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The Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

23rd June 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council

I am writing to you on behalf of Barton Parish Council.

This Council believes that the Boundary Commission is proposing to:
(a) move Madingley into Bar Hill County Council electoral Division
(b) leave Barton, Coton and Grantchester in Hardwick County Council electoral Division

I am writing to request that the Commission reconsiders its draft proposal with respect to Madingley. Currently, Madingley lies within Hardwick Ward, which means that it is grouped together with Barton, Coton and Grantchester. Your proposal, which is to place Madingley within Bar Hill Division, would mean that it would no longer be grouped with its current three villages, who you propose would remain within Hardwick Division.

Community Identity – the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant

You may not be aware that the four villages of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley have teamed-up and work together under the name “Cambridge’s Quarter-to-Six Quadrant”.
‘QTSQ’ reflects the four villages’ geographic location: if you look at Cambridge and consider it a clock-face, the River Cam is the 6 o’clock ‘short hand’ and the A14 is the 9 o’clock ‘long hand’, and all four villages fall within the quarter-to-six quadrant of the clock-face (actually, it’s nearer ten-to-six, but ‘ten-to-six quadrant’ didn’t sound so snappy, or allow the alliteration of the two Qs!).

The four QTSQ villages:

- share a common identity and interest, all being small/medium-sized rural villages lying on the edge of the City;
- expressed their common identity and interest and local ties in their 78-page QTSQ Vision document dated May 2012 (see http://qtsq.org.uk/?page_id=186 and click on “main document + appendix 1). This was produced by all four Parish Councils after an extensive public consultation exercise amongst the residents of all four villages, and a unified public meeting attended by residents of all four villages;
- (as you will see on page 49 of this “Vision” document) have publicly pledged that “the four parish councils will work together, and with all those already involved in the area, to develop this vision over the coming years”. This is clear evidence of a recorded community interaction and collective engagement, now and for the future;
- have an easily identifiable boundary, being the City boundary, the River Cam and the A14;
- have local ties: the four Parish Councils work closely together, and all four villages input closely into the QTSQ exercise, and maintain close links.

For the above reasons **Barton Parish Council earnestly requests that Madingley should remain in the Hardwick division.**

Yours faithfully

Patrick De Backer
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Yvonne Rix - Clerk to Burwell Parish Council
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Burwell Parish Council

Comment text:

Re Fordham Villages and Soham South The proposed area comprises of two very separate communities, especially where communication, transport, education, morality and other links are concerned. It is important for the community that these are maintained. The proposed area with two elected members covering the whole area would make communication difficult. A north/south split of the proposed area would be more reflective of the community and more convenient. The current proposals in the Local Government Boundary Commission recommendations do not ensure that the community is reflected by the division. Therefore Burwell Parish Council would prefer a single member ward as it better reflects community identity and effective and convenient local government bringing representatives closer to local people. It is possible to divide the area called Fordham Villages into two with one member for each half and still fulfil the electorate requirement.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: John Prestage
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Bury Parish Council

Comment text:

Bury Parish council wish to register their disagreement (this is more than a comment!!) with the recommendation to combine our parish with Ramsey. Primarily because Ramsey is a market town and its electors live in an urban setting whereas Bury electors live in a rural setting. The electoral quality will therefore be anything but enhanced. Added to our objection we note that Ramsey do not want to be combined with Bury and therefore we would question the level of support we would be likely to receive from our new county councillor as opposed to the excellent support that we currently receive from our Warboys and Bury councillor; as both the latter areas are similar. It is equally confusing to us to note that Warboys also disagree with your recommendation to extend their division to include the Stukeleys - which I can honestly say as a local resident makes no sense especially considering your avowed aim of delivering electoral quality. The only factor that appears to have taken into consideration is electoral numbers - you cannot honestly believe that your recommendations for this part of Cambridgeshire will really deliver electoral quality. Given the sparsely populated nature of some areas of Cambridgeshire it is unfair on electors to force them into divisions which will patently not deliver electoral quality - the reason you so regularly espouse in your recommendations. Please, please will you listen to local opinions and not be simply constrained by numbers. In summary please leave us with Warboys and what ever you decide don't saddle Warboys with the Stukeleys. John Prestage, Chair Bury Parish Council

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

Cambourne Parish Council: Electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council

Cambourne Parish Council has considered the draft recommendations and we are concerned about the recommendations for two reasons:

The first reason is that the Council is concerned that the figures used are incorrect or out of date and we are aware that South Cambs District Council had also previously raised concerns on this.

The basis of the Parish Councils concerns are set out below. Cambourne is continuously growing with over 150 dwellings a year being occupied. The figures used do not take this into account. Within your proposal you state there are 7251 electorates in the proposed Cambourne Division (Bourn, Boxworth, Cambourne, Childerley, Knapwell and Lolworth) with this forecast to reach an electorate of 7750 by 2020.

The reason Cambourne Parish Council considers this to be wrong is because the electorate for the division as of the 1st June 2015 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourn</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxworth</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambourne</td>
<td>6520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childerley</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapwell</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolworth</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that the current numbers are within 0.7% of the 2020 forecast.
This with your expected 9% growth in electorate would give a forecast of 8382 electorate by 2020.

This looks acceptable as the division average is 8547, but Cambourne currently has outstanding consent for a further 538 dwellings plus 27 (565) which is in the process of being approved these will all be occupied by the end of 2018. Using the average of 1.71 electorate per household this gives an additional electorate of 966 (565x1.71) this will give an electorate for the Division as follows:
Parish          Electorate
Bourn            758
Boxworth         184
Cambourne        7486
Childerley       21
Knapwell         77
Lolworth         130
Total            8656

The above electorate figure of 8656 makes no allowance for any growth in the adjoining villages, if this is allowed the electorate will rise to 8761 (2.3% above average) this makes no allowance for the 5% of children who will reach voting age before 2020, even allowing for the 1.5% that are over 75 there will be further additional electorate in Cambourne. If you allow a 3.5% addition this takes the figure to 8685 (5.1% above average).

There is also an emerging Local Plan that has housing proposed in the Division comprising 250 additional homes in Cambourne which pre application consultation has begun and is likely to deliver an additional 427 electorate within the forecast period giving a total of 9412 (10% above average).

Also in the emerging Local Plan is an additional 3200 dwellings on Bourn Airfield which is also in the Division, but no allowance has been made in the above figures as delivery of this is unknown.

The second issue we would wish to be taken into account is that Cambourne Parish Council has made a request to South Cambs District Council to carry out a governance review to amend the Parish Boundary to include the area identified as West Cambourne in the emerging Local Plan and as submitted as a Planning Application copy of our request to South Cambs District Council and Caxton Parish Council attached. This area will have potentially 2350 dwellings although it is likely that approx. 300-450 dwellings are anticipated to occupied prior to 2020.

Taking into account the committed and forecast growth in electorate Cambourne Parish Council would recommended the following alteration to the draft proposal. To have Cambourne as a single division incorporating part of Caxton Parish identified as West Cambourne on attached report. This would give a potential electorate of 8688 by 2020 (1.6% above average) with Boxworth, Childerley, Knapwell and Lolworth being added to the Papworth and Swavesey Division and Bourn being added to the Hardwick Division. Cambourne Parish Council considers that the villages have greater affiliation to the surrounding villages in the adjoining Divisions than with Cambourne. A division of villages will ensure fairer representation, rather than a group of small villages being linked to a much larger settlement which would demand greater representation than the attached villages.

The change of the Parish boundaries suggested above can be carried out under the “2009 Act” as it would be a direct consequence of the Local Government Boundary Commission's recommendation.

If you require any further information please contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

John Vickery
Cambourne Parish Clerk

CC Andrew Francis

Please address any reply to John Vickery Clerk to the Parish Council Parish Office.
22nd June 2015

Andrew Francis
Electoral Services Manager.
South Cambs District Council
South Cambridgeshire Hall,
Cambourne Business Park,
Cambourne,
Cambridge.
CB23 6EA

Dear Andrew,

Cambourne Parish Council: Governance Review
The Parish Council has been considering the Governance of West Cambourne as a result of the emerging Local Plan and subsequent Planning application and would request a Governance review. The Parish Council understands that to request a Governance Review to an area outside its current governance is unusual, but in this case it considered that a review is an intrinsic part of the development of West Cambourne. Attached is a report explaining why it is considered that a Governance review should be carried out. We have informally spoken to Caxton Parish Council, but have not made a formal approach. We intend to talk to Caxton Parish Council prior to the Civic Affairs Committee considering our request.

If you require any further information please contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

John Vickery
Cambourne Parish Clerk
29th June 2015

Mrs Gail Stoehr
LGS Services
30 West Drive
Highfields Caldecote
Cambridge
CB23 7NY

Dear Gail,

Cambourne Parish Council: Governance Review
Further to our informal discussions with yourself and Keith Howard. Cambourne Parish Council has been considering the Governance of West Cambourne as a result of the emerging Local Plan and subsequent Planning application and have requested a Governance review. The Parish Council understands that to request a Governance Review to an area outside its current governance is unusual, but in this case it considered that a review is an intrinsic part of the development of West Cambourne. Attached is a copy of the letter and report explaining why it is considered that a Governance review should be carried out. We would like to formally approach Caxton Parish Council to seek your support.

If you require any further information please contact me.

Yours Sincerely,

John Vickery
Cambourne Parish Clerk

CC Keith Howard
Andrew Francis

Please address any reply to John Vickery Clerk to the Parish Council Parish Office, }
CAMBOURNE WEST GOVERNANCE

Figure 1.0: Current Parish Boundaries as at June 2015.
Summary.

This report recommends a community governance review be initiated by South Cambridgeshire District Council with a view to changing the boundary of the Parish of Cambourne so that any development on land identified as Cambourne West falls within the administrative boundary of the Parish of Cambourne.

Introduction.

The purpose of this report is to set forth the case for the boundary of the Parish of Cambourne being extended to incorporate the development site of Cambourne West as set out by MCA Developments Ltd – Planning reference (S/2003/14/OL).

Cambourne Parish Council was formed under the Parish Council of Cambourne Order 2004 and became part of the Bourn Ward comprising the Parishes of Bourn, Cambourne, Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley. The original masterplan for Cambourne put the number of houses to be built at 3,300. In 2011 a further 950 homes were approved bringing the total number of occupied houses expected to be in Cambourne upon completion to 4,250 when considering approved applications.

However, at time of writing, a planning application (referenced above) submitted by MCA Developments Ltd in December of 2014 for development at land identified as Cambourne West for up to 2350 new dwellings, is being considered. Furthermore the emerging Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire is being scrutinised by a government appointed Inspector. The Local Plan proposes 1,200 homes at the same site. Consequently it seems likely that the number of homes in Cambourne is set to increase significantly unless both the Local Plan and the present application are rejected.

Currently, the site identified for the development of Cambourne West, be it the version set out by MCA Developments Ltd or the version set out in the emerging local plan, sits wholly within the Parish of Caxton.

It is the view of Cambourne Parish Council that should any development take place on that site, be it 1,200 new homes or 2,350 new homes, then careful thought will need to be given as to logistics with regard to the management of open spaces and community facilities that are likely to emerge. It also seems likely that the burden of managing and maintaining said new open spaces and facilities will fall to Cambourne Parish Council regardless of which Parish the development is situated in.

Should MCA's application to develop Cambourne West be approved, the final number of occupied dwellings in Cambourne is likely to be circa 7,000, giving rise to a total Parish population of approximately 19,320 using the current household multiplier of 2.76 as set out in the 2011 census.
Open Space & Community Facilities

The Design and Access statement for Cambourne West purports to offer approximately 155 acres of public open space, including a number of specialist sports pitches. This will require careful management and generate a need for specialist knowledge and equipment particularly when it comes to the maintenance of sports pitches and allotments.

Furthermore there are a number of community buildings planned, all of which will become rateable assets, and need to be the subject of robust care and management plans. There will also be an administrative workload generated once the community start to use them.

Cambourne Parish Council currently maintains approximately 200 acres of open space, including multiple specialist sports pitches, and employs a dedicated full-time team of Grounds Maintenance operatives, many of whom have professional qualifications. The Parish Council also boasts an impressive array of grounds maintenance equipment and vehicles and thus considers the infrastructure necessary to look after large areas of open space to be already in place.

The Parish Council also employs a number of full and part time administrative staff, cleaners and caretakers and therefore is already set up to manage extra community buildings and take bookings.

It is envisaged, that should the development go ahead, then the Parish Council will need to expand its workforce in order to cope with the extra workload, possibly opening a second grounds maintenance headquarters closer to the site. This will be extremely difficult to achieve if the Parish Council is not the recipient of any precept the development generates.
Community Identity

The Development will be viewed as part of Cambourne. Indeed, the Design and Access Statement produced by MCA Developments Ltd describes the development as "a high quality extension to Cambourne."

