen Edith's division. This division provides for good electoral equality and does not divide communities between divisions. We confirm it as part of our final recommendations.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

East Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Ely East	1	5%	This division comprises the east of the city, the cathedral area to the south, and communities east of Lynn Road.	<p>We received 38 submissions relating to East Cambridgeshire district. The majority of respondents objected to the allocation of councillors for the district, and our proposed Fordham Villages & Soham South, Littleport East & Soham North and Littleport West divisions. We also received localised objections from parish councils located in our proposed Littleport West division.</p> <p>We received alternative proposals which were based on eight and nine single-member divisions. We have decided to base our final recommendations on eight county councillors for East Cambridgeshire. As stated earlier, we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence was received to justify changing the allocation of councillors to the district.</p> <p>While the proposal based on eight councillors resulted in divisions with reasonably good levels of electoral equality, it created divisions comprising Ely and adjoining parishes with poor internal access between communities. The proposals would also result in dividing Downham parish between two divisions. To provide for a uniform pattern of eight single-member divisions which provide an effective balance of the statutory criteria would require significant changes to the proposals received for Ely. We do not have sufficient evidence to make such changes.</p> <p>We therefore propose to confirm the draft recommendations for these five divisions in East Cambridgeshire as final subject to a minor change in Littleport to allow the division boundary to run behind Millfield and along Ely Road. While we note the views and objections of respondents to our draft</p>
Ely West	1	-7%	This division comprises much of the Ely community which is bounded by the A10 and A142 roads. The remainder of the division is made up of the rural area to the south and west of Ely.	
Fordham Villages & Soham South	2	8%	This division comprises Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Wicken parishes. It also comprises the southern part of Soham parish.	
Littleport East & Soham North	1	7%	This division comprises the eastern part of Littleport parish, the eastern part of Ely parish and northern part of Soham parish.	
Littleport West	2	9%	This division comprises Coveney, Downham, Haddenham, Mepal, Stretham, Sutton, Thetford, Wentworth, Wilburton, Witcham and Witchford	

			parishes. The division also comprises parts of Littleport and Ely parishes.	recommendations for East Cambridgeshire district, we consider that our proposed divisions provide for the best balance of the statutory criteria.
Woodditton	1	-1%	This division comprises Ashley, Bottisham, Brinkley, Burrough Green, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kirtling, Lode, Stetchworth, Westley Waterless and Woodditton parishes.	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. We are satisfied Woodditton division meets the statutory criteria and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Fenland District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Chatteris	1	5%	This division comprises the whole of Chatteris parish.	<p>We received 29 submissions relating to Fenland district. The majority of respondents objected to the allocation of councillors for Fenland, and our proposed two-member March North & Waldersey division. We also received localised objections to our proposals in Whittlesey and Wisbech St Mary parishes.</p> <p>We received alternative proposals which were based on nine and 10 single-member divisions. We have decided to base our final recommendations on nine county councillors for Fenland as we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence was received to justify changing the allocation of councillors to the district.</p> <p>The alternative proposals for Fenland received resulted in the creation of a division which comprised Christchurch, Elm, Manea and Wisbech St Mary parishes. On visiting the local area, we noted that the proposed division did not have clear road access between communities and did not reflect local community identities. Furthermore, it would span a large geographical area which would combine disparate communities that do not appear to share community identities and interests. Indeed, to traverse the proposed division by road, particularly between Elm parish and Christchurch parish, requires leaving the county. Although this division results in good electoral equality, we consider that it does not reflect community identities or provide for effective and convenient local government.</p>
March North & Waldersey	2	7%	This division comprises the northern part of March parish and the parishes of Christchurch, Elm and part of Wisbech St Mary parish.	
March South & Rural	1	8%	This division comprises the southern part of March parish and the parishes of Manea and Wimblington.	
Roman Bank & Peckover	1	8%	This division comprises Gorefield, Leverington, Newton, Parson Drove and Tydd St Giles parishes. It also includes parts of Wisbech and Wisbech St Mary parishes.	
Whittlesey North	1	-7%	This division comprises Bassenhally, Stonald and part of the St Andrews area.	
Whittlesey South	1	0%	This division comprises the district wards of Benwick, Coates & Eastrea and Lattersey and part of the St Andrews area. It also comprises Benwick and Doddington parishes and the rural part of March parish.	

