

## Local resident submissions to the Cambridgeshire County Council electoral review

This PDF document contains submissions from local residents.

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

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



BodenC-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-20



CowlingR-res-Cambridgeshire-2014-12-18



DayJ-res-Cambridgeshire-2014-10-30



HumanP-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-18



HumeR-res-Cambridgeshire-2014-11-16



KingJ-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-16



PowerA-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-30



RosenstielC-Cambridgeshire-2014-11-14



RossA-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-16



Tanfield-Jackson M-Cambridgeshire-2015-01-17



TaylorP-res-Cambridgeshire-2014-12-20

## Hinds, Alex

---

**From:** Egan, Helen  
**Sent:** 20 January 2015 15:30  
**To:** Hinds, Alex  
**Subject:** FW: Cambridgeshire Division Boundary Review.

Hi Alex,

Please see submission below for Cambridgeshire.

Helen

---

**From:** chris boden [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 23:00  
**To:** Reviews@  
**Subject:** Cambridgeshire Division Boundary Review.

Good Evening.

As a local elector ([REDACTED]) I would like to make the following personal submission to the LG BCE in respect of the current Cambridgeshire Review:

1. I support the reduction in the number of County Councillors from 69 to 63 - this provides some cost saving whilst still giving the County enough councillors to fulfil their function adequately, given the current governance structures. I believe that having an odd number of Councillors helps to avoid severe political uncertainty if and when there would otherwise be an equality of councillors representing different parties on the Council, in which case the Council ends up often making decisions on the Chairman's casting vote - having an odd number of Councillors helps to avoid that..
2. I support the proposals put forward by the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association in respect of the boundaries of the new ten Divisions in Fenland.
3. I believe strongly that efficient and effective local government will be promoted if the Commission uses the new District Council Ward boundaries, and the new polling district boundaries, as the building blocks for the new Divisions in Fenland. These new Wards and new polling districts come into effect in this May's elections. It will lead to two decades of confusion if the new County Division boundaries in Fenland are based on old district ward boundaries and old polling district boundaries which would have become redundant in May 2015, two years before the first County Elections on the new boundaries would be scheduled to be held (2017).
4. It would be farcical to include part of one of the Fenland Towns in a Division which includes part of another of Fenland's four Towns. Such a Division would have very poor public recognition and would be very difficult indeed for any Councillor to represent effectively, because of conflicting communities of interest in the different towns. It would be especially unwelcome to residents in both towns in part of the urban section of one town were included in the same Division as part of the urban section of another town. It would be like trying to join chalk and cheese together!
5. Even though the Division would be above average size, the opportunity exists to make the Town of Chatteris and the Chatteris County Division wholly co-terminous. This would create a very strong sense of identity for that Division, and would clearly reflect the local communities' interests.

6. Following the recent Community Governance Review, the exclusion of How Fen from Chatteris Town, and its inclusion in the Parish of Manea, must be recognised by the Commission in this review to avoid confusion.

7. Within Whittlesey, incorporating the whole of the new Bassenhally FDC Ward, the whole of the new Stonald FDC Ward and the St Andrews Town Ward part of the new St Andrews FDC Ward in a single Division will satisfy the electoral number requirements and will provide a clear boundary within the Town. In fact, this would differ from the existing Whittlesey North Division only because of the inclusion (from part of the old St Marys FDC Ward) of what is the new Delph Town Ward, which is part of the new Bassenhally Ward. This will make identification of the boundary between the two Whittlesey Divisions as simple as is possible, given the arithmetic constraints of trying to achieve electoral equality.

8. Areas of March Town west of the A141 by-pass, in Westry and in the Goosetree Estate are very rural and have much in common with Guyhirn and other parts of Elm Parish to the North, which are in the slightly undersized current Waldersey Division. Including these very rural areas of March Town within Waldersey Division therefore makes great sense, especially where properties (such as the Goosetree Estate) have better road links with Guyhirn than with the rest of March Town, and where the properties on Whittlesey Road, Middle Road and Whitemoor Road will be able to be joined together in a single Division, rather than (as at present) being split very artificially between two different Divisions.

Kind Regards,

Christopher Boden

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:** Richard Cowling

**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

I don't believe that a reduction from 69 to 60 is anything but "tinkering" and I would support a more radical approach, perhaps 48 or 50. Modern communication and cultural changes mean that councillors no longer deal with residents in person. If we are stuck with this very unambitious review, then my specific comment on boundaries is about Newton (CB22 7xx). It is a small village with c.140 residents and will have no material impact on constituency size. It has more in common with Harston, Hauxton and the Shelfords (the places where we shop, use the library and the primary school) than it does with Whittlesford, Thriplow and beyond. The catchment school for Newton is Harston, and that alone is sufficient to create a real community link. I understand that some organised religions serve Harston and Newton jointly. I consider that Newton has been misallocated and would prefer to see it in the same ward as Harston.

