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From: Anna Bailey
Sent: 05 July 2015 15:14
To: reviews
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Boundary Review

Dear Sir / Madam

I am a Cambridgeshire County Councillor for the Ely South & West Division and an East Cambridgeshire District Councillor for the Downham Villages Ward and I live in Ely. I therefore have extensive knowledge of the East Cambs area and its dynamics.

I do not agree with the Commission’s proposals in respect of Cambridgeshire as a whole, or specifically relating to East Cambridgeshire. I do not believe that the Commission has followed its own guidance, or that the solution proposed supports the three main principles of that guidance as effectively as it is possible to do.

- I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of Councillors should be reduced from 69 to 63. Using the 63 figure facilitates single Member Divisions in East Cambs and is the key to the best solution for convenient and effective local government and reflecting community interests and identity throughout the county.
- I believe that single Member Divisions throughout Cambridgeshire provide for the most effective local government, giving greater clarity to the electorate and to City, Town and Parish Councils and other local organisations.
- I support the proposals put forward in July 2015 by the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association and East Cambridgeshire District Council

Specifically, I believe that the Commission's proposed two-member “Littleport West” Division is unworkable, unacceptable and fails to meet the statutory requirements in redrawing boundaries. This massive proposed Division covers the parishes of Little Thetford, Streatham, Wilburton, Haddenham, Wentworth, Witchford, Sutton, Mepal, Witcham, Coveney and Little Downham, together with the whole of the Littleport West District Ward. In 2020, this “Littleport West” Division is projected to have 18,510 electors, which would give it the largest electorate of any of the Commission’s 57 proposed Divisions in the whole of Cambridgeshire. Given the highly rural and geographically challenged nature of much of this Division, it is inconceivable that two Members will adequately be able to represent this disparate, oversized area, which contains so many parishes. If the Commission were to ask local residents in most of the villages included, if they lived in or identified with “Littleport West” they would receive a unanimous “no”. Certainly, this was the case when I took this proposal to the Parish Councils in the Downham Villages and I know it also to be the case for those Parish Councils falling within the Haddenham Division, as reported by Bill Hunt, the local County Council Member for Haddenham.
There are a number of extremely rural areas within the proposed Division of Littleport West which score badly in the national deprivation indices and I believe these areas would be neglected in such a large Division. In particular, I am concerned about the needs of Pymoor and the Downham Droves which, whilst low in population, have extreme challenges in terms of access to services and their geography. This is further exacerbated by the fact that the Division is proposed to have two Members who may or may not be willing to work in co-operation. If the two Members were to work in co-operation, I believe that such a large area would inevitably be divided geographically between them, highlighting the need to split the Division into single Member Divisions in the first place. If the two Members are not willing or able to work co-operatively the size of the Division each Member would be trying to represent and service would be too large. I believe that this would make it very difficult to find people willing to stand for election, with people being deterred by the geographical difficulties and the sheer amount of time required both in terms of campaigning to become elected as well as afterwards if successful; this is particularly acute for single Independent (or single political party) candidates. I believe this is bad for democracy.

The Commission, in its own detailed guidance, states that it will not support “doughnut” electoral areas (that is, an electoral area which surrounds another electoral area) on the grounds that the far parts of the “doughnut” will tend to have far more in common, and better community connections, with the central “hole” in the doughnut than they tend to have with each other. Whilst the "doughnut" is not complete, that is exactly the effect that is happening in this proposed Division. Littleport lies north north-east of the city of Ely. Little Thetford and Stretham lie south south-west of Ely - 180 degrees the other side of Ely from Littleport. Other than looking towards Ely for larger shopping and some leisure facilities, Sutton, and particularly the villages to the south of Sutton (Wentworth, Witchford, Haddenham, Aldreth, Wilburton, Stretham and Little Thetford) are totally remote from Littleport - geographically (residents of those areas look to Ely and Cambridge and do not use or travel to Littleport), culturally (residents of those areas do not link themselves in any way to Littleport), demographically and in terms of service need (educational, economic and health and wellbeing needs are markedly different).