				<p>We also looked at whether we could propose an alternative pattern of nine single-member divisions for Fenland district which did not require the acceptance of the above division. However, we were unable to find an alternative which would adequately meet the statutory criteria.</p> <p>We therefore propose that these six divisions are confirmed as part of our final recommendations. While we note the views and objections of respondents to our draft recommendations for Fenland district, we are satisfied that our proposed divisions will ensure good electoral equality and effective and convenient local government.</p>
Wisbech East	1	-2%	This division comprises the district wards of Kirkgate, Octavia Hill and Staithe.	<p>We received an alternative division pattern for the two Wisbech divisions which each comprised three of the six district wards for the town. After considering this arrangement, we are satisfied that it would better reflect the statutory criteria in Wisbech. This division arrangement improves electoral equality and provides for better coterminosity with the district wards of Fenland. We also propose the divisions are named Wisbech East and Wisbech West. We propose that these two divisions are adopted as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Wisbech West	1	-1%	This division comprises the district wards of Clarkson, Medworth and Waterlees.	

Huntingdonshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Alconbury & Kimbolton	1	-8%	This division comprises Alconbury, Alconbury Weston, Barham & Woolley, Brington & Molesworth, Buckworth, Bythorn & Keyston, Catworth, Covington, Easton, Ellington, Great Gidding, Great Staughton, Hail Weston, Hamerton & Steeple Gidding, Kimbolton, Leighton, Little Gidding, Old Weston, Perry, Spaldwick, Stow Longa, Tilbrook, Upton & Coppingford and Winwick parishes.	We received a submission objecting to our proposed division. We received an alternative pattern of divisions for this part of the district. However, based on a 61-member Council, a proposed Kimbolton division would have a variance of greater than 10%. We consider that our proposed division better reflects the statutory criteria and propose that it is confirmed as final.
Brampton & Buckden	1	-3%	This division comprises Brampton, Buckden, Diddington, Grafham, Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy and Southoe & Midloe parishes.	We received support for our proposed division from a local councillor. We received no other responses for this division. Brampton & Buckden division provides for good electoral equality, reflects communities and ensures effective and convenient local government. We propose it is confirmed as final.
Godmanchester & Huntingdon South	1	-9%	This division comprises Godmanchester parish and a part of Huntingdon parish to the south of American Lane and Priory Road.	We are satisfied that Godmanchester & Huntingdon South division meets the statutory criteria. We received an objection to include the Newtown area in our proposed division from a local respondent. However, they did not put forward an alternative division pattern. Therefore we propose this division is confirmed as final.

Huntingdon North & Hartford	1	-1%	This division comprises the north of Huntingdon parish, including the areas of Hartford and Sapley.	We received support for our proposed divisions in Huntingdon from a local councillor. We are satisfied that Huntingdon North & Hartford and Huntingdon West divisions reflect our statutory criteria and propose that both divisions are confirmed as final.
Huntingdon West	1	-3%	This division comprises the centre and west of Huntingdon parish.	
Ramsey & Bury	1	1%	This division comprises Bury and Ramsey parishes.	We received two submissions relating to this division. One of the respondents supported our draft recommendations. The other submission objected to our proposals. It was argued that Bury is a rural community with different interests to the market town of Ramsey. We investigated the possibility of transferring Bury parish into Warboys & The Stukeleys division; however, this arrangement would result in an electoral variance of 14%. We are unable to find an alternative division pattern which would meet the statutory criteria. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Sawtry & Stilton	1	7%	This division comprises Alwalton, Chesterton, Conington, Denton & Caldecote, Elton, Folksworth & Washingley, Glatton, Haddon, Holme, Morborne, Sawtry, Sibson-cum-Stibbington, Stilton and Water Newton parishes.	We received two submissions relating to this division. One of the respondents objected to our draft recommendations. A local councillor proposed our division name of Norman Cross should be changed to Sawtry & Stilton. We are persuaded by the councillor's evidence that Sawtry is the largest village in the division and is increasing in size due to housing development. We consider the proposed name better reflects communities in our proposed division. Subject to this, we confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Somersham & Earith	1	-9%	This division comprises Bluntisham, Broughton, Colne, Earith, Kings Ripton, Old Hurst, Pidley-cum-Fenton,	We received objections to our proposed division arrangement. It was argued that Wyton-on-the-Hill parish has little connection with the parishes of Somersham, Earith and Bluntisham. It was proposed that Wyton-on-the-