It is likely that residents of Cambourne West will view themselves as Cambourne residents, and come to Cambourne Parish Council as the first port of call should contact with the immediate local authority be necessary. However, as stated above, the development sits entirely within the parish of Caxton, and therefore dwellings would pay Caxton precept to Caxton Parish Council. It is envisaged that this could create identity problems and attenuate any sense of emerging community within the development.

Conclusion

A governance review to include Cambourne West within the Parish of Cambourne is essential to support the community identity as it will be an extension of Cambourne sharing existing and new infrastructure. The clear community identity is important in developing a sustainable community, building on what has been achieved in Cambourne. Cambourne Parish Council is well placed to take on the challenges of governing a large scale development of this nature. Trained staff are already in place, and a substantial investment has been made in vehicles and equipment over the last 11 years. It is envisaged an expansion of the workforce will need to occur, and further investment in plant and machinery will be required. The Parish Council would not be able to effectively manage this without the precept generated by the development.
From: Ramune Mimiene
Sent: 29 June 2015 10:50
To: reviews
Cc: Andrew Moore
Subject: Catworth Parish Council re: Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire

Dear Review Officer,

Thank you for the information provided on this public consultation.

Catworth Parish Council noted the recommendations.

Sincerely

Ms Ramune Mimiene
Clerk to Kings Ripton Parish Council
 Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Sent by email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

17 June 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire: Draft Recommendations consultation

Thank you for your email of 12 May, which was considered by the Parish Council when it recently met. The Council wishes to respond that it notes the proposed changes and voted by a narrow margin in favour of the proposals.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Gail Stoehr
Clerk
Dear Sir/Madam

With regard to the electoral review of Cambridgeshire draft recommendations, this is to confirm that Chatteris Town Council supports the proposal for the Chatteris division – a single division comprising the whole of Chatteris parish.

Yours sincerely
Joanna Melton
Town Clerk
Dear Mr Hinds,

I refer to the public consultation that is currently taking place on The Local Government Boundary Commission’s draft recommendations on new division boundaries across Cambridgeshire.

Doddington Parish Council has considered the draft recommendation as it applies to its Parish and considers that the reallocation of Doddington from its current area into Whittlesey South will be a retrograde step. Doddington is a rural village with close links to March and the neighbouring village of Wimblington which is remaining in the March South and Rural area. The villages of Doddington and Wimblington are also held in plurality at Fenland District Council, having two councillors who look after both villages. The draft recommendations would therefore mean that the two villages would be attached to two different rural areas.

In your review, one of the criteria used in revising the boundaries is:

"That the pattern of divisions should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities"

Doddington Parish Council feels that the draft recommendations do not reflect this statement for the following reasons:

Doddington is a rural village surrounded by agricultural activity, there is no industry in the area. There are local amenities for the residents but the main area for shopping, banks, rail transport etc is March sited some 5 miles east of the village. Whittlesey, on the other hand, is urban in nature with various industrial estates, and is sited some 12 miles to the west of Doddington. Members of the Parish Council feel that Doddington has no historical or current connection with Whittlesey.

The recent switch of Police administration from March to Whittlesey has left the village feeling neglected. If the recommendations on the new electoral arrangements are implemented, then rural Doddington, being sited with the urban area of Whittlesey, will only compound the potential lack of support or consideration to rural needs that will undoubtedly ensue. Doddington wishes to remain with its neighbouring village of Wimblington in March South & Rural.

Roger Wilkin
Clerk to Doddington Parish Council
Dear Sir

Thank you for forwarding the consultation details for the Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire – Draft Recommendations. Dullingham Parish Council has no objections to the proposal to reduce the number of Councillors from 69 to 61.

Kind regards

Yvonne Rix
Clerk to Dullingham Parish Council
From: Fuller, Heather  
Sent: 13 July 2015 12:06  
To: Hinds, Alex  
Subject: FW: Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire - Draft Recommendations

From: wendy gray  
Sent: 13 July 2015 11:46  
To: reviews  
Subject: Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire - Draft Recommendations

Response from Elton Parish Council:

“do not accept/agree with draft recommendations”

Wendy Gray  
Parish Clerk
The City of Ely Council considered the above consultation at their Full Council meeting and would like to make the following representation:-

The City of Ely Council notes the proposed ward boundary changes under paragraph 31 of the Cambridgeshire Draft Recommendations (12/05/2015).

While the new boundaries do provide individual seats for rural communities, this is at the expense of electoral equality. Based on the estimated electorate figures for 2020, the number of electors per seat will range from only 130 in Ely Rural North up to 1620 in Ely Central. The Council does not agree that such an imbalance is justified.

The Council also expects that the expansion in the number of wards is likely to result in more uncontested or empty seats, which would be detrimental to effective local government.

There is now a review of East Cambridgeshire District Council boundaries in progress. This review may also require changes to Ely City ward boundaries. Frequent change to boundaries is confusing for the electorate, breaks continuity of representation and is undesirable. The Council asks that no changes be made to the ward boundaries until after District review has taken place.

Tracey Coulson
Clerk to the City of Ely Council

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete the email and all attachments immediately. This email (including any attachments) may contain confidential and/or privileged information, if you are not the intended recipient any reliance on, use disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this email or attachments is strictly prohibited. It has been checked for viruses but the contents of an attachment may still contain software viruses, which could damage your computer system. We do not accept liability for any damage you sustain as a result of a virus introduced by this email or any attachment and you advised to use up to date virus checking software. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free. This email is not intended nor should it be taken to create any legal relations, contractual or otherwise. Any views or opinions expressed within this email or attachment are solely those of the sender, and do not necessarily represent those of the City of Ely Council. If verification is required, please request a hard copy version. We are not bound by or liable for any opinion, contract or offer to contract expressed in any email. The City of Ely Council can be contacted on 01353 661016.
This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.
Good morning,

Farcet Parish Council would support the electoral change for Farcet, which would reflect the District Ward. The Parish Council believes this is a positive move and beneficial for the Parish of Farcet.

Kind regards

[Redacted]
Clerk to Farcet Parish Council

The information in this message should be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless otherwise stated. If you have received this message in error please delete it and notify the sender. Any views expressed in this message are personal and not necessarily those of Farcet Parish Council, unless otherwise stated.
Dear Review Officer

Ref Draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire

We would like to have it recorded that our comments filed online on the 13th January 2015 seem to be missing from your draft report. They are as follows;

The Fen Ditton Parish Council have been actively involved with the Wing development proposed by Marshall's and are committed to continuing as one parish. This has been a considerable effort for a small council and will continue to be in the future. A number of our plans and policies have been developed based on a single enlarged parish, for example our Affordable Housing Policy.

As you will see from the attached document from our January 2014 meeting (page 4-5) we have given the idea of a separate parish for Wing some thought and come to the conclusion that the community would be better served as one parish for the reasons indicated. Some of our concerns have been incorporated in the revised outline plan submitted by Marshall’s, reinforcing our long term plans for one community.

In the event that future generations of residents of Fen Ditton or Wing wish to separate into separate parish’s Marshall's has agreed to incorporate such provisions while setting up the legal structures for Wing.
We also attached a document outlining our plans.

We are planning to discuss your draft proposals at our next council meeting and I have no doubt we will have further comments.

Yours faithfully

Vince Farrar
Chairman
Fen Ditton Parish Council.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Vince Farrar
Subject: Re: Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire
Date: 13 January 2015 15:25:56 GMT
To: Laurie Suess
Cc: Laurie Wooffenden - FDPC, Sarah Smart, Susannah Ticciati, Charles Jones, Felicity Bennée, Williams

Hi to All

I’ve had another look at the Commissions web site and it allows for doc’s to be uploaded, so propose the following in the comments box with the report from our January Meeting discussion document which covers all the details. Saves generating another document.

Any comments?

Regards

Vince

Proposed Submission to Boundary Commission (comments section)

The Fen Ditton Parish Council have been actively involved with the Wing development proposed by Marshall's and are committed to continuing as one parish. This has been a considerable effort for a small council and will continue to be in the future. A number of our plans and policies have been developed based on a single enlarged parish, for example our Affordable Housing Policy.
As you will see from the attached document from our January 2014 meeting (page 4-5) we have given the idea of a separate parish for Wing some thought and come to the conclusion that the community would be better served as one parish for the reasons indicated. Some of our concerns have been incorporated in the revised outline plan submitted by Marshall's, reinforcing our long term plans for one community.

In the event that future generations of residents of Fen Ditton or Wing wish to separate into separate parish’s Marshall's has agreed to incorporate such provisions while setting up the legal structures for Wing.

Upload the following:
Executive summary:

Outline planning for Wing has been submitted – mostly as we expected.

There could be a conflict between Marshall's intention of managing public services via a Management Company or Trust, usually under local authority control, therefore bypassing the democratic process.

Many public facilities are the subject of current legislation and are normally the responsibility of the local authorities including a parish council.

Other parishes that have seen major development may have had public service assets transferred to them for long term ownership and management.

(Proposed) Cornerstone FDPC policy

All public facilities/services/assets including operating costs, covered under legislation, controlled through the democratic process.

That the handover of responsibility/assets is timed to coincide with the numbers of tax (precept) paying households in Wing being approximately on par with the current number of households of the parish and the Wing development phases.

Future Wing householders should not be subject to "management fees" for any Wing services over and above the precept.

As the PC does not have the necessary knowledge on implementing such a strategy, outside resources will be required in implementing this policy.

Shop units.

The number of smaller retail units may exceed the number the local community can support relying on passing trade.
INTRODUCTION

First the disclaimer. This document is written from a layman’s perspective, the author has little previous knowledge of planning system.

The relationship between Wing and the existing Fen Ditton village has been discussed between councillors and at parish council meetings for some time. The discussion have been based on various draft versions of the outline plan. In general the argument to continue as one parish has prevailed and this is currently parish council policy.

However, in light of the outline planning application as submitted, councillors felt this was an good time to review this policy and widen the discussion.

This document is focused on the key relationship between Marshall's and the Parish Council. Or the relationship between Marshall's and the future residences.

Feel free to add anything you feel we need to discuss.

Initial examination of the outline plan has not reveal any unexpected items, other than fewer business premises than was discussed at some of the workshops. What is missing may be of more interest: The lack of a Wing – Parish Council integration plan.

Powers and duties of parish councils

This list is reproduced from a Department of Environment Consultation Paper on "The Role of Parish and Town Councils in England" August 1992. It is intended only as a summary of the relevant principal functions cobbled together and not intended to be a definitive list, but may be useful in guiding our relationship with Wing/Marshall's.

Allotments

Powers to provide allotments. Duty to provide allotment gardens if demand unsatisfied

Statutory provisions Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908, ss.23, 26 and 42

Burial grounds, cemeteries and crematoria

Power to acquire, provide and maintain

Power to agree to maintain monuments and memorials

Statutory provisions Open Spaces Act 1906, ss.9 and 10; Local Government Act
1972, s. 214; Parish Councils and Burials Authorities (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1970, s.1  Power to contribute towards expenses of cemeteries Local Government Act 1972, s.214(6)

**Bus shelters**

Power to provide and maintain shelters

**Statutory provisions** Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1953, s.4

**Bye-laws**

Power to make bye-laws in regard to recreation grounds and Cycle parks.

**Statutory provisions** Public Health Act 1875, s.164  
Road Traffic Regulation  Public Health Act 1936, s.223  
Open Spaces Act 1906, s.15  Public Health Act 1936, s.198

**Closed churchyards**

Power as to maintenance

**Statutory provisions** Local Government Act 1972, s.215

**Commons and common pastures**

Powers in relation to inclosure, as to regulation and management, and as to providing common pasture

Inclosure Act 1845; Local Government Act 1894, s.8(4): Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908, s.34

**Conference facilities**

Power to provide and encourage the use of facilities

**Statutory provisions** Local Government Act 1972, s.144

**Community centres**

Power to provide and equip buildings for use of clubs having athletic, social or educational objectives

**Statutory provisions** Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, s.19
Drainage

Power to deal with ponds and ditches

Statutory provisions Public Health Act 1936, s.260

Entertainment and the arts

Provision of entertainment and support of the arts

Statutory provisions Local Government Act 1972, s.145

Highways

Power to repair and maintain public footpaths and bridleways

Power to light roads and public places

Power to provide parking places for vehicles, bicycles and motor-cycles

Power to enter into an agreement as to dedication and widening

Power to provide roadside seats and shelters. Consent of parish council required for ending maintenance of highway at public expense, or for stopping up or diversion of highway.