I strongly urge you to consider carefully the proposal put forward by East Cambs District Council and that of the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association for 63 Members, giving 9 Members in East Cambs. The boundaries proposed achieve single Member Divisions, good electoral equality, provide for convenient and effective local government and offer the best solution, by some margin, in terms of reflecting community interests and identity.

Yours faithfully
Anna Bailey

CCC County Councillor - Ely South & West
ECDC, District Councillor - Downham Villages
I support the Liberal Democrat group's counter-proposal for a 63-member council, with one member per division. I hope that proposal will be accepted, but here are my comments on the proposals before us. My comments relate specifically to the Queen Edith's ward, where I have been a councillor for twenty years. The northern boundary is similar to what we had before 2000, except that there is a gap east of Wulfstan Way, omitting a section of Cherry Hinton Road as well as Missinton Court to Carrick Close (see purple shape in map above). It would be more logical to restore those streets to Queen Edith's, and to leave the Greystoke Road area, which has never been in Queen Edith's, in Cherry Hinton. This would keep these streets in the same ward as the local schools, and the main road makes a logical boundary. On the southern boundary, you are proposing to remove Wot's Causeway and Babraham Road from Queen Edith's (see blue shape 3). These streets contain family housing and are part of the Queen Edith's community; people shop in the Wulfstan Way area and attend the churches there; children go to the Queen Edith's, Queen Emma and Netherhall schools. Residents in these streets have little in common with Trumpington. There would be more logic to giving Homerton St and Parbeck Rd to Trumpington ward as the residents in those streets are more transient, and the boundary could run down Hills Road.
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Dear Mr Caller,

I understand the goal of reducing the County Council from 69 members to 61 or 63.
I really am very very unhappy with the suggested new County Division which may combine Littleport, Sutton and Haddenham into one two member division.
People from Littleport have no connection with or little common ground with people from Haddenham.
People in Haddenham do not want to share with Littleport and I guess the same is true visa versa.
Two member divisions are bad for localism, bad for democracy and will win ring the death knell for Independent candidates.
I and many others have intimate knowledge of their divisions and the people who live in them, increasing the area by 150% will make communication difficult and representation a trial.
Please halt this unreasonable slide towards what will be unless extensively altered a real disaster.
Bill Hunt
Current Member Haddenham Division.

COUNTY COUNCIL DIVISIONS.

At present the Haddenham Division of the County Council covers:

Aldreth
Earith Bridge
Little Thetford
Haddenham
Stretham
Wentworth
Wilburton
Witchford
I have been the Local member since 2005 and was re-elected last time in 2013. What I have to say relates to the viability of the area, the effectiveness of resident's representation and open democracy. It is not personal to me it does however have an impact on any future County Councillors and the areas they represent.

It is suggested by the boundary commission that a new (two member) Division is created which includes the above plus
Mepal
Witcham
Sutton
Little Downham
Coveney
Wardy Hill
Pymore
Chettisham
Bits of Ely
half of Littleport
Black Horse Drove.

The proposed name of this division is Littleport West!

With the best will in the world, a Councillor who knows and understands the Haddenham area and its issues cannot be an expert on Sutton or Littleport.

How can a Councillor have regular and good contact with over a dozen Parish Councils even when it is a two member division?

At election time, can anybody really imagine hearing the views of so many many people? This disenfranchises and disadvantages individuals wishing to stand as Independent or anyone who doesn't have a 'running mate' as it will be all but impossible to canvass and provide information to all homes. It also risks Councillors and potential Councillors ignoring the more rural areas, as the area is too large to cope with adequately.

In my view (and I hope in yours) the creation of a new two Member "Super Division" will be very harmful to the relationship between Councillor and the communities he/she represents. Representation will be weaker and the "Council" will become more distant.

I am very content that the number of members of the County Council be reduced from 69 to 61 but consideration should be given to our expanding and fast growing population.Since the Haddenham Division is larger than most, it had been suggested that Wentworth could be transferred to Sutton Division this seems sensible.

