

Councillor submissions to the Cambridgeshire County Council electoral review

This PDF document contains submissions from councillors.

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.

Click on the submission you would like to view. If you are not taken to that page, please scroll through the document.



CllrBBoddington-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-08



CllrBHunt-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-16



Cllr-OrgeeT-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-20



CllrRWest-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-11



CllrSCount-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-15



CllrSKing-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-19



PCllrC-Saunderson-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-13

Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Barbara Boddington
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Huntingdonshire District Council

Comment text:

I am completely opposed to any change in the boundaries - Buckden Ward comprises a Rural Area - something to be safeguarded. Proposing to amalgamate with Loves Farm in total including future developments surely is not the right way forward - the development an urban settlement, much needed may I add but they will have different needs and would be over bearing to this rural area of the present Buckden Ward. I do agree it already has some anomalies with Gravely looking as if it should be in the Buckden Ward and of course Lt Gransden (the two Gransdens with residents who work together and share facilities now divided) they have always been joined and I fail to see why they were split. Again we need to protect our villages - keep their character- and not be swallowed up into an urban setting with eleven years experience as a councillor I understand the Area. Cllr Barbara Boddington Huntingdonshire District Council Chairman of Management Planning Panel January 2015

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 16 January 2015 08:25
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Cambridgeshire County Council Divisions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hunt Bill Cllr [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 17:38
To: Reviews@
Subject: FW: Cambridgeshire County Council Divisions.

Please find attached my comments.
Bill Hunt

From: Hunt Bill Cllr
Sent: 15 January 2015 17:36
To: 'review@lgbce.org.uk'
Subject: FW: Cambridgeshire County Council Divisions.

I also support the 69 members being reduced to 63.
Bill Hunt

From: Hunt Bill Cllr
Sent: 15 January 2015 17:34
To: 'review@lgbce.org.uk'
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Divisions.

I support the proposed reduction of County Members.
In my case (Haddenham Division) I support the removal of Wentworth from the Haddenham Division.
Regards
Bill Hunt

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>>

Electoral Review 2015 Cambridgeshire County Council

response (19 January 2015) to consultation by Tony Orgee

This response considers the following four key issues;

- 1 number of councillors
- 2 number of divisions
- 3 number of councillors representing each division
- 4 division boundaries

I do not wish to comment on names for the new divisions, except to say that naming each division after the largest village would be a good way forward, although in a small number of cases the name may need to include two village names because of those villages' size or relative geography in the new division.

1 number of councillors

I agree with the submission put forward by Cambridgeshire County Council as part of the preliminary process that the number of councillors should be reduced from the current 69 to 63, and also with the County Council's recommendation regarding the number of county councillors in each district council area within the county.

2 number of divisions

Under current electoral arrangements the vast majority (51) of county divisions are single-member divisions, but nine are two-member divisions. In my view this is not a coherent or consistent pattern of representation, and there is confusion regarding accountability of members.

I fully support a structure of single member divisions with a single member being accountable to his/her electorate for their actions as a councillor, and therefore support having 63 divisions.

3 number of councillors representing each division

For the reasons set out in 2 above, I fully support single-member divisions.

4 division boundaries

I wish to confine my comments on this issue to divisions within the South Cambridgeshire area of the county.

important biosciences employment site and the County Council. In addition The Welding Institute (TWI) site adjoins Granta Park and is another important employment and training site. The County Council has recently invested in cycleways to effectively link up these sites which are less than three miles apart.

There are therefore important reasons why these major employment sites should be in the same county division.

The Bellbird School in Sawston serves Pampisford as well as Sawston, and Sawston Village College provides secondary education for young students from Babraham, Hinxton, Pampisford and Sawston, and some from the Abingtons. Sawston Health Centre also serves residents from Babraham, Hinxton and Pampisford, and some residents of the Abingtons (myself included) are registered at the Sawston Medical Practice.

In addition, Great Abington and Little Abington should be in the same division. These two villages run into one another - there is a common house numbering scheme in the High Street, and both villages share the local primary school, village shop, village pub and village hall (known as the Abington Institute). These facilities are all located in Great Abington but are no more than 150 yards from Little Abington housing. The 13 bus service runs through the High Street. In addition many local people are employed at Granta Park or at TWI.

There are therefore important social, educational and employment reasons why Great Abington and Little Abington should be in the same county division.

Bringing these various points together, I therefore feel that Stapleford best lies in a new division that also includes Great Shelford, Harston, Hauxton, Little Shelford and Newton. The loss of Stapleford from the proposed new SC 2 division can be accommodated by adding Hinxton, Great Abington and Little Abington to an SC 2 that already includes Sawston, Babraham and Pampisford.