Power to complaint to district council as to protection of rights of way and roadside wastes.

Power to provide traffic signs and other notices

Power to plant trees etc. and to maintain roadside verges

Statutory provisions Highways Act 1980, ss.43,50
Parish Councils Act 1058, s.3; Highways Act 1980, s.301 Litter Act 1983, ss.5,6
Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, ss.57, 63 Highways Act 1980, ss.30, 72
Parish Councils Act 1957, s.1 Highways Act 1980, ss.47, 116
Highways Act 1980, s.130 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, s.72 Highways Act 1980, s.96

Litter

Provision of receptacles

Statutory provisions Litter Act 1983, ss.5, 6
Open spaces
Power to acquire land and maintain

Statutory provisions Public Health Act 1875, s.164; Open Spaces Act 1906, ss.9 and 10

Public buildings and village halls
Power to provide buildings for offices and for public meetings and assemblies

Statutory provisions Local Government Act 1972, s.133

Public conveniences
Power to provide

Statutory provisions Public Health Act 1936, s.87

Recreation
Power to acquire land for or to provide recreation grounds, public walks, pleasure grounds and open spaces and to manage them Power to provide gymnasiums, playing fields, holiday camps Provision of boating pools

Statutory provisions Public Health Act 1875, s.164; Local government Act 1972, Sched. 14, para 27: Public Health Acts Amendment Act 1890, s.44: Open Spaces Act 1906, ss.9 and 10; Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, s.19 Public Health Act 1961, s.54

Advantages of long term integration

This is a list proved by CAPAL (informal meeting)

• Potential economics of scale
• Trend to larger Parishes nationally
• Possible future government policy as part of the Localism trend
• Increase in resources
List as identified by council members:

- Coordinated and shared resources. Avoiding unnecessary competition between pavilions and balancing use.
- Additional choice/flexibility in primary schooling, assuming Wing/FD easy access.
- Wing to provide PC office.
- Possibility of two clerk's increasing flexibility.
- PC may have increased influence representing a large community
- Additional development pressure may be reduced.

Old Village facilities

The old village has some facilities that cannot be provided on the Wing site. Riverside and old character pubs and the Church. It is of great interest to the parish that all these facilities remain viable. If any of the pubs closes there could be a tempting site for developers and if the church closes there could be a cost to the parish in the maintenance of the churchyard under the legislation mentioned above.

Marshall's Vision states they do not want to negatively effect the existing pubs and the proximity of more local customers the future viability for the pubs is improved by the Wing development. ASSUMING there is easy foot/cycle access from Wing to the old village. (I can't see many customers staggering home across muddy fields). However, document 8.01 does indicate a “drinking establishment” in area B (Newmarket road, next to P&R). This is a specific permission and not just a “vision” which may not be binding. The is also mentions of Bar's so some clarification may be required.

A suitable assess route between Wing and Fen Ditton village has been identified. It is indicated as a “Potential” cycle route on the outline plan.

The addition of new residences in the village due to Wing will increases the potential congregation for the Church thus improving it's long term viability.

Downside discussion

It must be noted that initially some councillors did not view Wing as having a place in the Fen Ditton parish in the long term. This will no doubt will still be the case among the local
community. The fear expressed (from memory) was that it will have a negative impact on the small rural feel of the village, which I am sure we are all keen to maintain. Also the fear was that with the larger numbers of residences, that over time the PC will be dominated by representatives from Wing and be primarily focused on the Wing area.

If we feel that the PC is being dominated by Wing representatives (many years down the road) there are two options. We can split into two wards or instigate the democratic process to split into parishes. Which is available (under current legislation) to both areas.

The CAPAL representative informs us that in his experience, new residences do not normally take an active role in parish councils due to the demographic profile of new home owners.

From the existing information, it could be 15 years before there are sufficient residences in the Wing development to possibly dominate the parish and for this to be an issue. This is too far away for us to even consider further at this stage (opinion).

Increased workload
To date the increase in work load has been manageable and not added to the costs in any significant way. This may change as more detailed planning requests are submitted, but there is an agreement in principle with Marshall’s that should mitigate the extra costs. This agreement is only verbal and in principle and not binding at this stage.

However, I am sure all the councillors are committed to ensuring that the current FD tax payers are not burdened with the additional costs in administering the Wing development.

No clear plan for public services integration by Marshall’s. The “Vision” mentions a Management Company or Trust which adds another layer and can complicate management as we found with the existing Rec Trust. This additional layer could become a source of additional costs and/or revenue generator plus as mentioned outside democratic control unless structured accordingly.
**Recreation facilities**

Looking the legislation would suggest many recreational facilities are a PC responsibility. But Marshall's vision indicates they wish to operate the facilitates in the long term taking them out of public control. Does the PC wish to have a (binding) say or in anyway control these facilities? Maybe a contractual arrangement or control of the Trust of management company through appointing directors or trustees?

Section 5.59 of the outline plan

The increase in population will increase demand for community facilities. The proposed development includes 3.8 ha of outdoor sports facilities (including three junior football pitches and two adult football pitches), a sports pavilion, 12.0 ha of informal public open space (including a park, informal play space and public squares), a park pavilion (including a café and gym), 1.7 ha of allotments, 1.0 ha of children's play areas, and a community hall. In addition, 1.3 ha of open space, including three tennis courts and allotments, are proposed on land to the immediate west of the planning application boundary (covered under a separate planning application to Cambridge City Council).

It may be the case that the existing football pitch is under used. So the addition of a further 2 pitches would make this worse. Discuss!

There does not appear to be any provision in the plans to integrate sports facilities. Football facilities seem to be excessive when added to the existing pitch. (see 8.01 for details)

A key aim is that the existing (substandard), facilities do not fall into disrepair due to lack of use. In the worst case scenario, if facilities are duplicated and the end users switch to the newer higher standard facilities, justification in spending funds to continue upkeep of the current site could be difficult.

It is therefore proposed that recreation is split across the parish, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec Ground (Church Street)</th>
<th>Wing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior play area</td>
<td>Play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket pitch</td>
<td>Skate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football 45*27 Mini-League size</td>
<td>Football 55*36 Soccer size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Astroturf Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New modern Pavilion</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-use games area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As pitch lighting is not possible on the Wing site due to its proximity to the airport it may be worth considering having this feature at the Rec as part of the proposed upgrade of this site.

All management and bookings of all the recreational facilities should be handled by the PC.

In the Community, Social and Economic Effects report by Terence O’Rourke Ltd the following information may be relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FD Population</th>
<th>Type of open space</th>
<th>Provision (Hectares)</th>
<th>Requirement from Standard</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play space</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal open space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In paragraph 5.27 it states:

Fen Ditton – Fen Ditton Recreation Ground, with pitches for football (very good quality), cricket (good quality) and athletics, an all-purpose pavilion (average quality), a neighbourhood equipped area of play (NEAP; good quality) and two areas of allotments (both of average quality)

The description of the “all-purpose pavilion” being of average quality is at best optimistic. A better description would be “not fit for purpose”.

**Allotments**

As the allotments are in private hands and not available to the general public (as far as I am aware) they should not be included in this list.

**Public rights of way**

The proposal to move the existing footpath to the wooded area along High Ditch road is now shown as a winding bridle path. Tree cutting involved? Discuss!
**Precedence**

How have public services and assets been handled in other large developments? Extracts from the Cambourne web site can give us some indication.

“When the Cambourne Parish Council was formed it had no assets to look after, but was consulted on what was to be transferred over the period of the development.”

A list of the asset list for Cambourne and the dates they were transferred it gives us some idea of how public services and assets can or should be handled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Date Transferred</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hub, Community Centre</td>
<td>01/06/05</td>
<td>Operated by PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Crow Hill</td>
<td>01/04/05</td>
<td>68 plots, admin and maint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Brace Dean</td>
<td>01/03/10</td>
<td>107 plots admin and maint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout/Guide Land</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Hut pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate Burial Ground</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Leased to CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Lane Sports Pitch</td>
<td>Phase 1 transferred Sep 2006, phase 2 transferred Sept 2008</td>
<td>4 mini pitches, 2 junior pitches, 1 9v9 pitch, 1 colts pitch, 3 colts/adults pitches and 2 rugby pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUGA and Tennis Courts, Back Lane</td>
<td>01/01/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts, Monkfield Lane</td>
<td>01/07/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green, Back Lane</td>
<td>01/05/09</td>
<td>Bowls club being setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary changing rooms, Back Lane</td>
<td>Sept 2006</td>
<td>Funded by contributions from the PC, McA, Cambourne Developers and SCDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambourne Sports and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>01/12/11</td>
<td>Given to the Parish Council in Dec 2011 by MCA as part of their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambourne Sports Pavilion and PC office</td>
<td>01/08/11</td>
<td>Funded by the PC with support from MCA and SCDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Board Park, Back Lane</td>
<td>01/01/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambourne Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>01/03/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambourne Green</td>
<td>01/07/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambourne Green Play Area</td>
<td>01/07/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer Park</td>
<td>01/02/08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Park Kick-about Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Originally maintained by The Wildlife Trust, this was transferred to the Parish Council as it was felt they would be better placed to maintain the kick-about area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Hang Out</td>
<td>01/02/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Park Play Area</td>
<td>01/02/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cambourne Cricket Pavilion</td>
<td>01/05/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cambourne Green and Cricket Pitch</td>
<td>01/01/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cambourne Play Area</td>
<td>01/07/08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambourne Cricket Wicket</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Cambourne Cricket Wicket Play Area</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cambourne Village Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>Due for transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cambourne Village Green Play Area</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The area will be extended as part of the infrastructure for the 950...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extra dwellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Cambourne Village Green Car Park</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verges and Public Open Spaces</td>
<td>Maintains all the verges and open spaces retained by Bovis Homes Ltd until they are transferred to the PC or CC. The PC is in discussion with the other house builders in Cambourne to come to a similar arrangement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extracts from the Cambourne PC web site. See appendix for link.

Points of Interest - from outline plans

The following section are extracts from the plan that may be of interest, mention the parish council, or mention an area of interest.

Community Management – Extracts from Planning Statement

4.19 Marshall will retain ownership of the public spaces and community facilities. Some of the smaller streets, lanes and mews will also not be adopted by the county council, but managed and maintained by Marshall through a management organisation. The details of the adoption strategy have yet to be fully worked out with the council.

4.20 In partnership with the parish council and other local stakeholders and residents, the community will be actively managed by those living or working within the community and those elected to represent local residents.

4.21 Policy CE/31 requires management strategies for services, facilities, landscape and infrastructure to be submitted as part of the outline planning application. These strategies have been shaped by the vision and principles for Wing, based around Marshall’s own ethos and feedback from the community and elected council members, as outlined below.

4.22 Marshall intends to retain the freehold of the local centre, and will therefore be able to ensure it is well managed and maintained. It will be able to choose the occupiers, and set the terms of their lease. This will assist with minimising voids and vacancies. The units will be flexible so that they can be combined into larger units or sub-divided into smaller units to meet occupier demand. Details of the local centre will be worked up in the design code, and submitted for approval with a management plan at reserved matters stage.

4.23 Marshall intends to manage and retain control of the public spaces and
community facilities, and will establish an estate management company or community trust which includes residents and other local stakeholders, such as the parish council. Section 10.08 of the Design and Access Statement details the key features of the landscape management strategy.

4.24 The Flood Risk Assessment (Technical Appendix H to the Environmental Statement) addresses how the drainage features within the open spaces will be managed and maintained. There will be an on site presence in an estate office so that any issues that might arise can be dealt with immediately. Marshall will play a significant role in this, working alongside Fen Ditton Parish Council, residents and other stakeholders.

5.23 The local centre is capable of accommodating the following, many of which were suggested by local residents and Marshall's staff:

- an anchor foodstore of up to 1,500sqm gross and adjacent petrol filling station
- 3,000sqm of smaller retail units, such as cafés, shops, bars, dentists
- health centre of 1,200sqm, if this is preferred to an off site contribution. Other health uses such as dentists, chiropractor, or physiotherapists could alternatively take this space
- an arts studio / gallery which could be part of the public art strategy
- an office and meeting room for Fen Ditton Parish Council

**Page 33**

Section Summary of AAP requirements

The design should not preclude a future public transport access onto High Ditch Road, or a new junction on the A14 between the existing Quy and Fen Ditton junctions, as a replacement for the latter.

Page 35

There is no vehicular access onto High Ditch Road or into the Fison Road Estate.

**Marshall's Vision**

Marshall's wishes to retain some form of longterm control over wing.