The very rural nature of this area makes it difficult/impossible to service and support. Earith Bridge to Black Bank to nearly Chittering!

At the very least, cutting the area in half with Sutton/Haddenham on one side and Ely/Littleport at the other should be considered.

You are being consulted, please express your views.

Many Thanks
Bill Hunt
Local Member Haddenham Division
Dear Cllr Hunt,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS


View the draft recommendations

You can view the Commission's draft recommendations at https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4143 where you can find interactive maps, a report and guidance on how to have your say. The Commission has not finalised its conclusions and now invites representations on the draft recommendations.

There is a summary outlining the Commission's draft recommendations outlining the draft recommendations, an interactive map of the Commission's recommendations for Cambridgeshire, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new wards is available on the consultation area at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk. Further information about the review and the Commission’s work is also published on our website at: https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council.

Have your say

We encourage everyone who has a view on the draft recommendations to contact us whether you support them or whether you wish to propose alternative arrangements.

Before finalising the recommendations, the Commission will consider every representation received during consultation whether it is submitted by an individual, a local group or an organisation. We will weigh each submission against the criteria the Commission must follow when drawing up electoral arrangements:

- To deliver electoral equality where each county councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the county.
- That the pattern of divisions should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities.
- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

It is important that you take account of the criteria if you are suggesting an alternative pattern of divisions. You can find additional guidance and information about previous electoral reviews on our website to help you or your organisation make a submission.

Get in touch

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 06 July 2015. Representations should be made:

- Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.

- By email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk.
• Or in writing to:
  Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
  Local Government Boundary Commission for England
  14th Floor
  Millbank Tower
  Millbank
  London
  SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to publish every response it receives during phases of consultation. If you do not want all or any part of your response or name to be made public, you must state this clearly in the response. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. All responses may be subject to publication or disclosure as required by law (in particular under the Freedom of Information Act 2000).

This is the last opportunity to influence the Commission’s recommendations before they are finalised. We therefore encourage local people to get in touch with us and have their say.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Alex Hinds
Review Officer

Please note as of 27 April we have new contact details. Our new address is LGBCE, 14th Floor, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London, SW1P 4QP. Our new telephone number is 0330 500 1525. The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you receive this email by mistake please notify the sender and delete it immediately. Opinions expressed are those of the individual and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Cambridgeshire County Council. All sent and received email from Cambridgeshire County Council is automatically scanned for the presence of computer viruses and security issues. Visit www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Review of the Electoral Division boundaries for the County of Cambridgeshire

Dear Sir,

I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically, in respect of the whole of the County, I make the following two submissions:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63. Strong evidence was presented to the LGBCE by Cambridgeshire County Council at an earlier stage of this review following extensive consultation and careful consideration of the workload of County Councillors. The County Council sought to propose a Council size which would produce cost-effective local government by reducing the number of County Councillors to the minimum number which could reasonably allow Councillors to maintain all of the duties and associated functions associated with their role. That number was deemed to be 63. The LGBCE stated, on receipt of this evidence, that it was "minded" to agree with that number. In its draft recommendations, the LGBCE proposed, instead, a Council size of 61 asserting that difficulty in drawing division boundaries in Fenland and in East Cambridgeshire meant that a Council size of 61 produces better achievement of the statutory criteria. I disagree with that assertion and submit that schemes put forward to the LGBCE for Fenland (by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association) and for East Cambridgeshire (by East Cambridgeshire District Council and by the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association). Since proposals have been made on the basis of 63 members which are, in both Fenland and in East Cambridgeshire, more in accordance with the statutory criteria that the LGBCE's draft recommendations based on 61 members, it would appear that the LGBCE's rationale for proposing a 61 member Council instead of a 63 member Council is now superseded and incorrect, and that the Commission should therefore revert to proposing a Council size of 63.