I would therefore suggest the following changes to the possible new county divisions as put forward by the County Council in the preliminary process:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Division SC 1 | move Great Abington and Little Abington from this division to SC 2. |
| Division SC 2 | add Great Abington, Little Abington from SC 1
add Hinxton from SC 3
move Stapleford from this division to SC 4. |
| Division SC3 | move Hinxton from this division to SC 2
move Newton from this division to SC 4 |
| Division SC 4 | add Stapleford to this division from SC 2
add Newton from SC 3 |

These changes would give a much better alignment in terms of social, educational, and employment interrelationships between villages but there are some consequences in terms of the electorates of the proposed new electoral divisions.

Two consequences are that the new SC 3 would have too small an electorate in 2020 and the SC 4 division too large an electorate in 2020.

The SC 4 issue can be addressed by moving Haslingfield out of the proposed SC 4. There are currently no electoral arrangements that link Haslingfield with any of the villages I have proposed for the new SC 4, and there have been, to my knowledge, no requests for any such linkage.

Where best to place Haslingfield and how to deal with removing both Hinxton and Newton from the proposed SC 3 do require further detailed work, and I suggest that this further work needs to cover the proposed divisions SC 3, SC 8, SC 9 and SC13 to bring greater coherence to these proposed new divisions. The detail is really a matter for residents in the villages affected.

If my proposed changes above are considered to be unacceptable because of the relatively low electorate (7360) in SC1 in 2020, then a possible way forward would be to move Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom from SC 15 to SC 1. The result of this additional change would be to make the 2020 electorates of these two proposed new divisions more closely aligned.

I am not necessarily advocating this change for the Wilbrahams and Six Mile Bottom but, coupled with the other changes set out above, it would lead to more equal electoral representation across the proposed new divisions SC1, SC 2, SC 4 and SC 15, than the range of electorates in these proposed new divisions in the County Council's submission.

I have seen and support the views expressed by the following local parish councils: Great Shelford Parish Council, Harston Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council and Little Shelford Parish Council, all of which set out reasons why particular villages should be in the same new electoral division. I understand that Stapleford Parish Council has similar views regarding the inclusion of Stapleford, Great Shelford and little shelford within the same new division.

In conclusion, I have set out reasons why I believe that the villages referred to above need to be in the same new electoral division in the future.

Whatever the outcome of the consultation, I believe that these local connections need to be reflected in the final electoral arrangements for the future.

Tony Orgee

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 12 January 2015 08:52
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Cambridgeshire County Council boundary changes

From: Richard West (Cllr) [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2015 17:25
To: Reviews@
Subject: FW: Cambridgeshire County Council boundary changes

From: Richard West (Cllr)
Sent: 11 January 2015 17:21
To: 'reviews@isbce.org.uk'
Cc: Barbara Boddington (Cllr)
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council boundary changes

I understand the decision has been taken to reduce County Council members down from 69 to 63.

I urge consideration to be given to understand the historic relationship between rural and urban areas in Cambridgeshire.

There is no question rural and urban areas have different issues which require decision making which may differ. Village life which many enjoy services need different delivery to urban areas with greater population where the majority of funding will be used therefore the historic balance in the past should be maintained which worked in the past.

I hope the wards will not be selected by numbers only.

Regards

Richard West

Hinds, Alex

From: Count Steve Cllr [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 January 2015 13:06
To: Reviews@
Subject: Cambridgeshire boundary changes

Dear Sirs

I am writing to you in respect of proposed boundary changes in Cambridgeshire. As you know this council which has no overall control settled on a proposal of 63 members a reduction of 6 from the present 69. Both as leader of the council and as a private submission I believe that that number was the correct balanced view.

As a representative for March North in Fenland I wish to make specific comment on the Fenland proposals.

Fenland comprises four quite distinct towns, together with 12 other parishes. The Towns all have specific identities quite separate to each other and only marginally similar to nearby parishes. Any cohesive answer must therefore concentrate on electoral divisions being as far as possible be one or the other and try to avoid mixtures. There can be no satisfactory answer that encompasses a division straddling any two towns.

In March I understand it is too large to support just two County Councillors but is too small to justify three. In fact it is my own North Division that is overwhelmingly under populated. I can only come to the conclusion that March would be better served by two principally core of the Town Councillors rather than any proposal which links a third councillor to another Market Town. The North and West of the Town links up well with Guyhirn and Elm particularly in terms of roads and common destination routes, whilst the south-west of the Town has good links with Wimblington and Christchurch. Not only through roads but these parish communities automatically look in only one direction for their main town and that is March.