We want access for local people who wish to work or live in the area. We want Wing to be a fully inclusive and integrated community from the start. This is the same policy as that adopted by the other growth sites around Cambridge. However, in contrast to those sites, we wish the policy to remain in place rather than just apply to the first occupiers.
While (personal view) there is probably no conflict in principle with this goal, how this is achieved legally is not clear. Is this an issue for the PC?

More of a concern is the section on page 4 “Our Involvement”

We will retain ownership of a large element of the open spaces, commercial uses and public areas as we believe that the residents of Wing would prefer Marshall to have the final responsibility for the community assets rather than a management company with no long term interest in the site. Marshall has experience of looking after the tree belts, fields, hedges, fences, ditches and watercourses around the whole of the Airport. Operating an Airport adjacent to the site also brings with it additional requirements such as the management of flocking birds and the height of trees for the radar and landing equipment. Consequently, we believe we have a moral obligation to provide a stewardship role on Wing.

We are also considering retaining the ownership of the affordable housing, as again, the management of the community is seen as key to its success. As regards the day to day management of the open spaces and community assets on behalf of the community, Marshall anticipates establishing a community trust to run and manage the site, and will be one of many partners involved in its operation.

This “Involvement” would again take some facilities normally under PC control outside of the democratic process and may leave local people with no control over their local environment. While Marshall's goal of avoiding a management company is understandable (and supported by the author) they or a trust, in effect become the management company and unaccountable.

On the surface it makes more sense to use the existing democratic organisation, a Parish Council, to undertake it's traditional role, supported by legislation, to manage community assets in a democratic way.

It is possibly this issue that would make the idea of splitting Fen Ditton Parish off from Wing make sense, as the role of any PC could become diluted to where it becomes almost powerless.

There may be other solutions like the PC having the right to appointing trustees, but this just adds in another layer of administration costs.

What is also unclear, is the “Vision” presented in the outline plan binding? Can Marshall's change their commitments to Wings at any point. For example, if there is a change of management, the costs become a burden, or they review their commitment to the current airport location.

**Affordable Letting Policy**

Page 80 of the Design & Access statement states:

“Marshall wishes to retain the local lettings policy throughout all future lets, to ensure that the new affordable homes can continue to meet the need of Cambridge and the surrounding villages“
There is no mention of the legal structure they plan to use to achieve this goal similar to above.

**Maintenance Costs to Wing residences**

If not planned in a fair way this could become an area of some disagreement in the longer term. If Marshall’s retains the long term maintenance of all the community facilities normally provided by the parish council and places a charge on the residences of Wing in addition to the precept, the new residences will probably be unhappy!

**CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS**

**The PC request the following added to the outline plan**

**Wing - Fen Ditton Parish integration**

To successfully integrate Wing with the existing Fen Ditton parish:

- Good foot/cycle communications.
- Public assets and services placed under democratic control
- Integrated public services and assets including upgrade to existing sports facilities
- One common service charge across the entire parish
- Public services and assets available to all residences
- Balanced representation of the PC as the community numbers change.
- Handover of responsibility for public services and assets when community population comes into balance.
- Financial support for the parish during periods of peak costs and low precept income.

**Cornerstone Policy Proposal**

Many of the new facilities in the Wing development are traditionally the area of responsibility of the parish council and covered by legislation. For example allotment, recreation facilities, verges.

The Proposal is that the Parish Council enters into negotiations with Marshall’s with a view to taking over all relevant community facilities that are covered by legislation (see above), possibly with Marshall’s acting as a contractor to the parish if they wish to continue long term maintenance. The aim is to integrate the services and precept across the entire parish, to avoid two sets of charges on the Wing residences and ensure all public services are controlled through the democratic process.

If the outline plan is passed with Marshall's retaining control (directly or indirectly) of the public assets, spaces and facilities indefinitely, the proposal is that FDPC recommends to the local
residences (via a consultation process) that the parish council instigates separation from Wing as soon as practical. There seems little benefit in committing the PC to year of effort if there is minimal positive outcome in the form of additional public assets as in the Cambourne examples. The Marshall's “Vision” may provide for many public assets but they will not be under public (democratic) control, limiting the traditional role of the PC and it not functioning as intended.

Additional proposal is that the parish council takes advise (from SCDC?) on how the transition from developer to parish council normally takes place.

**Business Premises**

There are fewer business premises that envisaged in the residential areas of the plan. However, the (potential) number of smaller retail outlets needs further examination. The proposal is we ask Marshall's if there is any data to support the 3000m3 of mixed use premises (A1-5,B1,D1-2), plus a further 2,600m3 (8.01). A report mentions that Savills is confident they will attract passing trade, but that appears to be the limit of the justification.

**Allotments**

There are no existing allotments available to local residences via the Parish Council and the Small Holdings & Allotments Act 1908, ss. 23, 26, and 42.

The new allotments should be available to all parish residences and as per the Cornerstone policy, administered through the PC.

All management and bookings of all the recreational facilities should be handled by the PC.

Propose we find out if the Marshall's “Visions” are binding.

**Reference Documents etc.**

http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Eliz2/5-6/42/contents
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1972/70/contents  Note: changes to the act make this site difficult to read.
http://www.cambourneparishcouncil.gov.uk/assets

Disclaimer
The opinions expressed in this document are the opinions of the author and do not represent the policies of the Fen Ditton Parish Council unless they are adopted at a full meeting of the council and so minuted. This document is for internal discussion only and due to time constraints is has not been refined and error checked. Due to time constraints expert opinion was not available before publication.
Fen Ditton Parish Council

Response to Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire – Draft Recommendations

Introduction

As described in consultation document https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk//node/4143, the Electoral Review Commission (ERC) is proposing to split the parish of Fen Ditton into two electoral Wards as part of a county wide programme to balance the projected numbers of electors per councillor in the County Council in 2016 and 2020; the years before a County Council election.

It is proposed to:

A) split the village of Fen Ditton along High Ditch Road and east of the disused railway line to include the proposed Wing development and retain the new Fen Ditton-South in Fulbourn County Council Division whilst moving the existing main village area into the Waterbeach Division as Fen Ditton-North; and

B) constitute FDPC with 3 councillors to be elected from FD-N and 6 from FD-S.

There would be no change to overall parish boundaries or parliamentary boundaries.

Whilst the simple numerical calculation underpinning the proposal balances, Fen Ditton Parish Council (FDPC) believes that the data assumptions no longer hold up to scrutiny. FDPC concludes that the split is unnecessary and will have highly undesirable consequences for the parish. In response to the consultation, FDPC therefore objects to the ERC proposals for Fen Ditton in their current form.

Discussion

1. Proposal A - Analysis of voter numbers and impact on County Divisions

Table A1 in the ERC consultation and their assumptions for Fen Ditton (Appendix A) indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waterbeach Division</th>
<th>Fulbourn Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluding Fen Ditton</td>
<td>Fen Ditton (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of voters 2014</td>
<td>7338</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of voters 2020</td>
<td>7520</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+182</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FDPC understand that the underlying data for proposed housing development were submitted some time ago by Cambridgeshire County Council. However, taking an average of 1.7 voters per dwelling (see Appendix A), the major changes by 2020 proposed in the review are:

- Waterbeach + 184 voters or 108 dwellings
- Fulbourne + 593 voters or 349 dwellings
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- Fen Ditton-South + 1384 voters or 814 dwellings (Wing)

At the East Cambridge Forum meeting of 1 June 2015, it was stated that the Wing programme has slipped with a decision on outline planning permission now due in late 2015. Even if all then goes well, current development plans indicate only 120 new homes per year from 2018. The number of new dwellings occupied in 2020 is thus likely to be near 300 (510 voters) rather than 814 (1384 voters). This casts grave doubt on the fundamental basis of the proposed split.

If, as has also been stated, there are planning issues still to be resolved for developments in Fulbourn, there is a real risk that splitting Fen Ditton would result in the Fulbourn division having less than 90% of the county average voter numbers in 2020 before rising well above average in 2024 with Waterbeach then exceeding 110% of average some time around or after 2028 assuming new developments there now under discussion are progressed. FDPC therefore suggest that keeping Fen Ditton as a single unit within Fulbourn until the review prior to the 2024 elections would continue to deliver a reasonable degree of electoral equality and continue to reflect the interest and identity of the local community. This also minimises the risk of changes in 2020 being reversed in 2024.

2. Proposal B - Analysis of impact on Fen Ditton

The proposal does not conclude any transitional arrangements to account for the gradual and delayed development of Wing. Expected voter numbers mean that six parish councillors will be excessive until several years after 2020. Until 2020, it is likely that candidates would be mainly drawn from the existing community due to the rules on eligibility to stand for election.

From the inception of Wing, FDPC has worked closely with Marshalls to ensure its integration and reinforce its identity within the community, both through transport links on foot or bicycle and through consideration of how community resources and other interests could best be shared (Appendix B). The new primary school planned for Wing is in Phase 3 so there is likely to be a period where pupils from Wing will have to attend Fen Ditton Primary School thus reinforcing community ties. A recent survey identified a need for a small amount of affordable housing to serve the parish. FDPC is in talks with Marshalls to create a Community Land Trust within Wing to meet this need.

FDPC notes that the ERC proposals do not reflect the geographical divide along the River Cam although retaining the link with Horningsea. The proposals would lead to two sets of District and County councillors being requested to attend PC and public meetings. Although they perform a vital role and contribute greatly to getting things done, this may not be a convenient use of councillors in the period up to 2020 when the number of voters in the parish is expected to be only around 1081.

Conclusion

Taking into account the revised timetable for Wing and impact on likely voter numbers, FDPC suggests that keeping Fen Ditton as a single unit within Fulbourn Division until the review prior to 2024 elections would continue to deliver a reasonable degree of electoral equality at County level and continue to reflect the interest and identity of the local community. This will delay a change until Wing is flourishing and the electoral numbers become clear.

The proposed split into a ward with 3 parish councillors and a ward with 6 will be highly unequal until some time well after 2020 and will negate the efforts made by Marshalls and FDPC to develop a
shared identity and shared facilities as Wing grows. FDPC suggests that delaying a decision on a split until 2024 will avoid this. If a split is enforced, avoiding the imposition of fixed numbers of councillors before 2020 would avoid the inequality although doing little for enhancing the shared identity of the community.
## Appendix A – ERC and County Council Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of voters 2014</th>
<th>Number of voters 2020</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterbeach</td>
<td>3236</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>3132</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Ditton-N</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landbeach</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horningsea</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7909</strong></td>
<td><strong>8091</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division as % of County Average</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbourn</td>
<td>3817</td>
<td>4410</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversham</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow cum Quy</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wilbraham</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Wilbraham</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Ditton-S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7086</strong></td>
<td><strong>9069</strong></td>
<td><strong>1983</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division as % of County Average</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>478,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>521,380</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average per Councillor</strong></td>
<td><strong>7851</strong></td>
<td><strong>8547</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Dwellings (2013)</th>
<th>Voters/Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterbeach</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Ditton</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landbeach</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horningsea</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbourne</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversham</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stow cum Quy</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Wilbraham</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Community Identity and supporting facilities in Fen Ditton

Clubs and events currently operating in Fen Ditton include:

- Cricket Club and Football Club (Recreation Ground)
- Town and University Bumps, Rowing Regattas – on the River Cam
- Retired persons coffee club
- Bowls, Badminton, Gardening clubs
- Village Society
- Parochial Church Council

The following community facilities are available in Fen Ditton North but not planned for Fen Ditton South.

- Riverside Pub/Restaurant (The Plough)
- Historic Pub/Restaurant (The Ancient Shepherds) which will be the nearest to Fen Ditton-South
- Pub (Kings Head)
- Parish Church (St Mary the Virgin, Grade 1 Listed Building)
- Church Hall
- Cricket ground/pavilion
- Riverside access and walks
- Cemetery

The following community facilities will be available in Fen Ditton-South but not in Fen Ditton-North.

- Shops, cafe and a supermarket
- Community Hall equipped for staged events, plays etc.
- Parish Council Offices
- Ice rink

Common shared facilities to be available in both areas

- Community halls
- Football playing fields
- Children’s play areas
Response to Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire – Draft Recommendations

- Pavilions, one large one small.
- Allotments (tbc)
Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: The Local Government boundary Commission for England

Foxton Parish Council’s comments are as follows:

Foxton Parish Council understand the objective of an electoral review is to ensure that, within each local authority area, the number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same. Whilst we fully understand and support this general reorganisation, the specific boundary changes proposed to Melbourn and Bassingbourn Division isolate Foxton from Melbourn which is an essential local centre for secondary education and many other essential community services. Foxton also shares with Melbourn a strong association to the A10 and rail transport corridor. Foxton has no shared infrastructure or community services with the villages south of the A505 (Gt/LT Chishill, Ickleton, Hinxton)

Foxton Parish Council feel it important to retain political and administrative influence within the area from where the residents receive essential services such as health, education and general community support.

