

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	7
Draft recommendations	7
New Draft recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	11
Cambridge City	12
East Cambridgeshire District	19
Fenland District	21
Huntingdonshire District	23
South Cambridgeshire District	28
Conclusions	32
Parish electoral arrangements	32
3 What happens next?	36

Appendices

A Table A1: New draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council	38
B Submissions received	44
C Glossary and abbreviations	48

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 considered that a decrease in council size by eight to 61 members will ensure the Council can perform its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Why are we publishing new draft recommendations?

We published our previous final recommendation on 9 February 2016. Following publication of those recommendations, it became apparent to us that, despite following the statutory procedure governing reviews and our own guidance, some residents and groups felt that there had been insufficient opportunity for their views to be communicated during the consultation process. This was particularly so with regard to changes we made in Cambridge City and East Cambridgeshire District.

By law, we cannot amend our final recommendations. We must first publish a set of new draft recommendations and seek representations on them. Accordingly, we have decided to hold a new phase of public consultation on the electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council.

The consultation begins today, 10 May 2016 and will close on 20 June 2016. These new draft recommendations are identical to our previously published recommendations. However, it is key to stress that this intended to give local people and groups the chance to comment on the boundary proposals for the whole county.

We have an open mind about potential changes to these recommendations as a result of this consultation and will welcome views in support of the proposals and suggestions for alternative boundaries that meet the criteria set out in law. Once the consultation has closed, the Commission will carefully examine all the evidence presented and publish final recommendations in September 2016.

Electoral arrangements

Our new draft 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.

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
10 May 2016	Publication of new draft recommendations
20 June 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
10 September 2016	Publication of final recommendations

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

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.

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 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 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 during the previous round of consultation. 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 2020, a period five years on from the originally scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% by 2020. 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 new draft recommendations. Given that we have undertaken a period of further limited consultation in the Cambridge City area, as well as conducting this current consultation process, the publication of our final recommendations has been postponed until September 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. During the first round of consultation, 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 have put forward new draft recommendations based on a council size of 61 members.

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.

New Draft recommendations

23 We published our previous final recommendations on 9 February 2016. Following publication of those recommendations, it became apparent to us that, despite following the statutory procedure governing reviews and our own guidance, some residents and groups felt that there had been insufficient opportunity for their views to be communicated during the consultation process. This was particularly so with regard to changes we made in Cambridge City and East Cambridgeshire District.

24 By law, we cannot amend our final recommendations. We must first publish a set of new draft recommendations and seek representations on them. Accordingly, we have decided to hold a new phase of public consultation on the electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council.

25 The consultation begins today, 10 May 2016 and will close on 20 June 2016. These new draft recommendations are identical to our previously published recommendations. However, it is key to stress that this is intended to give local

people and groups the chance to comment on the boundary proposals for the whole county.

26 We have an open mind about potential changes to these recommendations as a result of this consultation and will welcome views in support of the proposals and suggestions for alternative boundaries that meet the criteria set out in law. Once the consultation has closed, the Commission will carefully examine all the evidence presented and publish final recommendations in September 2016.

Cambridge City

27 During the previous round of consultation, we received 105 submissions relating to our proposed electoral divisions in Cambridge. These included four city-wide proposals for electoral divisions that were notably different from our original recommendations. The County Council, Cambridgeshire Labour Group, Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrat Group and a local resident each submitted city-wide schemes.

28 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. 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.

29 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 considered that the alternative proposals provide for good electoral equality, and reflect community identities and interests in Cambridge.

30 During the development of the previous 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. We considered at the time that this necessitated a boundary modification between the proposed Abbey and Petersfield divisions. Accordingly, the boundary between these two divisions was 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%)

31 We acknowledge that this proposed change has been necessitated by an error in the calculation of electorate figures. In light of this, we would particularly welcome the views of local people on this proposed change. We would particularly welcome

any viable alternative division pattern that would both reflect community identities and secure good electoral equality.

32 We received objections to the proposed two-member divisions in Cambridge City from the County Council, City Council, political parties and local residents. We considered that persuasive evidence has been received to support two single-member Castle and Newnham divisions. We also included Windsor Road in Castle division as we received persuasive evidence that Windsor Road shares strong community links with adjoining roads in the Castle area. However, we were 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 proposed no changes to Trumpington & Queen Edith's division.