			Somersham and Woodhurst parishes.	Hill be transferred to St Ives as it shares closer transport and community links with the town. While such a transfer improves electoral equality in St Ives North division, it would result in 13% fewer electors per councillor in Somersham & Earith division. To improve electoral equality, we propose that Broughton and Kings Ripton parishes are transferred to this division from our proposed Warboys & The Stukeleys division.
St Ives North & Wyton	1	3%	This division comprises the north of St Ives parish and Wyton-on-the-Hill parish.	We propose that Wyton-on-the-Hill parish is included with this division from Somersham & Earith. We are persuaded that Wyton-on-the-Hill has closer transport and community links with St Ives. Our proposals also significantly improve electoral equality in the division and provide for effective and convenient local government.
St Ives South & Needingworth	1	-8%	This division comprises the south of St Ives parish and Holywell-cum-Needingworth parish.	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. We are satisfied St Ives South & Needingworth meets the statutory criteria and have decided to confirm it as final.
St Neots East & Gransden	1	0%	This division comprises part of a new development in St Neots, east of the railway and Abbotsley, Great Gransden, Great Paxton, Toseland, Waresley-cum-Tetworth and Yelling parishes.	<p>We received a number of submissions objecting to our proposed division for this area. It was argued by councillors, local residents and parishes in the proposed division that the Loves Farm development in St Neots town should be included in a St Neots-based division.</p> <p>We investigated whether it was possible to include the housing development in one of the St Neots divisions to the west of the railway line. However, this would result in poor levels of electoral equality. We did not receive a viable alternative for this area which would meet the statutory criteria for St Neots and the adjoining rural parishes. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft</p>

				recommendations for St Neots East & Gransden as final. While we note the views of respondents in this area, we consider that our proposed division provide for the best balance of the statutory criteria.
St Neots Eynesbury	1	-5%	This division comprises the east of St Neots which includes the Eynesbury area.	We received objections to our proposals to include the area between Cambridge Street, Church Street and Fox Brook in St Neots Eynesbury division. We do not consider that a persuasive argument has been made to transfer this area to St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton division. We consider our draft recommendations better reflect communities as Church Meadow and adjoining roads have access into Eynesbury over Fox Brook. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	1	2%	This division comprises the parish of St Neots north of the High Street and Little Paxton parish.	We received specific comments relating to parish warding arrangements in this area. We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. We are satisfied that St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton meets the statutory criteria and have decided to confirm it as final.
St Neots The Eatons	1	-1%	This division comprises the west of St Neots which includes the Eaton Ford area.	We did not receive any objections to our draft recommendations for this division. St Neots The Eatons division provides for good electoral equality, reflects communities and, in our view will ensure effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
The Hemingfords & Fenstanton	1	-5%	This division comprises Fenstanton, Hemingford Abbots, Hemingford Grey,	We received responses to our proposed division which made observations but did not provide any alternative proposals. We are satisfied that our proposed division provides for good electoral equality, reflects communities

			Hilton and Houghton & Wyton parishes.	and effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Warboys & The Stukeleys	1	-5%	This division comprises Abbots Ripton, The Stukeleys, Upwood & The Raveleys, Warboys, Wistow and Wood Walton parishes.	<p>We received objections to our draft proposals in this area. It was argued that The Stukeleys does not share strong community identities with Warboys. It was proposed that The Stukeleys be included with Alconbury & Kimbolton or Brampton & Buckden divisions. This arrangement was supported by a local parish council and local residents.</p> <p>We investigated whether such an arrangement was possible; however, this would result in electoral variances of 28% more and 33% more electors per councillor for Alconbury & Kimbolton and Brampton & Buckden divisions respectively. We did not receive a suitable alternative which would meet the statutory criteria. However, as stated above, we have decided to amend our draft recommendations between this division and Somersham & Earith.</p>
Yaxley & Farcet	1	1%	This division comprises Farcet and Yaxley parishes.	We received support for the draft recommendations relating to this division. Yaxley & Farcet provides for good electoral equality, reflects communities and effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

South Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Bar Hill	1	2%	This division comprises Bar Hill, Dry Drayton, Lolworth and Girton parishes.	We received a submission which proposed that Lolworth parish be transferred to Bar Hill division from Cambourne division. It was argued that the parish is separated from Cambourne by the A428 dual carriageway. We propose to modify our draft recommendations to include Lolworth in Bar Hill division. We are persuaded that Lolworth has closer links with Bar Hill via the A14. Our proposed division also provides for good electoral equality and reflects communities.
Cambourne	1	-10%	This division comprises Bourn, Cambourne, Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes.	We received a submission which proposed that Boxworth, Childerley, Knapwell and Lolworth parishes be transferred to Papworth & Swavesey division from Cambourne division. On visiting the area we discovered that Cambourne is separated from these parishes by the A428 dual carriageway. The parishes are also a considerable distance away from Cambourne. We therefore propose that Boxworth, Childerley and Knapwell parishes are included in Papworth & Swavesey division where they share closer community identities. To improve electoral equality in Cambourne division we propose to include Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes. We propose this division as part of our final recommendations.
Cottenham & Willingham	1	4%	This division comprises Cottenham, Rampton and Willingham parishes.	We received a submission which commented on particular arrangements for Over and Willingham parishes. Having considered the evidence received we are content this division provides for good electoral equality and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Duxford	1	-5%	This division comprises Duxford, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great & Little Chishill, Heydon, Hinxton, Ickleton, Pampisford, Shepreth, Thriplow and Whittlesford parishes.	We received three submissions relating to Duxford division. Having considered the evidence received we propose that Pampisford parish is included in the division. We are satisfied with the evidence that Pampisford shares strong community links with local parishes within the division. We consider our proposed division reflects the statutory criteria and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
Fulbourn	1	6%	This division comprises the southern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Fulbourn, Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham, Stow-cum-Quy and Teversham parishes.	Our proposals for this division split Fen Ditton parish between two divisions. We received an objection to this arrangement which argued that the parish should be included within an entire division. To propose this change would result in poor electoral equality and the creation of a detached division. Our proposals meet the statutory criteria in this area and we have decided to confirm Fulbourn division as part of our final recommendations.
Gamlingay	1	-4%	This division comprises Abington Pigotts, Arrington, Barrington, Croydon, Gamlingay, Guilden Morden, Hatley, Litlington, Orwell, Shingay-cum-Wendy, Steeple Morden, Tadlow and Wimpole parishes.	We did not receive any objections to our draft proposals for Gamlingay. However due to the transfer of Longstowe and Little Gransden parishes to Cambourne division, Gamlingay division would have a variance of 12% fewer electors. To improve electoral equality we propose to include Litlington parish.
Hardwick	1	4%	This division comprises Barton, Caldecote, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Great Eversden, Harlton, Hardwick, Kingston, Little Eversden, Madingley and Toft parishes.	We received five submissions which supported transferring Madingley parish to Hardwick division. Having considered the evidence received we propose to modify our draft recommendations. We are content that Madingley parish has strong community links with parishes in Hardwick division. Our proposed division also provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities in this area.

Histon & Impington	1	4%	This division comprises Histon, Impington and Orchard Park parishes.	We received support for our draft recommendations and consider that our proposals meet the statutory criteria. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Linton	1	-1%	This division comprises Balsham, Bartlow, Carlton, Castle Camps, Great Abington, Hildersham, Horseheath, Linton, Little Abington, Shudy Camps, Weston Colville, West Wickham and West Wrating parishes.	We received support for our draft recommendations and consider that our proposals meet the statutory criteria. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
Longstanton, Northstowe & Over	1	1%	This division comprises Longstanton, Oakington & Westwick and Over parishes.	We received three submissions in relation to this division. Having considered the evidence received we propose to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final subject to a change of division name. We are unable to include Oakington & Westwick parish in Bar Hill division as this would result in poor electoral equality in both divisions. In addition, to include Over parish in a division with Fen Drayton, Swavesey and Willingham parishes would require significant changes in adjoining divisions for which we have received no evidence. One of the submissions proposed that we reflect the name Longstanton in the name of the division. We consider that the name of Longstanton, Northstowe & Over provides a better reflection of communities and forms part of our final recommendations.
Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1	-8%	This division comprises Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Melbourn,	We received two submissions in relation to our proposed division. It was argued that Shepreth parish should be included in a division with Meldreth parish. However, to adopt such an arrangement would result in a Duxford