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:** Julian Day

**E-mail:**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

Currently, Shepreth is not recognised as part of the Cambridgeshire County, through postcodes. It seems as though the divide of the A10 has split the villages either side into Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire, I believe this to be incorrect.

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:** Peter Human

**E-mail:**

██████████

██████████

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

I agree to the siugestion that the Wisbech area should be split into 3 wards to give a better balance of people in those wards. Peter Human

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:** ROGER HUME

**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** none

### Comment text:

THE EMAIL ADDRESS YOU GIVE IS BEING REJECTED - hopeless I am pleased that representation is to be equaled to all divisions. At present our representation is historically shared with small villages and now being such a large community after 14 years development Cambourne should now have its own, this has resulted in poor unequal representation. But there is no indication that this will happen. The boundary has not changed. Bourn Ward Cambridgeshire Roger Hume [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:** Jeanne King

**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

My district ward is Peckover and having it as part of a Peckover and Roman Bank Division (as it is now) does not reflect our community identity at all. Peckover is part of the town of Wisbech; it contains a secondary school, shopping area, doctor's surgery, sports facilities and community venues that are all linked to the town. We have virtually nothing in common with the villages and farming areas that make up the rest of the division; parts of the division are approximately 10 - 15 miles away! This might not matter in a rural division, but we are very much part of a town and our interests and priorities are different. People in Peckover Ward have no reason to interact with any of the communities that make up the rest of the division. The consultation document states that your aim is to have variations of less than 10% yet Wisbech South and North are still not within that tolerance. I see that March has three divisions. Would it not be possible to look at three divisions for Wisbech: Peckover and Waterlees Village Clarkson, Kirkgate and Staithe Octavia Hill and Medworth

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Hinds, Alex

---

**From:** Alison Power [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 January 2015 01:09  
**To:** Hinds, Alex  
**Subject:** Cambridgeshire electoral ward boundaries - consultation

Dear Alex,

It was good to speak to you on Friday regarding the forthcoming changes to the electoral ward boundaries in Cambridgeshire. As we discussed, the public consultation has now closed - though, as I mentioned, I was not aware that there were potentially significant changes in the offing, or indeed that there was a public consultation, until after the consultation had taken place. Also, neither were many of my neighbours. Though we noted that Cambridge City Council have been given an extension to respond to the consultation by 30th January - the end of this week.

As I mentioned - having chatted to some neighbours and spoken to people via email and social media - I felt it would be useful for you to be aware of local people's opinions on the matter. I will keep this as brief as possible...

My own opinions are that the potential ward changes in the Cambridge City area have not been publicised properly and people don't seem to be aware. If they were small proposed changes (e.g. with a street or two here and there finding itself in a different ward) then fine. But the proposed changes for Cambridge are sweeping - shifting boundaries considerably, removing some wards in their entirety (Petersfield, Coleridge etc), re-naming wards etc. From the very limited info I have seen about these proposals, it is not clear if the boundary changes are just for the County Council, or if they will end up affecting City Council wards too, what the implications are etc. It's very confusing on a local level.

Most significantly, Petersfield is to be removed (!) and replaced with St Matthews and St Paul's. When I told the Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) about the changes a few days ago they didn't seem to have been previously aware - even though the Labour City Councillors seem to have part-justified their proposal to remove Petersfield based on the activities of PACT. Also, the new wards (St Matthew's + St Paul's) would actually be in an area that is less religious than most of the rest of Cambridge (Cambridge as a whole is 44% christian, yet the two new wards would be just over 28% each - census data 2011/12). They may be historical saintly names (from previous centuries) but they are not relevant today and it would feel like Cambridge would be taking a step backwards.

Opinions of others include:

- That the west tip of Abbey would be isolated; that the west end of Abbey would be completely split off from community facilities and green space of Abbey's core.
- Dismay at the inclusion of Queen Edith's into South Cambridgeshire, rather than the city; would be frustrating to live in Cambridge yet somehow be part of a rural constituency.
- Concern that some of Romsey would be moved to Barnwell; very clear community of Romsey, should not be shifted.
- Concern that Romsey would look like an eerie shouty cartoon face, under the proposals.
- The boundary change plans propose splitting Mill Road down the middle - that's absurd.
- Concerns over gerrymandering.
- Concerns over incompetence.
- Labour party ignoring the rules.
- People confused that this is being discussed now, as they thought it wasn't due until May.
- Most people having no idea that changes were even planned.
- Public not being aware that there was a public consultation.
- The published map with the proposed changes is in unreadable print, so you can't really see where the

boundaries are.