I hope you find my comments of use and you are able to come to a satisfactory and not too controversial solution.

Steve Count
Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council
Councillor for March North

[REDACTED]

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

Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Simon King

E-mail: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

As the current two Wisbech Divisions exceed the population guidelines, I suggest that three Divisions be created: Wisbech East with the Wards of Clarkson, Kirkgate and Staithe; Wisbech North with the Wards of Peckover and Waterlees Village and a new Wisbech South with the Wards of Medworth and Octavia Hill. This brings Peckover Ward back into the community of Wisbech where it always used to be, as well as reducing the size of the Roman Bank Division. Peckover Ward is an integral part of Wisbech and has little or nothing in common with the villages to the north.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire

St Ives

The town currently has two councillors who both cover the town and the village of Needingworth that is two miles away and has limited things in common with the town. In the past St Ives was linked with Warboys and that is even further away.

Since the last review the population of St Ives has grown significantly and should no longer need to have an outside village linked to it.

In my view there is nothing to be gained by splitting the town into two separate constituencies. If I have a problem I choose whichever councillor I think might be most suitable for the problem. As it happens neither of them are up to much. One is spread too thin (a common problem) and the other one doesn't do much but has a few useful, at times, connections. I must confess that I am an activist with another (minority) party so, where protocol allows, I try to use someone from my own party and I have had some success for the common good both for the town and further afield.

The district and town council ward boundaries are a complete nonsense and relate to when the town was much smaller forty years ago. If the commission are determined to create single member wards regardless of the practicalities then there is a simple solution. The boundary division can either be a north/south one or from east to west. Ramsey Road would be for the former and St Audrey Lane/Houghton Road for the latter. Neither will give an equal arithmetic split but they are the most sensible divisions.

Population Growth.

Looking back I see that Bourn ward was once very small but the growth of Camborne was clearly catered for so the criteria for making boundary changes clearly allows for proposed developments.

The ones that I know about are Northstowe (near Cambridge), St Neots, The Weald (Huntingdon), Godmanchester and Wyton on the Hill (near St Ives). The last one is controversial because of the inadequate local road infrastructure and the extra cost involved with river crossings. However, I have to assume that it will go ahead although there may be problems with contamination by aircraft fuel.

Houghton & Wyton, The Hemingfords, Hilton and Fenstanton ward.

Firstly I should say I am currently a parish councillor for Fenstanton having been a district councillor there for fourteen months between 2010 and 2011. I do not live in the ward. I lived in Hemingford Grey between 1973 and 2004 and now live in St Ives where I was a town councillor between 2008 and 2012.

Linking Houghton and Wyton with the other villages never seemed to make much sense to me. They are the other side of the river Great Ouse with only a footpath as a direct link. This means going through another ward to get from one part to the rest. The village primary school is dependent upon pupils from Hartford to make up the numbers so there is much more of a link with that part of Huntingdon.

Wyton on the Hill already has its own primary school and parish council but with another 4,500 homes planned for part of the old airfield site the likely total population might be enough to justify its own county councillor. That, I'm sure, is not what you want to hear given the requirement to reduce the number of councillors.

The current parish council would not want to be linked with St Ives in fact I'm sure any proposals along those lines would be fiercely resisted. A very arrogant manager of the district council tried to do away with the "green strip" between St Ives and Houghton and brushed aside the objections of the parish council and other local residents. A judicial review came down heavily in their favour but that may not be the end of the story even though the planning manager has gone. At present a county council proposal to make a (much improved) footpath between St Ives and Houghton into a cycle path as well is being fiercely resisted so it will most probably go to a public enquiry. The improvement of the path was partly funded by Sustrans who list the path as a major route because it is part of the Ouse Valley Way. As recently as 2007 Houghton & Wyton PC asked St Ives Town Council for help to improve The Thicket Path but things have changed since then.

Budgetary Constraints

The political composition of the county council means that the majority party can only govern with the support of one or more of the other parties. Even so there seems to be a consensus that the only way forward is for unitary authorities. Needless to say there is less enthusiasm for this at Huntingdonshire District Council. There has to be a limit to things that the Boundary Commission can consider and I guess this is probably one of them. Even so I think you have to be mindful that this may well come to pass and be on the agenda after May 2015.

Colin Saunderson BA (Hons), FCA. (Aged 75)

Parish Councillor Fenstanton, Vice Chairman St Ives & District Road Safety Committee. (It is made up of parish & town councillors in the area) and volunteer for the Holt Island nature reserve. (Responsibilities include the district council owned The Thicket that lies between St Ives and Houghton and borders the path referred to above.)

January 2015