If, despite the evidence provided, the LGBCE is still not minded to propose a Council size of 63, I would ask the Commission, in the light of the detailed boundary proposals received, to consider a Council size of 62 rather than 61, because there is a real danger that the further that the LGBCE reduces the number of Councillors below 63, the greater the chance is that there will be too few Councillors available to fulfill all of the functions that Councillors are meant to fulfill.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor. As a County
Councillor, I know for a fact that I would be unable to give as dedicated a service to the electors I represent if my division were to be twice the size that it is, even if it were a two-member division. The LGBCE is correct to say that, in terms of strict arithmetic electoral equality, 15,000 electors represented by two councillors is equivalent to 7,500 councillors represented by a single councillor. However, in terms of quality of representation, all of the County Councillors I have spoken to state that single-member division provide more effective representation than two-member divisions. In Cambridgeshire County Council, at least, it appears widely felt that efficient and effective local government is best achieved through single-member divisions.

The comments above relate to this review at a County-wide level. I shall make a separate submission specifically about the recommended boundaries for County Council divisions within Fenland District.

Yours faithfully,

Councillor Chris Boden
County Councillor for Whittlesey North Division
District Councillor for the Bassenhally Ward of Fenland District Council.
Town Councillor for the Elm Ward of Whittlesey Town Council.
**SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE SCHEMES OF 9 AND 10 SINGLE-MEMBER DIVISIONS IN FENLAND**

Please find below detailed schemes for 9 and 10 single-member County Council divisions in Fenland, both of which satisfy the statutory criteria for boundary reviews more closely than the LGBCE's draft recommendation for 9 members representing 8 divisions.

The scheme for 9 divisions achieves far better co-terminosity with Fenland District Council Wards than is achieved in the LGBCE's draft recommendations for 9 members. My scheme for 10 divisions (which is slightly different from that submitted by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association) achieves the same level of co-terminosity with Fenland District Council Wards as is achieved in the LGBCE's draft recommendations for 9 members [despite the Commission's claim that it is difficult to meet the statutory criteria with ten members in Fenland]. Both of my schemes adhere more closely to existing town boundaries, Parish boundaries and Town Ward boundaries in Fenland, thus promoting more efficient and convenient local government and reflecting local communities better than the LGBCE's draft recommendations do.

In terms of co-terminosity (which the Commission should take into account in determining electoral boundaries) the LGBCE's draft proposals achieve 75% co-terminosity with district ward boundaries in Fenland (18 out of 24 - the wards which are split are Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary, March East, March North, March West, Doddington & Wimblington and St Andrews)

My proposal below for 9 divisions achieves 92% co-terminosity with district ward boundaries in Fenland (22 out of 24 - the only wards which are split are Parson Drove & Wisbech St Mary and March North)

My proposal below for 10 divisions achieves 75% co-terminosity with district ward boundaries in Fenland (18 out of 24 - the wards which are split are Elm & Christchurch, March East, March North, March West, St Andrews and Doddington & Wimblington)

Since the District Ward boundaries were created only last year in Fenland by the LGBCE to maximise achievement of the statutory criteria, the Commission should give considerable weight to proposed schemes for new County electoral boundaries which maximise co-terminosity.

These schemes satisfy many of the objections made to the Commission's draft recommendations. No part of one Town Council area is included in the same division as part of another Town Council area. No Parish Council is split between divisions. No existing Town Council Ward in Whittlesey is split between divisions. There are no unpopular large two-member wards. In all four of these respects the Commission's draft recommendations fail the statutory criteria tests. In all four of these respects both of my schemes succeed.