			Meldreth and Whaddon parishes.	division with 13% fewer electors per councillor. As a result of changes in Gamlingay division we propose to transfer Litlington parish to Gamlingay division in order to improve electoral equality.
Papworth & Swavesey	1	3%	This division comprises Boxworth, Caxton, Conington, Childerley, Croxton, Elsworth, Eltisley, Fen Drayton, Graveley, Knapwell, Papworth Everard, Papworth St Agnes and Swavesey parishes.	We received two submissions in relation to our proposed division. We are unable to accommodate an arrangement which would result in Swavesey parish being included in a division with Fen Drayton, Over and Willingham parishes as this would require significant changes to adjoining divisions for which we have no evidence. However, we propose to include Boxworth, Childerley and Knapwell parishes from Cambourne division as evidence suggests that these parishes have stronger community links with local parishes within our proposed division.
Sawston & Shelford	2	-2%	This division comprises Babraham, Great Shelford, Harston, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Little Shelford, Newton, Sawston and Stapleford parishes.	We received submissions from local respondents which proposed that Great Shelford, Little Shelford and Stapleford parishes be included in the same division. It was argued that the parishes share close community links and facilities. While it is possible to include both parishes in a single-member division, it would require significant changes across the district in order to provide for divisions which meet the statutory criteria. Therefore, we propose to create a two-member division from our proposed Shelford and Sawston divisions. This will ensure both parishes are not divided between divisions. We also propose to transfer Pampisford parish to Duxford division where, it was argued, it shares closer community identity with local parishes.

Waterbeach	1	-5%	This division comprises the northern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Horningsea, Landbeach, Milton and Waterbeach parishes.	We received two submissions for Waterbeach division. Having considered the evidence received, we propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Waterbeach division as final. We consider this division provides for the best balance of statutory criteria.
-------------------	---	-----	--	--

Conclusions

36 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2021
Number of councillors	61	61
Number of electoral divisions	56	56
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	20	1
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

Final recommendation

Cambridgeshire County Council should comprise 61 councillors serving 51 single-member divisions and five two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Cambridgeshire. You can also view our final recommendations for Cambridgeshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

37 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

38 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the district councils in Cambridgeshire have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to

parish electoral arrangements.

39 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ely, Fen Ditton, Huntingdon, Littleport, March, Soham, St Neots, St Ives, Whittlesey and Wisbech St Mary parishes.

40 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ely parish.

Final recommendation
City of Ely Council should retain 15 town councillors, representing six wards: Chettisham (returning one member), Ely East (returning three members), Ely North (returning three members), Ely West (returning six members), Prickwillow (returning one member) and Stuntney (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

41 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Fen Ditton parish.

Final recommendation
Fen Ditton Parish Council should return nine parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: West (returning three members) and East (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

42 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Huntingdon parish.

Final recommendation
Huntingdon Town Council should return 19 town councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Central (returning two members), East (returning four members), North East (returning four members), South (returning two members) and West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

43 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littleport parish.

Final recommendation
Littleport Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Littleport East (returning eight members) and Littleport West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

44 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for March parish.

Final recommendation

March Town Council should return 12 town councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Central (returning one member), East (returning three members), Eastwood (returning one member), North (returning three members), Rural North (returning one member), Rural South (returning one member) and South (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Soham parish.

Final recommendation

Soham Town Council should comprise 14 town councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Soham Central (returning one member), Soham North (returning six members) and Soham South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

46 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for St Neots parish.

Final recommendation

St Neots Town Council should return 21 town councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Church (returning one member), Crosshall (returning one member), East (returning four members), Eaton Ford (returning three members), Eaton Socon (returning three members), Eynesbury (returning six members) and Priory Park (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

47 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for St Ives parish.

Final recommendation

St Ives Town Council should return 17 town councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Beech (returning one member), North (returning seven members), South (returning seven members) and West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

48 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Whittlesey parish.

Final recommendation

Whittlesey Town Council should return 14 town councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Bassenhally (returning three members), Coates & Eastrea (returning three members), Delph (returning one member), Elm (returning one member), Lattersey (returning two members), St Andrews (returning one member), St Marys North (returning one member), St Marys South (returning one member) and Stonald (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

49 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Wisbech St Mary parish.