Foxton Parish Council object to the boundary changes as proposed but would support an extension of the existing Melbourn Area to include Foxton, Thriplow and Fowlmere.

Best regards,

Frances Laville - Clerk to the Council
Dear Sirs

I write to you as Chair of Grantchester Parish Council. We are aware of the Boundary Commission’s proposal to move Madingley out of Hardwick County Council electoral division, in to Bar Hill County Council electoral Division and Madingley Parish Council’s reluctance for this to happen.

Can we let you know that Madingley have our full support in wishing to stay in the same electoral division as ourselves - we would be sorry if they were moved out.

Yours faithfully

L R Sherratt

Chair, Grantchester Parish Council
Great Gransden Parish Council

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

1st July 2015

Dear Mr Hinds,

Great Gransden Parish Council is once again writing with representations on the electoral review of Cambridgeshire and in particular the published draft recommendations to include Great Gransden within the St Neots East division which will largely be made up of Loves Farm.

Clearly grouping Great Gransden and 5 other villages with Loves Farm takes no account of the differing needs of rural and urban communities. The present recommendation provides for an electorate of 4,669 almost doubling to 8,560 by 2020 when further development of the Loves Farm area has been completed. This will make the proposed division almost wholly urban with the 6 villages making up a small proportion. The urban communities and their issues will take precedence over the smaller rural villages which will effectively be swamped.

The Boundary Commission sets out guidance for a good pattern of divisions. This includes:

- Reflecting community interests and identities and include evidence of community links. Community identity should reflect the issues which bind the community together. Six rural villages will have no links to a large urban area such as Loves Farm and the intended future development.
- Helping the council deliver effective and convenient local government. The proposed division of St Neots East and Great Gransden will fail to provide the rural villages with effective representation.

The Parish Councils of Great Gransden, Great Paxton and Waresley-cum-Tetworth have all previously objected to the proposals to include them with the Loves Farm development, a clear sign that our voices have been heard but ignored, effectively emphasising one of the reasons for objecting to grouping of rural areas with a large urban population. The commonality of community interests and identities and effective and convenient local government is being sacrificed for equality of electoral numbers.

Great Gransden is presently grouped with Waresley, Abbotsley, Yelling, Toseland the Offords and Buckden which better reflects community interests and identities as well
as delivering effective local government. The Parish Councils of Abbotsley, Waresley and Yelling concur with the views of Great Gransden Parish Council in objecting to the grouping of the villages with a large urban community and have asked for their names to be included with this letter. Great Paxton Parish Council has also written to object to the proposed grouping. St Neots is divided into 4 divisions and the interests and identity of the urban and surrounding rural areas would be better served by having 2 divisions for St Neots town and a division each for villages south and north of the town.

The Boundary Commission should once again look at the divisions to enable the rural communities of Great Gransden, Waresley, Abbotsley and Yelling as well as surrounding villages to have a fair representation rather than being at odds with a large urban community.

Yours sincerely,

Stephanie Beaumont,
Chairman, Great Gransden Parish Council

And supported by:
Waresley Parish Council
Abbotsley Parish Council
Yelling Parish Council
16th June 2015

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

Dear Mr Hinds,

Further to your letter of the 12th May, Great Paxton Parish Council have considered the published draft recommendations to include Great Paxton within the St. Neots East division, the majority of which comprises Loves Farm, and would make the following representations.

Great Paxton and the five other villages have differing needs to urban communities. The electorate of Loves Farm when building is completed will double by 2020, with the six villages making up a small proportion. It is felt that urban issues will take precedence over the small rural villages.

The Parish Council strongly objects on the grounds that the review does not take into account the different needs and issues of rural and urban communities and that the proposal does not reflect community interests and activities which are being overlooked for equality of electoral numbers. We would much prefer to be grouped with similar rural communities to ensure visibility.

We would respectfully request that the The Boundary Commission should consider these representations which would enable the rural communities mentioned above to be fairly represented instead of being grouped with a large urban community with different needs and issues.

Yours sincerely,

Wayne Bond
Chairman
From: HPC  
Sent: 16 June 2015 09:53  
To: reviews  
Cc: Hunt William Cllr  
Subject: Re: Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write on behalf of Haddenham Parish Council to advise the following:

Haddenham Parish Council does not agree with the proposed creation of a new Division to be named Littleport West.

It would be unrealistic to have even two councillors covering 19 villages and areas because they could not be expected to have sufficient knowledge or understanding of all of those parishes and this would result in them not being as effective as they should be.

It would be almost impossible for them to maintain regular and good contact with such a large Division and this would result in a weaker representation and become very harmful to the relationship between communities and the Councillors representing them.

If the number of County Council members is to be cut from 69 to 61 consideration should be given to the demands of a growing population and the suggestion that Wentworth could be transferred from the Haddenham Division to Sutton Division.

Being a rural area the proposals would make it very difficult if not impossible to support and service such a large area.

Consideration should also be given to dividing the area with Haddenham/Sutton on one side and Littleport/Ely on the other.

The Parish Council supports the likeminded views of our current County Councillor, Bill Hunt, who is very knowledgeable about the areas involved and we would urge that his comments and concerns are considered very carefully and seriously.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Manning  
Clerk To Haddenham Parish Council

Website: www.haddenham.org.uk
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Jennifer Abell
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Hail Weston Parish Council

Comment text:

Hail Weston Parish Council (HWPC) were disappointed with the proposal of Alconbury and Kimbolton division as primarily it was felt that this is a very large division and surprised how this will achieve a more 'engaged' parish as a result. The proposal of decreasing 69 Councillors to 61 in the future was a key concern for HWPC. It is understood by HWPC why it has been kept within 'rural' areas as opposed to moving it towards St Neots/L Paxton which was agreed not a better proposal than the one presented. HWPC still disappointed with decrease of representation and size of proposed division.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Angela Young
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Histon & Impington Parish Council

Comment text:

Histon & Impington Parish Council support the basic concept of a single member Histon & Impington division and request a "tidy up" of the small Milton area currently in Histon & Impington ward, and also hope this will be durable and survive any changes that the South Cambridgeshire District Council review brings forward

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am replying to the consultation on behalf of Little Abington Parish Council (LAPC).

LAPC supports the proposed boundary change moving it from the Duxford Division to Linton. There are many issues about safety and traffic volumes on the A1307 particularly as plans to develop Haverhill are agreed.

This change would group communities lying on the route together. The Parish Council felt it was important to have a County Councillor who understood the issues and concerns of the communities s/he serves and who may have an interest in taking initiatives forward on their behalf. This does not apply in the current geography.

Genevieve Dalton
Clerk
Little Abington Parish Council

Please note I do not access the Parish Council’s e-mail during office hours. If you need to contact me urgently please leave a voicemail or a text message on my mobile number.
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Jacqueline Wardle
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Little Downham Parish Council

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:

Comment text:
- The new 'Super Division' is considered too large;
- It is considered that each member would have difficulty providing a service to support and represent the different issues across the division;
- Parish Councils and their communities within the 'Super Division' would lose the relationship they have with the County Council because each member would be 'stretched' to be in contact with the 14 Parishes on a monthly basis;
- The rural villages have different issues than the urban residential areas in Elly and Littleport;
- It is recommended that the 'Super Division' be divided in two with one member in each division.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
26 June 2015

Alex Hinds
Review Officer

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Mr Hinds

Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire: Draft Recommendations

Members were somewhat at a loss to see how splitting Littleport into two wards with one aligned to Haddenham/Sutton and the other to Soham would give them a voice at County. Littleport is a deprived area and should be grouped accordingly.

Conservative policy at the District Council is to reduce the number of Councillors across the District and this review should go hand in glove with the County's proposals. Littleport is likely to be de-warded and see a reduction in District Council representation.

Members are not happy and believe this review and the review of District Council wards be considered as one item and not split Littleport as Soham is not a good match for Littleport. The whole of Littleport should be grouped with Pymore, Coveney, Wardy Hill and Witcham.

Members will be discussing the District Council review at their July meeting.

Yours sincerely

Lynda Clarke-Jones

Cc Mark Lloyd CCC
**Cambridgeshire County**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** John Houlton  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:** Lolworth Parish Meeting  

**Comment text:**

Lolworth Parish Meeting strongly feels it should remain in the Bar Hill Division rather than be moved to the Cambourne division. The number of electors is very small so each councillor will still represent roughly the same number of voters as elected members elsewhere in the authority if the status quo is maintained. The major reason for resisting the change is that the current ward pattern reflects the community interests far more appropriately than moving to Cambourne. Bar Hill is the nearest settlement to Lolworth and for non motorised users is readily accessed by the millennium footpath. Access to public transport and to shops and other amenities is therefore possible. Access to Cambourne is totally impractical - indeed it is on the other side of the A428! Further, we have no community links with Cambourne, in contrast to Bar Hill. The identity and boundary of the Bar Hill division with Lolworth included will be readily identifiable given their immediate proximity.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
6th July 2015

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

Dear Sir/Madam

Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire County Council: Draft Recommendations

Further to the Council meeting held on 8th June 2015, Longstanton Parish Council have asked me to contact you with their comments following the publication of the Draft Recommendations.

The recommendation from you has been to create a division ‘Northstowe and Over’ comprising of Longstanton, Oakington & Westwick, and Over.

Residents of Longstanton are already feeling that their village identity is already being lost with the new development of Northstowe which will continue over the next 30 years. In addition, Longstanton is closely tied with Oakington and Westwick, especially with the construction of Northstowe but there are no common ties with Over. It is not felt that the current suggestion reflects the identity of the community.

In order for Longstanton and Oakington to retain their community identities, it is suggested that the name for this division be ‘Longstanton, Northstowe & Oakington’.

Yours faithfully

Libby White
Parish Clerk/Proper Officer
MADINGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs Leigh Baffa (Parish Clerk)

Telephone:

Email:

6 July 2015 ref DX43mpc.bound
By post and E mail

Alex Hinds – Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1 4QP

Dear Mr Hinds

Boundary for Madingley Parish Council, Cambridgeshire

My apologies that we have not written before but there was some confusion about who was answering your letter of 12 May 2015.

The question I believe the Commission proposed is what are the views of Madingley Parish moving from Hardwick ward to the Bar Hill ward. This question was discussed and debated at a Parish Council meeting on Tuesday the 9th of June 2015.

As the matter is important to the whole village / parish, after discussing the issues the Council closed the Parish Council meeting and allowed members of the public to speak. There were upwards of 50 people in the village hall that night and some very strong views were expressed.

There have been very close links with villagers and at Parish Council level with Coton, Barton, and Grantchester over many years, and while we have friends in Dry Drayton and Bar Hill, and Girton, the same special relations do not exist with these three last parishes.

So the matter was put to a vote and there was an unanimous vote to remain in the Hardwick ward please. After this the Parish Council re opened their meeting and again unanimously passed a resolution which I pass onto the Boundary Commission that Madingley would like to remain in the Hardwick Ward of Cambridgeshire.

We believe as a small parish with circa 168 electors staying with Hardwick should not unbalance your figures.

I hope you can now rest assured not to change please.
Yours sincerely

Edward Byam-Cook – Chairman of Madingley Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs L Baffa
Chair: Mr E Byam-Cook
Vice-Chair: Mrs J Hinde
3rd July 2015  
ref: 5.4.1

Boundary Commission  
CCC  
Shire Hall  
Castle Hill  
Cambridge  
CB3 0AP

Dear Sirs

**Re: Proposed changes to the Boundary Divisions**

Meldreth Parish Council is against the changes to the current Melbourn Division in Cambridgeshire. The current Melbourn Division is a largely arranged around the catchment area for Melbourn Village College, set up as a community school. It also includes both Meldreth and Shepreth - two villages that have close historical and current links, both being linear villages on the C road that links the two villages. On this road both villages have houses that abut the boundary between the two villages.

The proposal is to move Shepreth to the new Duxford Division to be linked to villages that are on the other side of the A10 road rather than to the villages in the Melbourn and Bassingbourn Division that are on the same side of the A10 as Shepreth.

The proposed change will mean that while Meldreth and Shepreth will be represented at South Cambridgeshire District Council by the same District Councillor, at County level they will be represented by different County Councillors. We will lose the advantage of having councillors who can liaise on the many issues that affect both communities at district and county levels. This does not seem to be an improvement at a time when Cambridgeshire is facing major changes and growth.

It is also noted that Melbourn and Bassingbourn Division will have two Village Colleges while Duxford will have none.