[references below to polling districts in March use the pre-May 2015 polling districts as used in the whole of this review process so far, rather than using the current polling districts]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Alternative Fenland Scheme for 9 Divisions</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>2020 Variance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDC1 Chatteris</td>
<td>Town of Chatteris</td>
<td>8980 5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC2 Fenland North</td>
<td>Roman Bank Ward; Peckover Ward; Parson Drove Parish</td>
<td>8470 -0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling District</td>
<td>Electoral District</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC3 Waldersey</td>
<td>Wisbech St Mary Parish; Manea and Elm &amp; Christchurch Wards</td>
<td>8580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC4 Wisbech Riverside</td>
<td>Medworth, Clarkson &amp; Waterlees Village Wards</td>
<td>8610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC5 Wisbech East</td>
<td>Octavia Hill, Staithe &amp; Kirkgate Wards</td>
<td>8240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC6 March South-East</td>
<td>March East Ward</td>
<td>9220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from March North Ward: Polling District BB1 PD BB3 (east of Norwood Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC7 March North-West</td>
<td>March West Ward</td>
<td>9200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from March North Ward: Polling District BB2 PD BB3 (west of Norwood Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC8 Whittlesey</td>
<td>Bassenhally, Stonald &amp; St Andrews Wards</td>
<td>8710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC9 South West Fenland</td>
<td>Doddington &amp; Wimbington; Benwick, Coates &amp; Eastrea and Lattersey Wards</td>
<td>9100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(unidentified error: 10 extra voters included in total) 79110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* the electoral variance for each proposed division is calculated using a County-wide average electorate in 2020 of 8547, being 521,380 divided by 61

Proposed Alternative Fenland Scheme for 10 Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Variance*</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDC1 Chatteris</td>
<td>Town of Chatteris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC2 Fenland North</td>
<td>Roman Bank Ward; Peckover Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC3 Waldersey</td>
<td>Parson Drove &amp; Wisbech St Mary Ward; Elm Parish; the Town Wards of March Rural South and March Rural North (as proposed in the LGBCE's draft recommendations) 7460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC4 Wisbech Riverside</td>
<td>Medworth, Clarkson &amp; Waterlees Village Wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC5 Wisbech East</td>
<td>Octavia Hill, Staithe &amp; Kirkgate Wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC6 March North East</td>
<td>March North Ward (less the proposed &quot;Rural North&quot; Town Ward); that part of Polling District BA1 north of Creek Road that part of Polling District BC1 east of the A141 and west of Waveney Drive / Pentland Way 7720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC7 March Central</td>
<td>that part of PD BA1 south of (and including) Creek Road; that part of PD BC1 East of Waveney Drive / Pentland Way Polling Districts BA2, BA4; Polling District BC4 east of the A141 7600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC8 March South East &amp; Rural</td>
<td>Manea Ward; Christchurch Parish; Wimblington Parish; 7850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polling District BC2_3 east of the A141
Polling District BA3

FDC9 Whittlesey The District Wards of Bassenhally and Stonald; 7596 -8.22%
the St Andrews Town Ward in Whittlesey

FDC10 South West Fenland The St Marys Town Ward in Whittlesey 7594 -8.24%
Lattersey Ward and Benwick, Coates & Eastrea Ward
the Parish of Doddington

79100

* the electoral variance for each proposed division is calculated using a County-wide average electorate in 2020 of 8276, being 521,380 divided by 63

Yours faithfully,

Councillor Chris Boden
Cambridgeshire County Councillor: Whittlesey North Division Fenland District Councillor: Bassenhally Ward
Whittlesey Town Councillor: Elm Ward

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you receive this email by mistake please notify the sender and delete it immediately. Opinions expressed are those of the individual and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Cambridgeshire County Council. All sent and received email from Cambridgeshire County Council is automatically scanned for the presence of computer viruses and security issues. Visit www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk>
Dear sir

I was at the full council meeting when the Conservatives decided to carve up Wisbech North and South. When they made their decision I was only told of two options and they were option 1 leave it as it is option 2 take away Clarkson and replace it with staithe. I was shocked to hear that they all agreed on a third option that was not discussed at FDC on the 6th july at 9.30 with Cllr Chris Bowdon. Even he was leaning towards option 1 or 2. In my opinion this is done to maximize the Conservative vote in Wisbech North. This is a political decision not a fair decision. My option would be option 2 because it makes sense as my division would all be connected and in the North of Wisbech. My ward as i would like it would be Waterlees, Kirkgate and staithe. I do not want my division split up the way the Conservatives want it because it is not fair and it is under hand. This is all about the Conservatives getting rid of UKIP at any cost. One last observation when was Medworth ever in the north of Wisbech.

A very upset Councillor

Cllr Paul Clapp
 -----Original Message-----
From: David Brown
Sent: 06 July 2015 17:37
To: reviews
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Review

Dear Sir/Madam
I wish to register my support for the proposal put forward by South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association.
Yours faithfully
David Brown
County Councillor for Burwell Division

Sent from my iPhone
Comment on recommendations from LGBCE
e mail to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Comment on various points/issues in and around St Neots, as part of the draft recommendations LGBCE

1. Agree with bringing together the two wards to form “The Eatons”.

2. Proposals for 61 councillors, 53 single member wards and 4 member divisions across the County. Disappointed at 4x2 member divisions.

3. River and well defined areas form suitable and often well known boundary lines – and object strongly to Crosshall Road (B1048) being taken out of the Eatons division, and replaced with a twisting stepped line running uphill, behind the properties in and off Milton Avenue.

   A complete change and separation of community and identity.
   Works well if left alone!

   River forms a natural identifiable boundary line – please retain.

   The green swathe of land and variety of river movement and direction creates an attractive zone and opportunities for leisure activities.

   It should be part of St Neots and should be recognised within the boundary lines – the centre line of the river.

   The area is well recognised locally and within it is the golf course, Riverside Meadows and other recreational activities, all in place for many years.

4. Agree with changes at Church Meadows, Church Street, Cambridge Street and Hen Brook.

Cllr David Harty

Cambridgeshire County Council
tel:

Huntingdonshire District Council

30th June 2015
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 06 July 2015 09:22
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: County Council Boundaries
Attachments: Review of the Electoral Division boundaries for the County of Cambridgeshire.docx

-----Original Message-----
From: Fred Yeulett
Sent: 06 July 2015 09:09
To: reviews
Subject: County Council Boundaries

Dear Sir

In my view the draft recommendations do not address the urban and rural situation in the March area. I am in favour of single member wards. The proposal to include parts of March in the Whittlesey division is illogical - they have nothing in common with each other to support such a measure. I agree with the Conservative comments as attached.

Yours faithfully

Fred Yeulett
County Councillor, March East
Review of the Electoral Division boundaries for the County of Cambridgeshire

I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which have been put forward in July 2015 by the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for East Cambridgeshire) and by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for Fenland).

In March, Elm and Wisbech St. Mary:

The Commission’s proposed “March North and Waldersey” Division is a massively oversized two-member division, taking in as it does most of the Parish of Wisbech St. Mary, the Parish of Elm, the Parish of Christchurch and more than two-thirds of the electors of the Town of March. This mixture of a large urban town area and a dozen rural villages in three rural parishes would not produce a division with coherent community interests. This Division is so large and diverse that it would be very difficult for any councillor to represent effectively. This proposed division includes more than 95% of the March North District Council ward and more than 80% of the existing March East District Council ward. It is symptomatic of the illogicality of this division that the part of March North Ward which is excluded (notably the Goosetree Estate, Grandford and Westry) has better and closer connections by road to the existing Waldersey Division than that part of March North which the LGBCE proposes to merge with Waldersey Division. Given that Waldersey Division is overwhelmingly rural, it is also illogical that the most rural parts of March North (Westy, White Moor and the Goosetree Estate) are the only parts of March North Ward which are not proposed to be included in a Division with the predominantly rural Waldersey Division. Additionally, the proposal to include, with rural Waldersey, all of March East District Council Ward (except, anomalously, the Cavalry Drive area) also bizarrely mixes more of a very urban area with a very rural one in a single division. This
does not reflect the different community interests in the area.

to decide to split St. Mary’s Town Ward between two divisions. Alternative schemes for County division boundaries have been proposed which better satisfy the statutory criteria and which do not involve splitting any Town Ward in Whittlesey.