Final recommendation

Wisbech St Mary Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Murrow (returning three members) and Wisbech St Mary (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

50 We have now completed our review of Cambridgeshire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

Equalities

51 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Cambridge City								
1	Abbey	1	7,649	7,649	-3%	7,794	7,794	-9%
2	Arbury	1	7,382	7,382	-6%	8,404	8,404	-2%
3	Castle	1	6,366	6,366	-19%	8,327	8,327	-3%
4	Cherry Hinton	1	8,750	8,750	11%	8,945	8,945	5%
5	Chesterton	1	8,679	8,679	11%	8,977	8,977	5%
6	King's Hedges	1	9,029	9,029	15%	8,996	8,996	5%
7	Market	1	7,839	7,839	0%	8,361	8,361	-2%
8	Newnham	1	7,502	7,502	-5%	7,545	7,545	-12%
9	Petersfield	1	8,267	8,267	5%	8,618	8,618	1%
10	Romsey	1	8,981	8,981	14%	9,328	9,328	9%
11	Trumpington & Queen Edith's	2	12,715	6,358	-19%	16,455	8,228	-4%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
East Cambridgeshire District								
12	Ely East	1	6,914	6,914	-12%	8,960	8,960	5%
13	Ely West	1	7,581	7,581	-3%	7,960	7,960	-7%
14	Fordham Villages & Soham South	2	16,514	8,257	5%	18,489	9,245	8%
15	Littleport East & Soham North	1	8,957	8,957	14%	9,132	9,132	7%
16	Littleport West	2	17,456	8,728	11%	18,649	9,325	9%
17	Woodditton	1	8,108	8,108	3%	8,460	8,460	-1%
Fenland District								
18	Chatteris	1	8,115	8,115	3%	8,975	8,975	5%
19	March North & Waldersey	2	17,889	8,945	14%	18,351	9,176	7%
20	March South & Rural	1	7,909	7,909	1%	9,234	9,234	8%
21	Roman Bank & Peckover	1	8,992	8,992	15%	9,250	9,250	8%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
22	Whittlesey North	1	7,565	7,565	-4%	7,910	7,910	-7%
23	Whittlesey South	1	8,436	8,436	7%	8,530	8,530	0%
24	Wisbech East	1	8,025	8,025	2%	8,397	8,397	-2%
25	Wisbech West	1	7,944	7,944	1%	8,453	8,453	-1%
Huntingdonshire District								
26	Alconbury & Kimbolton	1	7,866	7,866	0%	7,890	7,890	-8%
27	Brampton & Buckden	1	8,013	8,013	2%	8,320	8,320	-3%
28	Godmanchester & Huntingdon South	1	6,834	6,834	-13%	7,813	7,813	-9%
29	Huntingdon North & Hartford	1	8,500	8,500	8%	8,497	8,497	-1%
30	Huntingdon West	1	6,788	6,788	-14%	8,310	8,310	-3%
31	Ramsey & Bury	1	8,179	8,179	4%	8,670	8,670	1%
32	St Ives North & Wyton	1	8,340	8,340	6%	8,785	8,785	3%
33	St Ives South & Needingworth	1	7,790	7,790	-1%	7,845	7,845	-8%
34	St Neots East & Gransden	1	4,669	4,669	-41%	8,560	8,560	0%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
35	St Neots Eynesbury	1	7,960	7,960	1%	8,111	8,111	-5%
36	St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	1	8,504	8,504	8%	8,723	8,723	2%
37	St Neots The Eatons	1	8,687	8,687	11%	8,466	8,466	-1%
38	Sawtry & Stilton	1	9,077	9,077	16%	9,110	9,110	7%
39	Somersham & Earith	1	7,692	7,692	-2%	7,790	7,790	-9%
40	The Hemingfords & Fenstanton	1	7,628	7,628	-3%	8,100	8,100	-5%
41	Warboys & The Stukeleys	1	5,751	5,751	-27%	8,140	8,140	-5%
42	Yaxley & Farcet	1	8,479	8,479	8%	8,650	8,650	1%
South Cambridgeshire District								
43	Bar Hill	1	7,337	7,337	-7%	8,760	8,760	2%
44	Cambourne	1	7,224	7,224	-8%	7,720	7,720	-10%
45	Cottenham & Willingham	1	8,163	8,163	4%	8,900	8,900	4%
46	Duxford	1	8,130	8,130	4%	8,140	8,140	-5%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
47	Fulbourn	1	7,086	7,086	-10%	9,069	9,069	6%
48	Gamlingay	1	8,070	8,070	3%	8,230	8,230	-4%
49	Hardwick	1	8,718	8,718	11%	8,920	8,920	4%
50	Histon & Impington	1	7,986	7,986	2%	8,850	8,850	4%
51	Linton	1	8,420	8,420	7%	8,440	8,440	-1%
52	Longstanton, Northstowe & Over	1	5,888	5,888	-25%	8,590	8,590	1%
53	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1	7,836	7,836	0%	7,870	7,870	-8%
54	Papworth & Swavesey	1	7,010	7,010	-11%	8,830	8,830	3%
55	Sawston & Shelford	2	14,810	7,405	-6%	16,690	8,345	-2%
56	Waterbeach	1	7,909	7,909	1%	8,091	8,091	-5%
	Totals	61	478,908	-	-	521,380	-	-
	Averages	-	-	7,851	-	-	8,547	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council>