Yours faithfully

Judy Damant
From: Mike Oakley
Sent: 03 July 2015 16:59
To: reviews
Subject: Cambridgeshire County Council Ward Review

I am writing to express the views of the Oakington and Westwick Parish Council on the proposed ward changes for Cambridgeshire County Council.

We note that the review suggests this Parish should be in a division called Northstowe and Over Division. We are very uncomfortable with this for the following reasons:

a) This would be a very long thin division, with the villages of Oakington and Westwick right at one end, and with no direct road transport links to the remainder of the division. We feel this will lead to the isolation of the village from the remainder of the division, and to the Division Councillor or Councillors for that division having very little interest in our area.

b) The Oakington and Westwick Parish is unusual in that the entire population lives at the bottom (southern) end of the area, the northern end comprises part of the old Oakington Airbase and is entirely unpopulated and that land will mostly in time be integrated with Northstowe. When Northstowe reaches a certain size in terms of buildings and residents we expect that it will be given its own Town Council, and at that point we anticipate that the Oakington and Westwick Parish boundary will be changed so that the currently unoccupied part passes to Northstowe Town Council (or whatever that body may then be named). We do not feel that the needs of the actual residents of this parish should be overridden by the possible future needs of the unpopulated area.

c) It seems to be the case in general that the residents of Oakington and Westwick are keen to preserve a separate identity for the village and not to become de facto incorporated with Northstowe. It is felt this aim is more likely to be achievable if we are not considered part of the Northstowe division.

d) All the actual road, bus and cycle links that are used by the populace of the parish, and the interests of those residents, tend to be towards Cambridge and the villages that like Oakington are on the Cambridge fringe, such as Girton, and Bar Hill. While we recognise this may change over time to include activities that involve Northstowe, it is unlikely to include other parts of a Northstowe and Over division.

e) We are in an area much effected by surface water and main river flows, and we feel we will be much better served if we are placed in the same division as other communities in the same catchment area with the same drainage issues and water courses.

f) We are not a large area in terms of electorate, and taking us away from the rest of this putative division is unlikely to make a major influence on the elector numbers in either that division or one we might become part of instead.

g) With a wholesale reorganisation of division boundaries and councillor numbers we do not anticipate such a change would have any significant impact on the councillor electoral cycle.

Taking all of this into account, we feel that the needs of our residents would be much better satisfied if the villages of Oakington and Westwick were included in the Bar Hill division instead, along with Girton, and we request that this change be made to the plans.

Yours sincerely,
Mike Oakley
Response from Over PC to LGBCE’s proposals

Over Parish Council wishes to express its serious concerns about the way in which you have conducted this Boundary Review in Cambridgeshire, and also to protest at the incongruous arrangement you have proposed for this Parish.

1 The unsound reliance on the Cambridge Labour Party’s submission

1.1 You state in your Report that you received 63 submissions. (There were actually 64 submissions, but you overlooked Swavesey PC’s submission – see below.) One of these documents, submitted by the Cambridge Labour Party, covered the whole county, and you have chosen to use that as the basis for your own proposals, referring to it as “city-wide submission”, “district-wide submission” and “county-wide submission” at frequent intervals in your report. However, you do not show at any stage that you have conducted any critical assessment of this document’s provenance, nor of the anonymous author’s qualifications, nor of his detailed knowledge of all the areas he considers, nor indeed of any political bias that this document might contain. Indeed its proposals for Cambridge City were rejected in their entirety by the Cambridge City Liberal Democrat Group because they believed them to be seriously flawed.

1.2 The document is highly unusual in that it is written in the first person by someone who has chosen to conceal his identity and his qualifications, and who has made no claim to know anything about the areas for which he is making proposals. It is also highly unusual for a Political Group to endorse such a personalised document without any explanation of how they came to commission the work or to adopt this person’s views as their own.

1.3 County Councils are inevitably politicised bodies, and it seems remarkable that you should adopt a submission from one political group as the basis for your own proposals. We understand that the adoption of the Labour Group document has saved you a lot of work in creating your own proposals from scratch, but we believe that you have thereby failed to carry out your task with due diligence.

2 Swavesey PC’s ‘lost’ submission

2.1 Over PC worked closely with Swavesey PC in preparing parallel submissions, since there are close community ties between the villages, as we each set out in our documents. You have told Swavesey PC that you did receive their submission and had indeed taken it into account while making ‘your’ proposals, merely omitting it when uploading them onto the website - but that is patently untrue. On Page 27 of your report, in the Papworth & Swavesey section, you state “We received two submissions from parishes in this area” and then explain what Caxton PC and Fen Drayton PC were requesting. There is no mention of any submission from Swavesey PC, which would have been a third submission, so it is quite clear that you did not take their views into account.

2.2 Since Over PC and Swavesey PC were both asking to be placed the same Division, you have clearly overlooked half of Over PC’s proposal and have therefore given it less weight than it deserved, as well as overlooking Swavesey PC’s views entirely.

3 The proposal for a new "Northstowe & Over" division

3.1 You state (on P27, for the umpteenth time) that “this division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire”, yet that county-wide document makes many unsupported and inaccurate comments about the three parishes that it proposes to bundle together with Northstowe to create the new division.
3.2 The Labour Group submission claims that “A key shared interest for all three parishes would be the new settlement at Northstowe which will impact significantly on the local area”. That is certainly true of Longstanton and of Oakington & Westwick, which will inevitably become suburbs of Northstowe in due course, but it is most definitely not true of Over. Willingham is far closer to Northstowe and will send its children to the new Northstowe Secondary school when it opens, whereas Over’s children will continue to travel to Swavesey Village College. It is hard to detect any interest in Over about the Northstowe development, which is generally regarded as an unwelcome imposition on the locality.

3.3 The “county-wide submission” continues: “All three villages have shared transport interests due to their proximity to the A14 and the Guided Busway”. To reach the A14 from Over we have to travel either down the B1050 past Longstanton or through Swavesey, while Willingham, Swavesey, Fen Drayton and many other villages – and even Northstowe itself – are closer to the A14. As for the Guided Busway, there are bus stops in Swavesey, Longstanton and Oakington to serve their inhabitants, while the busway just passes through the southern extremity of our parish, well away from the village itself. Over’s residents have to travel to the bus stops at either Swavesey or Longstanton to access the buses on the Busway.

3.4 It should be quite clear by now that the anonymous author of the Cambridge Labour Party submission has little personal knowledge or ‘feel’ for this area – and that his proposals make little sense as far as our community links, interests and boundaries are concerned. Over PC’s submission pointed out that Over had very little in common with Longstanton, and that it shared issues of flooding, transport links, etc. with Swavesey, Willingham and Fen Drayton. Somehow you have managed to give a far greater weight to the ill-founded suggestions of an anonymous Labour Party author than to Over PC’s – and Swavesey PC’s – proposals.

4 Short-sighted proposals that will leave Over ‘stateless’

4.1 We realise that you are only required to consider expected growth up to 2020, but the rapid development of Northstowe will render your proposed division useless after that. You accept the Labour Group’s suggestion that Northstowe needs Over to make up the numbers in what would otherwise be a tiny division at present, and that the numbers will then reach par by 2020 – and you seem to find that satisfactory. However, we don’t. Over is being pushed into an unwelcome grouping with Northstowe and its satellite parishes as a make-weight until 2020, after which time Northstowe’s continuing growth will inevitably lead to us being pushed out into yet another division to act as a make-weight there. We deserve better treatment than that.

4.2 Over PC put forward carefully reasoned proposals in conjunction with Swavesey PC but, through incompetence (overlooking Swavesey’s submission) and through taking the easy route of adopting untested proposals of dubious provenance, you have treated us most unfairly. More importantly you have failed in one of your three stated aims – that of “reflecting the identity and interests of local communities”.

5 Conclusion

5.1 We urge you to reconsider your ill-founded, short-sighted and muddled proposal to group Over with Northstowe, Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick, and ask that you consider the Over PC and the Swavesey PC proposals together (which you have not done so far) and give them the serious consideration that they deserve.
Dear Review Officer,

Please accept these comments on the Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire from Pampisford Parish Council in South Cambridge:

In the new arrangements Pampisford will be grouped with Sawston in a division and not with its surrounding villages. Pampisford PC have strong objections to being joined with Sawston and being represented by only one councillor. Sawston is an expanding small town and a much bigger community than Pampisford. The PC feel that the representation for the population would be disproportionate and it would not be conducive to us having equal representation with the Sawston population. The PC feel strongly that they would prefer to stay with the surrounding villages (Hinxton, Whittlesford, Duxford etc). The make-up of our communities is similar and they face issues that are comparable to us in direct contrast to the issues facing Sawston. We also have other affiliations with local villages such as ecclesiastical ties.

Please could you take this into consideration.

With kind regards

Anna Lovewell
Clerk to Pampisford Parish Council
Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter dated 12 May regarding the electoral review of Cambridgeshire.

Parson Drove Parish Council wish to make the following comments on your draft recommendations:

The Fenland District Council Wards should not be split for the County Council Wards.

The proposal to combine Walden with March North, number 19 on the map, with 2 County Councillors would result in the area being too big therefore March North should be a smaller ward with one County Councillor.

The District Council Ward of Parson Drove and Wisbech St Mary should be combined with the Roman Bank District Ward with one County Councillor as the Parish Councils in these areas work closely together and there are historical connections with Leverington.

The geographical boundaries should be taken into account with regards to the A47 and the river Nene.

Yours faithfully,
Mrs Yvonne Reader
Clerk to Parson Drove Parish Council

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com
East Cambridgeshire District

Personal Details:

Name: susan bailey
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Reach Parish Council

Comment text:

Reach Parish Council, within The Swaffhams area, would like to make the following comment on the consultation proposal. The area is too large. The main issue and worry is that we will not have a single representative as a contact. This will cause confusion and there will be no continuity.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Mr Hinds,

Mr Kydd who wrote to you on Jan 13th is no longer our Parish Clerk and I have been asked to write to you regarding the proposed Shelford Division.

The Parish Council considered the proposed divisions at a recent council meeting and wish to re-iterate their view that Gt Shelford and Stapleford have many community links - in fact for the purpose of planning they are considered a combined unit and recently we have agreed to discuss the possibility of combining in the production of a Neighbourhood Plan which would deal with issues such as traffic, the responsibility of the County Council - and therefore we are unhappy that we would no longer be represented by the same councillor. We have so much more in common with Stapleford and are disappointed that our view to remain in the same division was not mentioned in your summary.

It seems that if the numbers add up an arbitrary division of what are two very closely linked settlements can be justified.

Kind regards

Bridget Hodge
Vice-chair Great Shelford Parish Council
Dear Sir

I am writing to inform you that Stetchworth Parish Council has no objections to the draft recommendations for the Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire District Council.

Yours faithfully

Yvonne Rix
Clerk to Stetchworth Parish Council
Consideration was given to the draft recommendations at the Council meeting on 10 June 2015.

The Council would comment as follows:

The Council would object to the introduction of a fourth ward in St Ives on the grounds that it does not affect the democratic representation of the town in a positive manner but will increase election costs

The Council would support the reduction in County Councillors as this will improve democratic representation within the town.

Kind regards
Sue Rawlinson
Committee Clerk / Information Officer
St Ives Town Council

www.stivestowncouncil.gov.uk
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

7th July 2015

Review of Parish Ward boundaries St Neots Town Council, Cambridgeshire.

Dear Sirs,

We write in response to the draft recommendations for revision of St Neots Town Council parish ward boundaries as contained in section 35 of the Commission Report for Cambridgeshire County Council.

Section 35 reads as follows:

“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”.