In Whittlesey and March:

The proposal by the Commission to include almost half of the land area of March Town in the Whittlesey South Division clearly fails to recognise the very different community identities in our local areas. March and Whittlesey are two quite separate towns, with their own quite distinct identities. There would be several hundred electors in March Town (from Westry in the north to the Wimblington Road roundabout at the junction of the B1101 and the A141 in the south-east of the Town of March) who would clearly not identify themselves in any way as being in “Whittlesey South”. No-one in March or in Whittlesey would expect that any of the residents in parts of Gaul Road, Knights End Road and Burrowmoor Road would think of themselves as being more closely connected to Whittlesey than to March, yet the Commission is proposing that electors in the western parts of Gaul Road, Knights End Road, Burrowmoor Road and in some adjacent roads will be in the Whittlesey South Division. In deciding boundaries, the Commission must follow statutory rules reflecting both community identity and convenient and effective local government. Including several hundred March Town residents within a Whittlesey Division would clearly breach those statutory rules.

In Wimblington and Manea

Wimblington and Manea are both rural parishes with a central village. As such, it is preferable that both parishes are included in a division which is wholly or largely rural. The Commission is proposing to include Wimblington and Manea in its “March South and Rural” Division. But most of the 9,229 electors projected for 2020 in that division would live in the urban area of March South, making this a predominantly urban ward where more rural interests would be less adequately represented than is desirable.

Wimblington and Manea should really be in rural divisions. But if the electoral arithmetic requires Wimblington and Manea to be included with part of March in a single division, that part of March should not be so large as to dominate such a division to the
detriment of the interests of electors in the more rural areas.
From:- Cllr Julie Wisson

Date: Monday 6th July 2015

Telephone:-
E-Mail:-

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

Re: Consultation on Cambridgeshire Boundaries
Buckden, Gransden and the Offords Division

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing to give you my strong objection to the proposed changes to the boundaries in Cambridgeshire for the County Council Division. Whilst the division I represent would be dramatically reduced in electoral numbers under your proposal, areas of rural villages cannot be considered to be comparable to urban areas with regards to representing their requirements. It seems that the Boundary Commission have allowed for further development in St Neots over the next 5 years which would then mean that the proposed division of St Neots East and Gransden would become a largely urban division with several smaller villages included.

The rural villages have very different issues and concerns to that of urban areas and thus it would be very difficult to represent such a division. It is also seen by residents as a cost cutting exercise to further reduce the number of County councillors in Cambridgeshire when the county has such huge developments planned in the next 5 years but the number of councillors will be reduced. I therefore object to the proposals and hope that you will reconsider your decision.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Julie Wisson
From: Lynda Harford
Sent: 05 July 2015 17:35
To: reviews
Subject: Boundary Review - Cambridgeshire County Council

Please accept the following submission in response to the consultation currently being undertaken on the proposal for the electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council.

"I am the Cambridgeshire County Councillor currently representing Bar Hill Division.
I write to support the submissions by South Cambridgeshire District Councillor Francis Burkitt and John Houlton, Clerk, Lolworth Parish Meeting.
I ask that consideration is given to both Boxworth and Lolworth Parishes remaining in the Bar Hill Division. I would suggest that geographically it would be practical to also include Childerley in the Bar Hill Division.
This would support the submission of Cllr Burkitt that Madingley remain in the Hardwick Division.
Of the 6 villages that I suggest should make up the new Bar Hill Division only Girton is scheduled to see any appreciable increase in population through development in the foreseeable future. Although the inclusion of Boxworth, Lolworth and Childerley in the division will have the effect of lowering the proposed number of electors in Cambourne Division, this is an area that will, by contrast, see a large increase in population with the development of Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield.
This suggested change to the current proposal by LGBC takes better consideration of the character of all the villages and the interests of their communities. This is particularly true of Lolworth. Its closest neighbour is Bar Hill and the Millennium footpath between the two villages affords access for this very small village to public transport, shops and other facilities. Conversely access to Cambourne is impractical situated, as it is, on the other side of the A428."

Particularly in view of the fact that the deadline for responses is fast approaching, an acknowledgement of safe receipt would be appreciated.

Lynda Harford
South Cambridgeshire District Councillor
Cottenham, Ramlington, Oakington and Westwick
Cambridgeshire County Councillor - Bar Hill, Boxworth.
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Downes
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Cambridgeshire County Councillor

Comment text:

I take issue with the fundamentals of the process. The Boundary Commission (BC) is working within out-dated concepts and parameters and fails to understand the changing nature of the role of the councillor in 2015 and the future. Driven mainly by the requirement to equalise the numerical size of divisions and by a rather nebulous concept of 'community identity', the BC fails to provide a structure which will meet the needs of residents in the future. The demands on councillors in terms of responding to residents' concerns and complaints has risen exponentially in the last few years. This is because, as council services decline through funding reductions, the needs and concerns of residents require greater attention from councillors than previously. The increased availability of e-mail and other social media means that councillors are much more easily contacted than previously. In the 14 years of my service as a councillor, I have seen my 'caseload' quadruple, often several a day, week in and week out. In the light of this, the proposal to reduce the number of councillors from 69 to 61 is a serious mistake at a time when there is a major growth in population. On average, the resident:councillor ratio will increase by 23% if the BC continues with its present course of action. This seriously reduces the quality of service that can be provided the council taxpayers. I would therefore advocate an increase in the size of the Council to 73 from the current 69. This would still increase the caseload per councillor (from 6940 to 7142) but that would at least be manageable. The proposed increase to 8547 is not. There are no logistical reasons why the council size should not be increased by 4. The Council chamber has enough seats and the cost increase of about £30,000 is negligible in a Council budget of nearly £500 million. I would also question the concept of 'community identity', a phrase which is included in nearly every division proposal. In respect of the area I know best (Alconbury and Kimbolton), I would ask the BC to indicate the community identity linking Hail Weston to the Giddings. I would also like to know how the BC envisage a councillor giving quality service to a division with 23 parishes? I am not providing an alternative set of proposals based on 73 Members because I am conscious of the BC's reputation for ignoring ideas that challenge the fundamentals of its process but I wish to register my dissatisfaction in the strongest possible terms.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Simon Bywater  
E-mail:  
Postcode:  

Organisation Name: Cambridgeshire county Council

Comment text:

Dear Sir, I would like to refer to division 31 Norman Cross. I currently represent the existing division which includes Sawtry. I don't feel the name of "Norman Cross" is right and should be changed. Sawtry is the largest village in the division and is increasing in size due to the recent housing developments. To simply wipe it from the map is in my opinion incorrect. The new proposed division should at least have some reference to the village of Sawtry in order not to confuse the electorate going forward. I would like to propose the name Sawtry and Stilton Ward. I do hope you will seriously consider this matter. Kind regards Cllr Simon Bywater Sawtry and Ellington Cambridgeshire County Council

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Steve Count  
Sent: 06 July 2015 20:15  
To: reviews  
Subject: County electoral divisions Cambridgeshire

Dear Sirs,

I support the county Council position of 63 members (reduced from 69) as recommended by the county Council submission. Single member divisions are far superior to having more than one member in a division. These create areas too large in Fenland for independents to cover adequately and are only adequately served when there two members of the same party dividing the workload. This is not good for democracy. The divisions put forward by NECCA and SECCA in July 2015 are wholly endorsed by me.

Your draft proposal for a two member March North and Waldersey ward makes no sense to me whatsoever. The links between the communities are tenuous at best and the area is too large.

Regards Steve Count
I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which have been put forward in July 2015 by the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for East Cambridgeshire) and by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for Fenland).

Councillor Samantha Hoy
Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council
I do not agree with the draft recommendations of the LGBCE in respect of Cambridgeshire. Specifically:

1. I support the submission from Cambridgeshire County Council that the number of County Councillors be reduced from 69 to 63.

2. I believe that all of the County Councillors should be elected in single-member Divisions, to maintain the best possible contact between electors and their local County Councillor.

3. I support the proposals for boundaries for the County Electoral Divisions which have been put forward in July 2015 by the South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for East Cambridgeshire) and by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (for Fenland).

Councillor Samantha Hoy
Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council