County Council

- Cambridgeshire County Council

District Councils

- Cambridge City Council
- East Cambridgeshire District Council
- Fenland District Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council

Political Groups

- Cambridge City Liberal Democrat Group
- Cambridge Green Party
- Cambridgeshire County Council Liberal Democrat Group
- Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group
- North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association
- South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association

Councillors (County, District and Parish)

- Councillor A. Bailey (Cambridgeshire County Council & East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor A. Riley (South Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor A. Taylor (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor B. Hunt (East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor B. Waters (South Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor B. Boddington (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillors C. Ambrose Smith and D. Ambrose Smith (East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor C. Boden (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor C. Boden (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor C. Saunderson (Fenstanton Parish Council)
- Councillor D. Harty (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillor D. Baigent (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor D. Mason (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor D. Brown (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor D. Laws (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor E. Dorling (Fenland District Council)

- Councillor F. Burkitt (South Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor F. Yeulett (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor G. Booth (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor J. Chitty (Brampton Parish Council)
- Councillor J. Webber (East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor J. Windle (Whittlesey Town Council)
- Councillor J. Wisson (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor K. Owen (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor K. Mayor (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor L. Harford (South Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor L. Dupré (East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor M. Shellens (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillor P. Downes (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor P. Clapp (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor S. Bywater (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor S. Bligh (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor S. Hoy (Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council)
- Councillor S. King (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor S. Count (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor T. Sanderson (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillor V. Sanders (Cambridge City Council)

Local Organisations

- Christ's Pieces Residents' Association
- South Petersfield Residents' Association
- Trumpington Residents' Association
- Windsor Road Residents' Association
- North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (Whittlesey Branch)

Members of Parliament

- Stephen Barclay MP (North East Cambridgeshire)

Parish and town councils

- Barton Parish Council
- Burwell Parish Council
- Bury Parish Council
- Cambourne Parish Council
- Catworth Parish Council
- Caxton Parish Council
- Chatteris Town Council
- City of Ely Council
- Doddington Parish Council

- Dullingham Parish Council
- Elton Parish Council
- Farcet Parish Council
- Fen Ditton Parish Council
- Foxtton Parish Council
- Grantchester Parish Council
- Great Gransden Parish Council
- Great Paxton Parish Council
- Great Shelford Parish Council
- Haddenham Parish Council
- Hail Weston Parish Council
- Histon & Impington Parish Council
- Little Abington Parish Council
- Little Downham Parish Council
- Littleport Parish Council
- Lolworth Parish Meeting
- Longstanton Parish Council
- Madingley Parish Council
- Meldreth Parish Council
- Oakington & Westwick Parish Council
- Over Parish Council
- Pampisford Parish Council
- Parson Drove Parish Council
- Reach Parish Council
- St Ives Town Council
- St Neots Town Council
- Stetchworth Parish Council
- Stukeleys Parish Council
- Sutton Parish Council
- Swavesey Parish Council
- Warboys Parish Council
- Waterbeach Parish Council
- Whaddon Parish Council
- Whittlesey Town Council
- Willingham Parish Council
- Wisbech Town Council
- Witcham Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council
- Yelling Parish Council

Local residents

- 151 local residents

Further limited consultation in Cambridge

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council>

County Council

- Cambridgeshire County Council

Political Groups

- Cambridgeshire County Council Labour Group
- Cambridge Liberal Democrat Group
- Newnham Labour Party
- Newnham Liberal Democrats

Local Organisations

- Bentley Road & Newton Road Residents' Association
- South Acre, Latham & Chaucer Road Residents' Association
- South Petersfield Residents' Association
- Trumpington Residents' Association
- Windsor Road Residents' Association

Councillors

- Councillor A. Bailey (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor C. Boden (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillors J. Hipkin (Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council) and M-L. Holland (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor B. Hunt (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor I. Manning (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor S. Meftah (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor C. O'Reilly (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor C. Smart (Cambridge City Council)

Local residents

- 96 local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