East Cambridgeshire District

33 During the previous round of consultation, we received 38 submissions relating to East Cambridgeshire. The majority of local respondents and Stephen Barclay MP (North East Cambridgeshire) 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 were not persuaded sufficient evidence was received to change the allocation of councillors for East Cambridgeshire and our previous final recommendations resulted in an allocation eight councillors for the district. We would welcome the views of local people and organisations concerning alternative patterns of eight single-member divisions for the district.

Fenland District

34 During the previous round of consultation, 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.

35 We received alternative division patterns based on nine and 10 councillors for Fenland. As in East Cambridgeshire, we were not persuaded that we had received sufficient evidence to change the allocation of councillors for the district and decided our final recommendations in Fenland should allocate nine councillors.

Huntingdonshire District

36 During the previous round of consultation, 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 did 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.

37 We also received objections to our proposed Somersham & Earith and Warboys & The Stukeleys divisions. After considering the evidence received, we made some minor amendments to the draft recommendations and proposed 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

38 During the previous round of consultation, we received 34 submissions relating to South Cambridgeshire. A number of parishes provided evidence to support minor amendments to our 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.

39 We amended our previous 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, we proposed to include Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes in Cambourne division. We 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

40 The tables on pages 12–31 detail our new draft 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 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 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.</p>
Arbury	1	-2%	This division lies in the north-west of the city and comprises the Arbury community.	<p>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.</p> <p>We received four submissions specifically relating to Arbury division during the further limited consultation. A local resident proposed that Histon Road should form the division boundary between the Arbury and Castle areas. A local councillor proposed that part of Victoria Road be transferred to Arbury division. A Residents' Association and two councillors proposed that Windsor Road be transferred to a division with the Castle area.</p>

				<p>We were 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 did not receive evidence. However, we considered the evidence to transfer Windsor Road to Castle division to be persuasive and decided to make this change. We were satisfied Arbury division reflected community identities and provided for good electoral equality.</p>
Castle	1	-3%	This division comprises the Castle area of Cambridge.	<p>During consultation on our original 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 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, 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</p>

				toward Newnham. We considered the evidence received provided a persuasive argument for a single-member division comprising the Castle area. Furthermore, the evidence to include Windsor Road in Castle division was persuasive and we therefore decided to make this change. A single-member division would provide for good electoral equality and reflect community identities.
Cherry Hinton	1	5%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Cherry Hinton community.	<p>During consultation on our original 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 considered that insufficient evidence had been received to make this change. We also received support for the proposed Cherry Hinton division. However, we made one minor change in the north of the division where we used part of the railway as the boundary.</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.	During consultation on our original 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 required substantial modifications in the Castle and Newnham areas of the city for which we had little evidence.

				<p>We received a submission from a local councillor who objected to our proposals for Chesterton division. However, they did not put forward an alternative for this division. As we had received support for Chesterton division and we considered the proposed division reflected community identities, we confirmed this division as part of our recommendations.</p>
King's Hedges	1	5%	<p>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>	<p>During consultation on our original 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 considered this division reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality.</p>
Market	1	-2%	<p>This division comprises the centre of Cambridge, Cambridge University colleges and residential areas west of East Road.</p>	<p>In response to our original 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> <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</p>

				considered that the alternative proposals better reflect the Market community. The division also provides for good electoral equality.
Newnham	1	-12%	This division comprises the Newnham area and Churchill College to the north of Madingley Road.	<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 previous 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 considered 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 demonstrated that Newnham is a distinct community from Castle with few direct road links.</p>
Petersfield	1	1%	This division comprises the Newtown and Petersfield areas of Cambridge.	In response to our original 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

				<p>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 used 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 were of the view that insufficient evidence had been received from respondents in Petersfield division to make this change. We considered our proposed Petersfield division better reflected the community than our draft recommendations. The division also provided for good electoral equality. However, as stated earlier, we would particularly welcome comments from local people and groups on our recommendations for this area during consultation.</p>
Romsey	1	9%	This division comprises the Romsey community between Cherry Hinton Road and the railway line.	<p>In response to our original 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> <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</p>

				<p>Cherry Hinton Road from Hills Road to Perne Road be included in Queen Edith's division. However, we considered 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 reflected the local community than that proposed in our previous recommendations. The division also provided for good electoral equality. However, as stated earlier, we would particularly welcome comments from local people and groups on our recommendations for this area during consultation.</p>
<p>Trumpington & Queen Edith's</p>	2	-4%	<p>This division comprises the areas of Trumpington and Queen Edith's.</p>	<p>In response to the original 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>

				After considering the submissions received here, we did not think sufficient evidence had been received in support of this modification. In addition, the proposals of a local resident would have placed the boundary along Babraham Road. We considered that further persuasive evidence was required to justify this change. 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 decided to propose no change to Trumpington & Queen Edith's division.
--	--	--	--	--

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.	We received 38 submissions relating to East Cambridgeshire district during our previous consultation. 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.
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.	We also received localised objections from parish councils located in our proposed Littleport West division. We therefore proposed a minor change in Littleport to allow the division boundary to run behind Millfield and along Ely Road. We received alternative proposals which were based on eight and nine single-member divisions. We based our recommendations on eight county councillors for East Cambridgeshire. As stated earlier, we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been received at that time to justify changing the allocation of councillors to the district.
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.	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 the 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. As stated earlier, we are open to modifying our recommendations should we receive further persuasive evidence to do so. We would particularly welcome comments from local people and groups on our recommendations for this area during consultation.
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.	
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 recommendations for this division and were satisfied that Woodditton division meets the statutory criteria.

Fenland District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Chatteris	1	5%	This division comprises the whole of Chatteris parish.	<p>During the previous round of consultation, 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 decided to base our recommendations on nine county councillors for Fenland as we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been received to justify changing the allocation of councillors to the district.</p> <p>The alternative proposals received for Fenland 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 did not consider that it reflected community identities or provided 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>While we noted the views and objections of respondents to our recommendations for Fenland district, we were satisfied that our proposed divisions will ensure good electoral equality and effective and convenient local government. However, we will consider very carefully any further evidence received during this consultation period before we finalise our recommendations for the District.</p>
Wisbech East	1	-2%	This division comprises the district wards of Kirkgate, Octavia Hill and Staithe.	<p>During the previous round of consultation, we received an alternative division pattern for the two Wisbech divisions which each comprised three of the six district wards of the town. After considering this arrangement, we were 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 proposed the divisions be named Wisbech East and Wisbech West.</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.	During the previous round of consultation, 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 considered that our proposed division better reflected the statutory criteria.
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.
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 were 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.

Huntingdon North & Hartford	1	-1%	This division comprises the north of Huntingdon parish, including the areas of Hartford and Sapley.	During the previous round of consultation, we received support for our proposed divisions in Huntingdon from a local councillor. We were satisfied that Huntingdon North & Hartford and Huntingdon West divisions reflected our statutory criteria.
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.	During the previous round of consultation, 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 were unable to find an alternative division pattern which would meet the statutory criteria. However, we will consider carefully any further persuasive evidence relating to this area before finalising our recommendations.
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 recommendations. A local councillor proposed our division name of Norman Cross should be changed to Sawtry & Stilton. We were 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 considered the proposed name better reflected the communities in our proposed division and adopted it as part of our recommendations.
Somersham & Earith	1	-9%	This division comprises Bluntisham, Broughton, Colne, Earith, Kings Ripton, Old	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,

			Hurst, Pidley-cum-Fenton, Somersham and Woodhurst parishes.	Earith and Bluntisham. It was proposed that Wyton-on-the-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 proposed that Broughton and Kings Ripton parishes be 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 proposed that Wyton-on-the-Hill parish be included with this division from Somersham & Earith. We were persuaded that Wyton-on-the-Hill has closer transport and community links with St Ives. Our proposals also significantly improved 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 during consultation and were satisfied that St Ives South & Needingworth met the statutory criteria.
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>During the previous round of consultation, 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 a high electoral variance. We did not receive a viable alternative for this area which would meet the statutory criteria for St</p>

				Neots and the adjoining rural parishes. While we noted the views of respondents in this area, we considered 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.	During the previous round of consultation, we received objections to our proposals to include the area between Cambridge Street, Church Street and Fox Brook in St Neots Eynesbury division. We did not consider that a persuasive argument had been made to transfer this area to St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton division. We considered that our recommendations better reflected communities as Church Meadow and adjoining roads have access into Eynesbury over Fox Brook.
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 met the statutory criteria.
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 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.
The Hemingfords & Fenstanton	1	-5%	This division comprises Fenstanton, Hemingford Abbots, Hemingford Grey, Hilton and Houghton & Wyton parishes.	During the previous round of consultation, we received responses to our proposed division which made observations but did not provide any alternative proposals. We were satisfied that our proposed division provides for good electoral equality, reflects communities and effective and convenient local government.

Warboys & The Stukeleys	1	-5%	This division comprises Abbots Ripton, The Stukeleys, Upwood & The Raveleys, Warboys, Wistow and Wood Walton parishes.	<p>During the previous round of consultation, we received objections to our 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 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.

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 during consultation 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 proposed to modify our draft recommendations to include Lolworth in Bar Hill division. We were persuaded that Lolworth has closer links with Bar Hill via the A14.
Cambourne	1	-10%	This division comprises Bourn, Cambourne, Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes.	We received a submission during consultation 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 proposed 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 proposed to include Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes.
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 were content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects local communities.
Duxford	1	-5%	This division comprises Duxford, Fowlmere, Foxton,	We received three submissions relating to Duxford division. Having considered the evidence received we proposed that

			Great & Little Chishill, Heydon, Hinxton, Ickleton, Pampisford, Shepreth, Thriplow and Whittlesford parishes.	Pampisford parish be included in the division. We were satisfied with the evidence that Pampisford shares strong community links with other local parishes in the division.
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 decided to confirm Fulbourn division as part of our 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.	During the previous round of consultation, we did not receive any objections to our 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 proposed to include Litlington parish in the division.
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 proposed to modify our recommendations. We were content that Madingley parish has strong community links with parishes in Hardwick division. Our proposed division provided 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 during consultation and considered that our proposals for this division met the statutory criteria

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 Wratting parishes.	We received support for our recommendations and considered that our proposals for this division met the statutory criteria and, in particular, reflect community identities in this area.
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 were 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 had received no evidence. One of the submissions proposed that we reflect the name Longstanton in the name of the division. We considered that the name of Longstanton, Northstowe & Over provides a better reflection of communities and therefore forms part of our recommendations.
Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1	-8%	This division comprises Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Melbourn, Meldreth and Whaddon parishes.	During the previous round of consultation, 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 division with 13% fewer electors per councillor. As a result of changes in Gamlingay division we proposed to transfer Litlington parish to Gamlingay division in order to improve electoral equality.
Papworth & Swavesey	1	3%	This division comprises Boxworth, Caxton, Conington, Childerley,	We received two submissions in relation to our proposed division during consultation. We were unable to accommodate an arrangement which would result in

			Croxton, Elsworth, Eltisley, Fen Drayton, Graveley, Knapwell, Papworth Everard, Papworth St Agnes and Swavesey parishes.	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 had no evidence. However, we proposed to include Boxworth, Childerley and Knapwell parishes from Cambourne division as evidence suggested that these parishes have stronger community links with other local parishes in our proposed division.
Sawston & Shelford	2	-2%	This division comprises Babraham, Great Shelford, Harston, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Little Shelford, Newton, Sawston and Stapleford parishes.	During the previous round of consultation, 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 proposed to create a two-member division from our proposed Shelford and Sawston divisions. This ensured that both parishes were not divided between divisions. We also proposed to transfer Pampisford parish to Duxford division where, it was argued, it shares closer community identity with adjoining 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 during the previous consultation for Waterbeach division. Having considered the evidence received, we proposed to confirm our draft recommendations for Waterbeach division as we considered this division provided for the best balance of our statutory criteria.

Conclusions

41 Table 1 shows the impact of our new draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	New Draft 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

New Draft 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 recommendations for Cambridgeshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

42 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.

43 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.

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 Ely, Fen Ditton, Huntingdon, Littleport, March, Soham, St Neots, St Ives, Whittlesey and Wisbech St Mary parishes.

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 Ely parish.

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.

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 Fen Ditton parish.

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.

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 Huntingdon parish.

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.

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 Littleport parish.

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.

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 March parish.

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.

50 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.

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.

51 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.

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.

52 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.

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.

53 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.

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.

54 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.

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 Have your say

55 The Commission has an open mind about its new draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

56 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Cambridgeshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

57 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

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

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Cambridgeshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

58 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices at Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

59 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

60 In the light of representations received, we will review our new draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with these recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

61 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Cambridgeshire County Council in 2017.

Equalities

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: New draft 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.): New draft 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.): New draft 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.): New draft 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.): New draft 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 during the previous round of consultation

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 (Cambridge 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