The general feeling amongst those who've been in touch with me seems to be a complete lack of awareness, as the Council/s don't seem to have done enough to inform us of these potential changes. Also, there's concern that those who may be affected most by the changes (e.g. residents themselves and ward-centric community groups) haven't been consulted. The proposed changes (by Labour Councillors in Cambridge) appear to miss certain key details and aren't explained very well, which leads me - and others - to wonder if they've written it themselves or if it's been delegated to someone who is not actually from the local area. I am also concerned that these boundary changes are being proposed by one political party (with a majority locally), rather than being a joint decision/proposal. Also, I see a local Labour councillor on social media has said in the last two days that Romsey should stay the same and they shouldn't be forced to change boundaries by the Boundary Commission - yet it is Labour who are proposing the local boundary changes. It's all very confusing for us local residents.

Cambridge City Council haven't published any details of what happened at their meeting last night, so at the time of writing this I have no idea if they have/are about to put the aforementioned proposals forward to you - or not. Earlier this week the meeting just had the Labour proposal published on the agenda on the Council website, but I now see that in the last day or two the Lib Dems have added a suggestion that a public meeting be held, with community groups, residents, the public etc. This suggests to me that not even the Lib Dems were aware of these boundary proposals until the last minute - which is worrying given that they make up a significant proportion of our Cambridge Councillors. maybe they're not even aware that there has already been a public consultation.

I look forward to hearing more in due course; and if there are any other dates/consultations the public should be aware of, then do please let me know and I will do my best to pass on to others locally (many thousands of people rely on my tweets from my local community Twitter account here in Cambridge).

Many thanks,  
Alison

**Alison Power**  
**Cambridge**  
**Email:** 

## Hinds, Alex

---

**From:** Colin Rosenstiel [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 November 2014 12:34  
**To:** Hinds, Alex  
**Cc:** rosenstiel@cix.co.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Cambridgeshire electoral boundary review

Thank you. Got it now. I thought I'd looked there too.

As I feared, those figures for Cambridge look distinctly iffy. Not including anything in Petersfield B for a large residential part of the CB1 development currently being built is the most worrying at first sight. Are any of the underlying workings available, please?

I am most concerned that Cambridge, the only unparished area of the County, should not lose its close links between City and County Councillors, maintained through previous reviews since and before the 1974 local government reorganisation. If the figures are awry then the huge disruption involve in breaking those links could be founded on shaky foundations.

Colin Rosenstiel

## Cambridgeshire County

### Personal Details:

**Name:**

██████████

██████████

██

**Postcode:**

██████████

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

Move all area within the area bounded by Gazelle Way / Yarrow Road into the confines of Cambridge City. It is stupid having a group of houses with no centre dumped on a local village. The natural centre for this area in respect of Church, Shops and other facilities is Cherry Hinton but we have no say with respect to Cherry Hinton. It is anomalous and disenfranchises a whole section of the community.

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

## Hinds, Alex

---

**From:** Egan, Helen  
**Sent:** 19 January 2015 08:55  
**To:** Hinds, Alex  
**Subject:** FW: Boundary review response

Hi Alex,

Please submission for Cambridgeshire below.

Helen

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 January 2015 07:56  
**To:** Reviews@  
**Subject:** Boundary review response

My suggestion is that we create three Divisions of:

Wisbech West = Peckover and Waterlees Village

Wisbech East = Clarkson, Kirkgate and Staithe

Wisbech South = Octavia Hill and Medworth

This keeps with the community identity, which is important in any changes

Kindest Regards

Michelle Tanfield-Johnson  
Director



Redundant Asset Management

IT-Green the trademark of Computer Displays UK Limited, Company Number 05687345

Hazardous Waste Carrier: CBALP3312RD  
Authorised Treatment Facility: 100628  
Approved ATF (WEEE): WEEED00006Z1ATF

### Legislation and Legal Information:

**If you intend to consign hazardous waste (computer screens, laptops, universal power supplies, scanners or fluorescent tubes) through any registered recycler or waste carrier in the UK and the weight exceeds 500kgs in any 12 month period, you are legally required to register your premises as a producer. All recycling companies must submit quarterly reports, in which they will inform the Environment Agency of hazardous materials removed from your premises.**

Our Legislative and legal compliance as well as client requirements for adherence to UK and EU directives, as issued by the Environment Agency and Defra can be found [here](#). Clients are required to register with the environment agency as a waste producer before or shortly after recycling obsolete hardware or any wastes deemed hazardous. Registration can be completed [here](#) at a cost of £18.00.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Privacy**

Computer Displays (UK) Limited is committed to maintaining the privacy of its Clients and any information passed onto the parent company.

Computer Displays (UK) Limited will never share or divulge your information with anyone else. We do not partake in any form of solicitation

or spam emailing. If you have received this email in error, please report it to [REDACTED] and delete the original immediately.

The information contained within this and any other communication sent on behalf of Computer Displays (UK) Limited may not be shared with or divulged to any third parties.