Draft recommendation

St Neots Town Council should return 20 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Church (returning one member), Eatons North (returning three members), Eatons South (returning three members), Eynesbury (returning five members), Loves Farm (returning four members), Priory Park East (returning three members) and Priory Park West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

We have used the following current and projected registered elector data in our deliberations as contained in the Commission Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polling district</th>
<th>Description of area</th>
<th>Current Parish ward</th>
<th>Electorate 2014</th>
<th>Electorate 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>ST NEOTS LOVES FARM</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EAST</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>5,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>ST NEOTS PRIORY PARK West</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON FORD</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON FORD</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON FORD</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>3,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON FORD</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON FORD</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EYNESBURY</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON SOCON</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON SOCON</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON SOCON</td>
<td>ST NEOTS EATON SOCON</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>ST NEOTS PRIORY PARK East</td>
<td>ST NEOTS PRIORY PARK</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |                              |                          |                 |                 |
|                      |                              |                          | 24,209          | 28,100          |
New Parish Ward boundaries proposed by the LGBC:

Our comments on the Commission proposed St Neots Town Council Parish Wards are:

1) We do not support the creation of the new single member Ward identified as “AI” on the map. We feel strongly that the current St Neots Priory Park parish ward boundary should be retained..

   a) The streets in this area have been moved between the parish wards of Eynesbury and Priory Park in previous reviews. Current Councillors who served at that time have reported that these changes caused residents to feel a “loss of identity” with either ward and discouraged election participation.

   b) It is our view that Residents in the “AI” area share a common identity with residents of the “AN” area (St Neots Priory Park (east) ward).

   c) The town centre location of the “AI” area has been historically subject to considerable residential infill development. It is unlikely, in our view that significant further additions to the electorate will arise. Neither, the emerging Huntingdonshire Local Plan or St Neots Neighbourhood Plan, support further significant residential development in the “AI” area. Consequently, the proposed creation of a new ward would lead to disproportionate representation of the projected 251 residents in that ward.
2) **We would like to retain the current situation of 21 parish councillors.**

   a) The Commission Report incorrectly states the current number of parish councillors as 20 (see section 35 reproduced above). It is believed that the single member ward of St Neots East (referred to in the report as Loves Farm) may have been omitted.

   b) It is our opinion that the proposed new Eatons North Ward “AJ” should be increased from 3 to 4 members. The “AJ” electorate is projected to be 5,440 by 2020. The Commission proposal of 3 members gives a notional ratio of 1,813 electors per member. By increasing the number of members to 4, the notional ratio of electors to members is reduced to 1,360 which is more closely in line with other Wards.

   c) We feel 4 members in the Eatons North Ward better maintains a proportionate representation of the electorate on the Town Council.

   d) For same reasons as above “AL” Eynesbury should be increased from 5 to 6 members.

3) **We feel the names of the proposed new wards could better reflect local area identities and suggest the following:**

   a) “AO” Priory Park West. This area is recognised locally as part of Eaton Ford. However, historically the area formed around the hamlet of Crosshall prior to absorption into the larger village of Eaton Ford (and then St Neots Parish). The area contains both Crosshall Road and Crosshall Manor & we feel that “Crosshall Ward” would be preferred to “Priory Park West” as the Priory Park is itself is located to the east of St Neots.

   Since this was discussed by Councillors it has come to light that Crosshall School does not appear to be within the “AO” area and this has not yet been considered by Councillors.

   Other local features are Regatta Meadow or that the majority of streets in the “AO” are uniquely names after poets.

   b) “AJ” Eatons North has a strong local identity as Eaton Ford and we request the village name be retained for this ward. “Eaton Ford Ward”.

   c) “AK” Eatons South has a strong local identity as Eaton Socon and we request the village name be retained for this ward. “Eaton Socon Ward”.

   d) “AN” Priory Park East. We feel this should remain as “St Neots Priory Park Ward”. Appropriate naming of the “AO” Ward renders the West/East designation unnecessary.

   e) As stated in 1) above we support retention of the existing Priory Park Ward boundary and do not support creation of the new parish ward “AI” Notwithstanding, in the event this proposal goes ahead we suggest it is named “Church Ward”.

   f) “AL” Eynesbury. We support the retention of “Eynesbury Ward”.
g) “AM” Loves Farm. Although the first phase of development to the east of St Neots is known as Loves Farm, the majority of future development will be on the Wintringham Park site which is south of Cambridge Road. Loves Farm is the name of a two stage development to the north of Cambridge Road. Loves Farm is currently within a town parish ward named “St Neots East”. We suggest the “St Neots East Ward” name is retained as this encompasses the imminent development of the Wintringham Park site.

Equality of Electoral Representation.

The Table below illustrates average electors per member (LGBC draft proposal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>LGBC Ward Name</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Electorate 2020</th>
<th>Proposed Members</th>
<th>Ave Voters per Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Priory Park west</td>
<td>Crosshall (Regatta,Poets)</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Eatons North</td>
<td>Eaton Ford</td>
<td>5440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Eatons South</td>
<td>Eaton Socon</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Priory Park East</td>
<td>St Neots Priory Park</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Eynesbury</td>
<td>Eynesbury</td>
<td>7860</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Loves Farm</td>
<td>St Neots East</td>
<td>5940</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total projected electors</td>
<td></td>
<td>28100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table below illustrates average electors per member (St Neots proposal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>LGBC Ward Name</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Electorate 2020</th>
<th>Proposed Members</th>
<th>Ave Voters per Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Priory Park west</td>
<td>Crosshall (Regatta,Poets)</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Eatons North</td>
<td>Eaton Ford</td>
<td>5440</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Eatons South</td>
<td>Eaton Socon</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Priory Park East</td>
<td>St Neots Priory Park</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Eynesbury</td>
<td>Eynesbury</td>
<td>7860</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Loves Farm</td>
<td>St Neots East</td>
<td>5940</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total projected electors</td>
<td></td>
<td>28100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Carole Pollock
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: The Stukeleys Parish Council

Comment text:

The Stukeleys Parish Council strongly object to the proposed Huntingdonshire Division no 41 – Warboys and the Stukeleys. The Stukeleys natural affinity lies with the Alconburys and Brampton who are the Parish’s nearest neighbours and with whom the Parish shares many common interests. Whereas, the Stukeleys have little in common with Warboys. As it is proposed that there will only be one County Councillor for this division, The Stukeleys feel that with the size of the population in Warboys compared to the size of the population in The Stukeleys, our Parish’s interests may not always be fully considered and The Stukeleys will be seen as an outlining village. We therefore request that the Boundary Commission reconsider and take account of community interest and feelings.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Good afternoon,

Please find comments that have been resolved unanimously by Sutton Parish Council at their Full council meeting on the 23rd June 2015 regarding the Electoral Review

The council would prefer a single member division with fewer parish councils and a smaller geographical area. Sutton identifies with its neighbouring rural villages, rather than with Littleport and Ely. Any new division should be manageable and linked with similar villages.

If you need anything further from us, please let me know.

Thanks,

Melissa Wolland
Assistant Clerk to Sutton Parish Council

Office Hours Monday – Thursday
10am -12 noon for Reception and information centre
Dear Ms Wolland,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS


View the draft recommendations

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

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

Have your say

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

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

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

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

Get in touch

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 06 July 2015. Representations should be made:
• Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the
recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at:
www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.

• By email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk.

• Or in writing to:
  Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
  Local Government Boundary Commission for England
  14th Floor
  Millbank Tower
  Millbank
  London
  SW1P 4QP

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

Alex Hinds
Review Officer
Reviews@lgbce.org.uk
0330 500 1274

Please note as of 27 April we have new contact details. Our new address is LGBCE, 14th Floor,
Millbank Tower, Millbank, London, SW1P 4QP. Our new telephone number is 0330 500 1525.
Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire:
Draft Recommendations
Response from Swavesey Parish Council

Swavesey Parish Council wishes to submit its serious concerns and strong objections to the draft recommendations for the review of the County Council division relating to Swavesey Parish. The Council also wishes to support the objections and concerns raised by Over Parish Council to the way in which the Boundary Review appears to have been conducted and the proposal for a new division incorporating Over.

I attach a copy of the second response from Over Parish Council, which Swavesey Parish Council completely supports. I also detail below our objections to the draft recommendations for the Swavesey division.

1 Proposal to amend the Papworth & Swavesey Division
On page 27 of your Report, you state for the Papworth and Swavesey Division that “We have substantially modified the county-wide proposals for this division to provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations are to propose a division comprising 11 parishes which share good road connections over the A14 and A428. We consider that the division reflects community identity and is also projected to have good electoral equality.”

Swavesey Parish Council would comment that good road connections are about all we have in connection with the parishes the other side of the A14 to us. As stated in our first submission “The A14 is our parish boundary and provides a natural and obvious division boundary. Very shortly the A14 is to be improved and will become an 8-10 lane highway barrier between Swavesey and parishes to the south of it.

In our daily working lives, Swavesey parish has far more in common and in contact with the neighbouring parishes of Fen Drayton, Over and Willingham. Certainly more than with Boxworth, Elsworth, Papworth and the other smaller parishes with which we are currently and proposed to be grouped.”

This grouping does not ‘reflect community identity’, we have more ‘community identity’ geographically and in other ways with Fen Drayton, Over and Willingham.

2 ‘Lost’ first submission from Swavesey Parish Council
Swavesey PC worked closely with Over PC in preparing parallel submissions to the first consultation, since there are close community ties between the villages, as we each set out in our documents. Having noticed that our first submission was not included on the consultation website, you then confirmed to us that you did receive our submission and had indeed taken it into account while making ‘your’ proposals, merely omitting it when uploading them onto the website. However on Page 27 of your report (which I downloaded today 29th June 2015), it still states in the Papworth & Swavesey section, “We received two submissions from parishes in this area” and then explains what Caxton PC and Fen Drayton PC were requesting. There is no mention of any submission from Swavesey PC, which would have been a third submission, so it seems quite clear to us that you did not take our views into account when reviewing the Papworth and Swavesey division. Our views were very clear and substantial with regard to why we consider we would be better served by being in a division with closer ties to neighbouring parishes to the north of the A14.
Since Over PC and Swavesey PC were both asking to be placed in the same Division, you have clearly overlooked half of Over PC’s proposal and have therefore given it less weight than it deserved, as well as overlooking Swavesey PC’s views entirely.

3 Conclusion
Swavesey Parish Council urges you to reconsider the draft proposals for both Swavesey and Over parish councils and review the submissions submitted by both PCs.

On behalf of Swavesey Parish Council
Linda Miller, Clerk to Swavesey Parish Council
29th June 2015
Response from Over PC to LGBCE’s proposals

Over Parish Council wishes to express its serious concerns about the way in which you have conducted this Boundary Review in Cambridgeshire, and also to protest at the incongruous arrangement you have proposed for this Parish.

1 The unsound reliance on the Cambridge Labour Party’s submission
1.1 You state in your Report that you received 63 submissions. (There were actually 64 submissions, but you overlooked Swavesey PC’s submission – see below.) One of these documents, submitted by the Cambridge Labour Party, covered the whole county, and you have chosen to use that as the basis for your own proposals, referring to it as “city-wide submission”, “district-wide submission” and “county-wide submission” at frequent intervals in your report. However, you do not show at any stage that you have conducted any critical assessment of this document’s provenance, nor of the anonymous author’s qualifications, nor of his detailed knowledge of all the areas he considers, nor indeed of any political bias that this document might contain. Indeed its proposals for Cambridge City were rejected in their entirety by the Cambridge City Liberal Democrat Group because they believed them to be seriously flawed.

1.2 The document is highly unusual in that it is written in the first person by someone who has chosen to conceal his identity and his qualifications, and who has made no claim to know anything about the areas for which he is making proposals. It is also highly unusual for a Political Group to endorse such a personalised document without any explanation of how they came to commission the work or to adopt this person’s views as their own.

1.3 County Councils are inevitably politicised bodies, and it seems remarkable that you should adopt a submission from one political group as the basis for your own proposals. We understand that the adoption of the Labour Group document has saved you a lot of work in creating your own proposals from scratch, but we believe that you have thereby failed to carry out your task with due diligence.

2 Swavesey PC’s ‘lost’ submission
2.1 Over PC worked closely with Swavesey PC in preparing parallel submissions, since there are close community ties between the villages, as we each set out in our documents. You have told Swavesey PC that you did receive their submission and had indeed taken it into account while making ‘your’ proposals, merely omitting it when uploading them onto the website - but that is patently untrue. On Page 27 of your report, in the Papworth & Swavesey section, you state “We received two submissions from parishes in this area” and then explain what Caxton PC and Fen Drayton PC were requesting. There is no mention of any submission from Swavesey PC, which would have been a third submission, so it is quite clear that you did not take their views into account.

2.2 Since Over PC and Swavesey PC were both asking to be placed the same Division, you have clearly overlooked half of Over PC’s proposal and have therefore given it less weight than it deserved, as well as overlooking Swavesey PC’s views entirely.

3 The proposal for a new “Northstowe & Over” division
3.1 You state (on P27, for the umpteenth time) that “this division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire”, yet that county-wide document makes many unsupported and inaccurate comments about the three parishes that it proposes to bundle together with Northstowe to create the new division.
3.2 The Labour Group submission claims that “A key shared interest for all three parishes would be the new settlement at Northstowe which will impact significantly on the local area”. That is certainly true of Longstanton and of Oakington & Westwick, which will inevitably become suburbs of Northstowe in due course, but it is most definitely not true of Over. Willingham is far closer to Northstowe and will send its children to the new Northstowe Secondary school when it opens, whereas Over’s children will continue to travel to Swavesey Village College. It is hard to detect any interest in Over about the Northstowe development, which is generally regarded as an unwelcome imposition on the locality.

3.3 The "county-wide submission" continues: “All three villages have shared transport interests due to their proximity to the A14 and the Guided Busway”. To reach the A14 from Over we have to travel either down the B1050 past Longstanton or through Swavesey, while Willingham, Swavesey, Fen Drayton and many other villages – and even Northstowe itself – are closer to the A14. As for the Guided Busway, there are bus stops in Swavesey, Longstanton and Oakington to serve their inhabitants, while the busway just passes through the southern extremity of our parish, well away from the village itself. Over’s residents have to travel to the bus stops at either Swavesey or Longstanton to access the buses on the Busway.

3.4 It should be quite clear by now that the anonymous author of the Cambridge Labour Party submission has little personal knowledge or ‘feel’ for this area – and that his proposals make little sense as far as our community links, interests and boundaries are concerned. Over PC’s submission pointed out that Over had very little in common with Longstanton, and that it shared issues of flooding, transport links, etc. with Swavesey, Willingham and Fen Drayton. Somehow you have managed to give a far greater weight to the ill-founded suggestions of an anonymous Labour Party author than to Over PC’s – and Swavesey PC’s – proposals.

4 Short-sighted proposals that will leave Over ‘stateless’

4.1 We realise that you are only required to consider expected growth up to 2020, but the rapid development of Northstowe will render your proposed division useless after that. You accept the Labour Group’s suggestion that Northstowe needs Over to make up the numbers in what would otherwise be a tiny division at present, and that the numbers will then reach par by 2020 – and you seem to find that satisfactory. However, we don’t. Over is being pushed into an unwelcome grouping with Northstowe and its satellite parishes as a make-weight until 2020, after which time Northstowe’s continuing growth will inevitably lead to us being pushed out into yet another division to act as a make-weight there. We deserve better treatment than that.

4.2 Over PC put forward carefully reasoned proposals in conjunction with Swavesey PC but, through incompetence (overlooking Swavesey’s submission) and through taking the easy route of adopting untested proposals of dubious provenance, you have treated us most unfairly. More importantly you have failed in one of your three stated aims – that of “reflecting the identity and interests of local communities”.

5 Conclusion

5.1 We urge you to reconsider your ill-founded, short-sighted and muddled proposal to group Over with Northstowe, Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick, and ask that you consider the Over PC and the Swavesey PC proposals together (which you have not done so far) and give them the serious consideration that they deserve.
Dear Mr Hinds,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE: DRAFT RECOMMENDATION

I refer to your letter dated 12th May 2015 drawing attention to the Commission’s draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire.

The Parish Council now has had an opportunity to consider the recommendations. The Council noted that The Stukeleys Parish Council also objected to the composition of the proposed Warboys and The Stukeleys electoral division. The proposal may provide the best balance of the statutory criteria in the Commission’s opinion but from a local perspective, these are purely artificial boundaries that have no regard for affinities of interest.

The Parish Council therefore maintains its objection to the inclusion of The Stukeleys Parish in the proposed Warboys and The Stukeleys electoral division for the reasons outlined in my letter dated 27th November 2014.

Yours sincerely,

K. Reeves,
Clerk
01 July 2015

Dear Sirs

**ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE – WATERBEACH**

At a Parish Council meeting on 23 June this year, Waterbeach Parish Council reviewed the proposed boundary changes which will result in the increase in size of the Waterbeach ward.

Councillors have asked me to raise the question of the accuracy of the population figures used as the Commission would appear not to have taken into account new developments with full or outline planning consent or the potential for the even larger development of the old barracks site.

With best wishes
Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Jones
Clerk to Waterbeach Parish Council
I am writing on behalf of Whaddon Parish Council, Cambridgeshire to say that we are happy with the current proposals and the electoral district which Whaddon will be in. We have no further comments.

Best wishes

Gabrielle van Poortvliet
Clerk - Whaddon Parish Council
3rd July 2015

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

Dear Sirs,

Re: Cambridgeshire Review.

Please find attached the response from Whittlesey Town Council to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s Draft Recommendations for New Electoral Arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council:

1. Whittlesey Town Council does not believe that the LGBCE’s proposed new electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council satisfactorily meet the statutory criteria for reviews of such arrangements.

2. The LGBCE’s draft recommendations include a proposal to split the St Marys Town Ward of Whittlesey Town Council between two different electoral divisions. Community Identity is not reflected, and effective and convenient Local Government is not provided for, by splitting the St Marys Town Ward of Whittlesey Town Council between two electoral divisions.

3. The LGBCE’s draft recommendations include a proposal to include almost half of the land area of March Town Council within their proposed re-drawn Whittlesey South division. March Town and Whittlesey Town have very distinct identities, and it will be almost impossible for a single county councillor to represent the very different interests of these two communities. Whittlesey Town Council strongly opposes any proposal to include part of the Town of March within the Whittlesey South division.

4. The boundary within St Marys Town Ward between the LGBCE’s proposed Whittlesey North and Whittlesey South Divisions appears quite arbitrary and will not provide a clearly identifiable boundary between these two divisions.

5. Splitting St Marys Town Ward between two divisions also splits St Andrews District Council ward between two divisions. Wherever possible, co-terminosity between District wards and County divisions is usually encouraged by the LGBCE. Co-terminosity promotes effective and convenient local government, since it is far clearer who represents which areas at Shire Hall. In a Council of 61 members, the whole of St Andrews District Ward could be included within Whittlesey North division in an arrangement which would produce a smaller projected electoral disparity between divisions than is being proposed in the LGBCE’s draft recommendations. The improvement of electoral equality by reducing the disparity between the number of electors which different councillors represent is a statutory requirement which, in a 61 member Council, would be better achieved by including the whole of St Andrews District ward within a revised Whittlesey North division.

6. Whittlesey Town Council does not agree that 61 is an appropriate Council size for Cambridgeshire County Council. A large amount of detailed evidence was provided by Cambridgeshire County Council to support a proposed Council size of 63, and Whittlesey County Council therefore supports 63 as the most appropriate number of Councillors for the County Council.

[Map of Cambridgeshire]
7. The LGBCE, in paragraph 22 of the report accompanying its draft recommendations, argued for a Council size of 61 as opposed to 63 solely on the grounds that the statutory criteria could be better satisfied if the Council size were 61 rather than 63. The effect of this change to 61 instead of 63 would be to reduce the number of County Councillors by one in both East Cambridgeshire District Council's area and in Fenland District Council's area. Despite this justification, the statutory criteria have not been satisfactorily achieved in the LGBCE's proposed 61 member recommendation in a number of respects:
(a) splitting St Marys Town Ward (and St Andrews District Ward) between two divisions does not reflect community identity and does not promote convenient and effective local government.
(b) including part of the Town of March in the proposed new Whittlesey South division seeks to unite parts of two areas of two different Towns with very different community interests and identities, contrary to the statutory criteria.
(c) splitting the relatively small parish of Wisbech St Mary between two divisions does not reflect the identity of that parish, nor does it promote effective and convenient local government by unnecessarily splitting a small parish council area between two different divisions.
(d) splitting Littleport in two and putting one half in a division together with Haddenham (on the other side of Ely) whilst putting the other half with the northern part of Soham (which is itself split by the LGBCE's proposals) shows that a 61 member solution for Cambridgeshire fails to reflect community identity in East Cambridgeshire just as it fails to reflect community identity in Fenland.

8. Whittlesey Town Council is particularly opposed to the consequential amendment to Whittlesey Town ward boundaries proposed in paragraph 37 of the LGBCE's report. It is not conducive to effective and convenient local government to have Two town wards, each with a single member, with barely 400 electors each (St Marys North and St Marys South) whilst leaving another Town ward (Stonald) with one member to represent almost 2,000 electors. One of the two proposed Town wards in St Marys (St Marys South) is effectively split in two, with no effective connection between its two parts. This is contrary to the LGBCE's own recommended best practice and would significantly reduce the ability of local residents to identify with their local Town ward.

8. Whittlesey Town Council believes that the statutory criteria would best be achieved in a Council of 63 members, with Whittlesey North division comprising the District Council wards of Bassenhall and Stonald together with the Town Ward of St Andrews, and with Whittlesey South division comprising the Town Ward of St Marys, the District Council Wards of Luttersey, Benwick Coates & Eastrea together with the parish of Doddington. This better reflects community identity, is more conducive to effective and convenient local government and also achieves better electoral equality than the LGBCE's draft recommendation.

10. Whittlesey Council opposes a County Council of 61 members. However, if the LGBCE determines that it will confirm its recommendation of a Council size of 61, Whittlesey Town Council believes that all of the statutory criteria would be better satisfied in a 61 member Council by including the whole of the District Council wards of Bassenhall, Stonald and St Andrews in Whittlesey North division, and by including the whole of the District Council wards of Luttersey, Benwick, Coates & Eastrea and Doddington & Wimblington in Whittlesey South Division.

If you require any further information, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[Name]

Whittlesey Town Council

[Signature]

[Position]

Town Clerk & RFO
Dear Sirs

I am writing on behalf of Willingham Parish Council in response to your draft recommendations for the Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire.

Willingham Parish Council note that under the new plans Willingham would move away from its current ward with Over and instead join Cottenham and Rampton. Over would then be grouped with Northstowe. Whilst the Council does not have an issue being grouped with Cottenham and Rampton it does have some concerns regarding the possible implications of the change. The current boundary with Over is at the very edge of the village development with no green space between the boundary. The Council are concerned that this could mean future Northstowe developments infringing on Willingham. It is felt that the boundary to Over could be moved towards Over to allow green space between the boundaries and village development with minimum impact or significant change to parishioner numbers.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of these comments and any notify me of any action that may be taken as a result.

Kind regards

Mandy Powell
Parish Clerk
Willingham Parish Council
The draft recommendations in relation to the Electoral Review of Cambridgeshire were considered by Wisbech Town Council on 22 June 2015.

Although members of the council understand the rationale behind the recommendations, i.e. to achieve electoral equality within County Council electoral divisions, they are of the opinion that, because of the strong and established links between the wards which make up the current electoral divisions for Wisbech, the status quo should be allowed to remain.

Terry Jordan
Clerk to the Council

Wisbech Town Council
Website: www.wisbechtowncouncil.org.uk

Follow us on Twitter

Office hours 9.00 – 3.00pm Monday to Friday inclusive
Dear Sirs

Proposed Littleport West – County Councillor District

Witcham Parish Council objects to the proposal to enlarge and combine Sutton and Haddenham Districts with parts of Littleport and Ely.

The Council is concerned that the interests and identity of the existing villages in the Sutton Division will be lost in a group containing Littleport, a large developing village, and Ely, a fast growing City. Each has its own interests and demanding needs. We feel that the interests within the proposed new District will be diverse and the voice and concerns of the smaller rural villages in the area will be lost to the needs of the larger parishes and the city.

The prospect of 2 representatives covering the new District also raises concern. The two representatives will cover 19 parishes (or parts) and we cannot see how a Councillor can effectively know and understand the needs of such a large number of diverse areas. How could this be split to ensure each Councillor has regular and good contact with each parish/town/city council and its residents? We are concerned that the relationship between Councillor and the communities represented will become weaker and more distant, and lack uniformity.

The name of the Division, Littleport West, suggests this will be the key area of focus but it is only a part of Littleport that has been removed from the main Littleport area. We do not understand why Littleport should be divided up in this way. Similarly a small part of Ely has been removed from the main body of the population.

Witcham Parish Council has no objection to reducing the number of members of the County Council from 69 to 61 but further consideration is required as to how to achieve this, especially in the East Cambridgeshire area which is designated one of the fastest growing areas in the country. We believe the split and designation of two members for one ‘super’ area should be carefully reconsidered to ensure sustainability and fair representational support for our communities.

Yours faithfully

Susan J Bell
CLERK/RFO
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Alysoun Hodges
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: Witchford Parish Council

Comment text:

Witchford Parish Council does not agree with the proposal to merge the existing Haddenham and Littleport West divisions to create a single Littleport West division. The Parish Council considers that this is a meaningless geographical division, which will have no cohesion. The Parish Council considers that electoral divisions should be based on geographical areas that have meaning to the residents. Witchford Parish Council considers that the status quo should be retained with regard to these divisions.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Cambridgeshire County

Personal Details:

Name: John Peal
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: YELLING Parish Council

Comment text:

I disagree with the proposal to combine the existing rural parishes, of which Yelling is one, with Loves Farm and the Wintringham development. The more numerous residents in the edge of town developments will swamp the views of the residents in the rural communities. I am Chairman of Yelling Parish Council.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded