

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
South Cambridgeshire

*November 2001*

© Crown Copyright 2001

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.  
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper. 

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>37</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>39</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>41</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for the eastern part of the district is inserted inside the back cover of this report.



# WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Peter Brokenshire  
Kru Desai  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors, ward names and the frequency of elections. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish councils.



## SUMMARY

We began a review of South Cambridgeshire's electoral arrangements on 17 April 2001.

- **This report summarises the submissions we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in South Cambridgeshire:

- **In 26 of the 42 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district, and 16 wards vary by more than 20 per cent.**
- **By 2006 this situation is expected to deteriorate, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average in 29 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 21 wards.**

Our main proposals for South Cambridgeshire's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 115–116) are that:

- **South Cambridgeshire District Council should have 57 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 34 wards, instead of 42 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 32 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight, and 10 wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 23 of the proposed 34 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in 30 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district by 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish council electoral arrangements, which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Little Wilbraham and Milton.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for nine weeks from 27 November 2001. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, which, subject to Parliamentary approval, with effect from 1 April 2002 will be responsible for implementing changes to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also decide when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 28 January 2002:

**Review Manager  
South Cambridgeshire Review  
LGCE  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map Reference
1	Balsham	2	The parishes of Balsham, Carlton, Castle Camps, Horseheath, Shudy Camps, West Wickham, West Wrating and Weston Colville	Map 2
2	Bar Hill	2	The parishes of Bar Hill, Boxworth, Childerley, Dry Drayton, Knapwell and Lolworth	Map 2
3	Barton	1	The parishes of Barton, Coton and Grantchester	Map 2
4	Bassingbourn	2	The parishes of Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth, Litlington, Shingay cum Wendy and Whaddon	Map 2
5	Bourn	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Bourn, Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley	Map 2
6	Caldecote	1	The parishes of Caldecote, Kingston and Toft	Map 2
7	Comberton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Comberton	Map 2
8	Cottenham	3	The parishes of Cottenham, Oakington & Westwick and Rampton	Map 2
9	Duxford	1	The parishes of Duxford and Ickleton	Map 2
10	Fowlmere & Foxton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> (the existing Foxton ward) – the parishes of Fowlmere and Foxton	Map 2
11	Fulbourn	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Fulbourn	Large map and Map 2
12	Gamlingay	2	The parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Gamlingay, Hatley, Little Gransden and Longstowe	Map 2
13	Girton	2	The parishes of Girton and Madingley	Map 2
14	Hardwick	1	The parish of Hardwick	Map 2
15	Harston	1	The parishes of Harston and Hauxton	Map 2
16	Haslingfield & The Eversdens	1	The parishes of Great Eversden, Harlton, Haslingfield and Little Eversden	Map 2
17	Histon & Impington	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (the existing Histon ward) – the parishes of Histon and Impington	Map 2
18	Linton	2	The parishes of Bartlow, Hildersham and Linton	Map 2
19	Longstanton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Longstanton	Map 2
20	Melbourn	2	The parishes of Great & Little Chishill, Heydon and Melbourn	Map 2
21	Meldreth	1	The parishes of Meldreth and Shepreth	Map 2
22	Milton	2	Part of Milton parish (the proposed Milton parish ward) and the parish of Horningsea	Large map and Map 2
23	Orwell & Barrington	1	The parishes of Barrington, Orwell and Wimpole	Map 2
24	Papworth & Elsworth	2	The parishes of Conington, Elsworth, Fen Drayton, Graveley, Papworth Everard and Papwoth St Agnes	Map 2
25	Sawston	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Sawston	Map 2
26	Swavesey	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Swavesey	Map 2
27	Teversham	1	The parish of Teversham	Large map and Map 2
28	The Abingtons	1	The parishes of Babraham, Great Abington, Hinxton, Little Abington and Pampisford	Map 2

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map Reference</b>
29	The Mordens	1	The parishes of Abington Pigotts, Guilden Morden, Steeple Morden and Tadlow	Map 2
30	The Shelfords & Stapleford	3	The parishes of Great Shelford, Little Shelford, Newton and Stapleford	Map 2
31	The Wilbrahams	1	Part of Milton parish (the proposed South parish ward) and the parishes of Fen Ditton, Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham (the proposed Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom parish wards) and Stow cum Quy	Large map and Map 2
32	Waterbeach	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Landbeach and Waterbeach	Map 2
33	Whittlesford	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Thriplow and Whittlesford	Map 2
34	Willingham & Over	3	The parishes of Over and Willingham	Map 2

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2, Map A1 and the large map in the back of the report.

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Balsham	2	3,521	1,761	0	3,460	1,730	-9
2	Bar Hill	2	4,079	2,040	16	3,990	1,995	5
3	Barton	1	1,711	1,711	-2	1,680	1,680	-11
4	Bassingbourn	2	3,546	1,773	1	3,570	1,785	-6
5	Bourn	3	1,923	641	-63	6,350	2,117	12
6	Caldecote	1	1,195	1,195	-32	1,830	1,830	-3
7	Comberton	1	1,758	1,758	0	1,770	1,770	-7
8	Cottenham	3	5,605	1,868	6	6,180	2,060	9
9	Duxford	1	1,959	1,959	12	1,920	1,920	1
10	Fowlmere & Foxton	1	1,823	1,823	4	1,910	1,910	1
11	Fulbourn	2	3,663	1,832	4	3,590	1,795	-5
12	Gamlingay	2	3,704	1,852	6	3,710	1,855	-2
13	Girton	2	3,278	1,639	-7	3,470	1,735	-8
14	Hardwick	1	1,843	1,843	5	1,800	1,800	-5
15	Harston	1	1,908	1,908	9	1,870	1,870	-1
16	Haslingfield & The Eversdens	1	2,064	2,064	18	2,020	2,020	7
17	Histon & Impington	3	6,352	2,117	21	6,330	2,110	11
18	Linton	2	3,627	1,814	3	3,540	1,770	-7
19	Longstanton	1	1,200	1,200	-32	1,990	1,990	5
20	Melbourn	2	4,102	2,051	17	4,130	2,065	9
21	Meldreth	1	1,840	1,840	5	1,860	1,860	-2
22	Milton	2	3,299	1,650	-6	3,232	1,616	-15
23	Orwell & Barrington	1	1,804	1,804	3	1,780	1,780	-6
24	Papworth & Elsworth	2	2,976	1,488	-15	4,030	2,015	6
25	Sawston	3	5,615	1,872	7	5,570	1,857	-2
26	Swavesey	1	1,874	1,874	7	1,990	1,990	5
27	Teversham	1	1,997	1,997	14	2,000	2,000	6
28	The Abingtons	1	1,763	1,763	0	1,730	1,730	-9
29	The Mordens	1	1,837	1,837	5	1,840	1,840	-3

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
30	The Shelfords & Stapleford	3	5,650	1,883	7	5,730	1,910	1
31	The Wilbrahams	1	1,921	1,921	10	1,918	1,918	1
32	Waterbeach	2	3,940	1,970	12	3,870	1,935	2
33	Whittlesford	1	1,870	1,870	7	2,040	2,040	8
34	Willingham & Over	3	4,749	1,583	-10	5,230	1,743	-8
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>99,996</b>	–	–	<b>107,930</b>	–	–
	<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,754</b>	–	–	<b>1,894</b>	–

*Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by South Cambridgeshire District Council.*

*Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our proposals for the electoral arrangements for the district of South Cambridgeshire, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the five districts in Cambridgeshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of South Cambridgeshire. South Cambridgeshire's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1975 (Report no. 63). Cambridgeshire County Council were last reviewed in December 1983 (Report no. 460). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In carrying out these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Full details of the legislation under which we work are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out our approach to the reviews.

5 Our task is to make recommendations to the Electoral Commission on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish councils in the district.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been created locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local people are normally in the best position to judge what council size and ward configurations are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while also reflecting the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but we are willing

to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, or that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

9 The review is in four stages (see Table 3).

*Table 3: Stages of the Review*

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Description</b>
One	Submission of proposals to us
Two	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Electoral Commission

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper called *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half of the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals were taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, states that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities' electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our current *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 17 April 2001, when we wrote to South Cambridgeshire District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridgeshire Constabulary, the local authority associations, the County of Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils, parish councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Eastern Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited South Cambridgeshire District Council to publicise the review further. The Commission's Stage One consultation period was put into abeyance from 10 May 2001 until 7 June 2001 as a consequence of the General Election; the closing date for receipt of submissions (the end of Stage One) was 13 August 2001.

12 At Stage Two we considered all the submissions received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

13 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 27 November 2001 and will end on 28 January 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

14 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to modify them, and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. It will then be for it to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order. The Electoral Commission will decide when any changes come into effect.

15 With effect from 1 April 2002, subject to Parliamentary approval, the Electoral Commission will assume the functions of the Local Government Commission for England and take over responsibility for making Orders putting in place the new arrangements resulting from periodic electoral reviews (powers which currently reside with the Secretary of State). As part of this transfer the Electoral Commission will set up a Boundary Committee for England which will take over responsibility for the conduct of PERs from the Local Government Commission for England. The Boundary Committee for England will conduct electoral reviews following the same rules and in the same manner as the Local Government Commission for England. The Boundary Committee for England's final recommendations on future electoral arrangements will then be presented to the Electoral Commission which will be able to accept, modify or reject the Boundary Committee's findings. Under these new arrangements there will remain a further opportunity to make representations directly to the Electoral Commission after the publication of the final recommendations, as was previously the case with the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to send comments to the Electoral Commission.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The district of South Cambridgeshire is situated in the south of the county, with Suffolk to its east, Bedfordshire to its west and the counties of Essex and Hertfordshire to its south. The district covers the rural area of 89,861 hectares surrounding the city of Cambridge. The area has good transport links with London and the south east, and the A14 route between the Midlands and the East Coast ports also crosses the district. The whole district is parished and comprises 100 parishes.

17 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated, in percentage terms, the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average. In the text which follows, this figure may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

18 The electorate of the district is 99,996 (February 2001). The Council presently has 55 members who are elected from 42 wards. Two of the wards are each represented by three councillors, nine are each represented by two councillors and 31 are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

19 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,818 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,962 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 26 of the 42 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, in 16 wards by more than 20 per cent and in 11 wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Bourn ward where the councillor represents 224 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in South Cambridgeshire*

*Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2001)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2006)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Abington	1	1,527	1,527	-16	1,500	1,500	-24
2	Arrington	1	1,118	1,118	-39	1,130	1,130	-42
3	Balsham	1	2,101	2,101	16	2,060	2,060	5
4	Bar Hill	2	4,289	2,145	18	4,300	2,150	10
5	Barrington & Shepreth	1	1,374	1,374	-24	1,350	1,350	-31
6	Barton	1	1,117	1,117	-39	1,100	1,100	-44
7	Bassingbourn	2	3,084	1,542	-15	3,100	1,550	-21
8	Bourn	1	1,923	1,923	6	6,350	6,350	224
9	Castle Camps	1	1,507	1,507	-17	1,480	1,480	-25
10	Comberton	1	1,758	1,758	-3	1,770	1,770	-10
11	Coton	1	1,221	1,221	-33	1,210	1,210	-38
12	Cottenham	2	4,548	2,274	25	5,030	2,515	28
13	Duxford	1	1,429	1,429	-21	1,400	1,400	-29
14	Elsworth	1	1,633	1,633	-10	1,620	1,620	-17
15	Foxton	1	1,823	1,823	0	1,910	1,910	-3
16	Fulbourn	2	3,663	1,832	1	3,590	1,795	-9
17	Gamlingay	1	2,732	2,732	50	2,720	2,720	39
18	Girton	2	3,112	1,556	-14	3,310	1,655	-16
19	Great Shelford	2	3,296	1,648	-9	3,350	1,675	-15
20	Hardwick	1	2,859	2,859	57	3,460	3,460	76
21	Harston	1	1,651	1,651	-9	1,620	1,620	-17
22	Haslingfield	1	1,451	1,451	-20	1,410	1,410	-28
23	Histon	3	6,352	2,117	16	6,330	2,110	8
24	Ickleton	1	1,407	1,407	-23	1,380	1,380	-30
25	Linton	2	3,540	1,770	-3	3,460	1,730	-12
26	Little Shelford	1	1,186	1,186	-35	1,160	1,160	-41
27	Longstanton	1	1,200	1,200	-34	1,990	1,990	1
28	Melbourn	2	3,461	1,731	-5	3,500	1,750	-11

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
29	Meldreth	1	1,614	1,614	-11	1,650	1,650	-16
30	Milton	1	3,207	3,207	76	3,140	3,140	60
31	Orwell	1	1,823	1,823	0	1,800	1,800	-8
32	Over	1	2,100	2,100	16	2,220	2,220	13
33	Papworth	1	1,729	1,729	-5	2,780	2,780	42
34	Sawston	3	5,615	1,872	3	5,570	1,857	-5
35	Stapleford	1	1,425	1,425	-22	1,470	1,470	-25
36	Swavesey	1	1,874	1,874	3	1,990	1,990	1
37	Teversham	1	2,823	2,823	55	2,820	2,820	44
38	The Mordens	1	1,778	1,778	-2	1,790	1,790	-9
39	The Wilbrahams	1	1,187	1,187	-35	1,190	1,190	-39
40	Waterbeach	2	3,940	1,970	8	3,870	1,935	-1
41	Whittlesford	1	1,870	1,870	3	2,040	2,040	4
42	Willingham	1	2,649	2,649	46	3,010	3,010	53
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>99,996</b>	–	–	<b>107,930</b>	–	–
	<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,818</b>	–	–	<b>1,962</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Arrington ward are relatively over-represented by 39 per cent, while electors in Milton ward are relatively under-represented by 76 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

20 At the start of this review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire District Council and its constituent parish councils.

21 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 48 submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, together with an alternative district-wide scheme from a cross-party group of 15 members, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

#### **South Cambridgeshire District Council**

22 At Stage One, the District Council submitted two district-wide schemes. The proposed Scheme A, which was referred to as the ‘official Council’s scheme’, received support from 25 of the 47 members on the council who participated in this issue. In addition, the Council also submitted Scheme B, which was supported by a cross-party group of 15 members. It stated that, Scheme B “resolved to propose an alternative scheme, which diverges from Scheme A only in respect of matters which sought to address the perceived disadvantages of Scheme A”.

23 Scheme A was based on retaining the existing council size of 55, representing a mixed pattern of 33 wards. Scheme B was based on an increase in council size of two to 57 based on a mixed pattern of 35 wards. Scheme A involved consequent parish warding to facilitate the proposed district ward pattern. In addition, both schemes proposed that the existing electoral cycle of elections by thirds be retained. Under both Scheme A and Scheme B, improved levels of electoral equality would be achieved by 2006, with Scheme A containing one ward with a variance of more than 10 per cent from the district average (19 per cent) and Scheme B containing three wards above 10 per cent.

#### **Cambridgeshire County Council**

24 Cambridgeshire County Council stated that it wanted to stress the importance that it attaches to coterminosity between district wards and county divisions, and that as a result the Commission should give some forward thought to this issue when undertaking the periodic electoral reviews throughout Cambridgeshire.

#### **Parish Councils**

25 We received 16 representations direct from parish councils. Cottenham Parish Council expressed concern at the proposal under Scheme A to separate Cottenham and Rampton parish councils, stating that “There has been many years of a link between the villages of Cottenham and Rampton.” Under Scheme B, Cottenham and Rampton would form part of the same district ward. Duxford Parish Council opposed the proposals for its parish, which were identical under Schemes A and B. It proposed alternative proposals in which Duxford parish would be combined with Hinxtton parish, and Ickleton parish would be combined with

Heydon, Great & Little Chishill and Fowlmere parishes. Alternatively, it proposed that the existing warding arrangements in this area be retained. Great Abington Parish Council strongly opposed Scheme A, which would result in the division of the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington. It stated that the two parishes share a number of community links. Under Scheme B, Great Abington and Little Abington parishes would form part of the same district ward.

26 Great & Little Chishill Parish Council strongly opposed the proposals for its parish, which were identical under Schemes A and B. It fundamentally opposed the combining of the parish with Melbourn, which it considered to be “almost a small town”. It proposed that the parish should form part of “a small village ward” with Heydon, Ickleton and possibly Abington. Great & Little Eversden Parish Council opposed any division of the parishes of Great Eversden and Little Eversden, which would not be the case under either Scheme A or Scheme B. However, it expressed the preference that the existing Orwell ward, of which the parish is currently a part, be retained. Ickleton Parish Council expressed concern at the proposal to combine the parish with the neighbouring Duxford parish, as proposed under both Scheme A and Scheme B. It supported the proposals submitted by Duxford Parish Council, as detailed above.

27 Kingston Parish Council proposed that the existing Orwell ward, of which it currently forms a part, be retained. However, it expressed broad support for a single-member Caldecote ward, as proposed under both Scheme A and Scheme B. In addition, Kingston Parish Council also opposed any proposal which would result in the division of Great Eversden and Little Eversden parish councils, stating that, “although nominally separate civil parishes, they have always shared a single Parish Council”. Little Abington Parish Council made two submissions at Stage One. It strongly opposed the Council’s proposals under Scheme A which would result in the division of Great Abington and Little Abington parish councils and combine Little Abington with Stapleford with which it argues it has “no links whatsoever, one being a rural parish outside the green belt and the other being on the boundary of Cambridge City”. It expressed broad support for Scheme B, which would unite the ‘Abingtons’ in the same district ward, and in addition it stated that a natural linkage for Little Abington parish would also be with Hildersham parish.

28 Melbourn Parish Council opposed the proposals outlined in both Scheme A and Scheme B and proposed that if Melbourn needs to be combined with a neighbouring parish then it should be with Shepreth, “the centre of which is one mile from Melbourn”. It argued that this would be a more viable proposal than combining the parish with Heydon and Great & Little Chishill parishes. Oakington & Westwick Parish Council strongly opposed the proposed warding of the parish which would occur under Scheme A. It argued that “the strength of the village community would be diluted even more than it is now by it being split into two parts”. It proposed that the existing warding arrangements be retained. In addition, it also opposed the proposed increase of parish councillors from seven to nine, together with the proposed allocation between wards. Rampton Parish Council expressed strong opposition to the proposals under Scheme A and expressed support for the proposals under Scheme B, which would combine Rampton parish in a ward with Cottenham and Oakington & Westwick parishes. It strongly proposed that Rampton and Cottenham parish councils remain in the same district ward, arguing that “the connections with Rampton are too great to be discarded just to suit numbers”.

29 Stapleford Parish Council expressed support for the existing warding arrangements, opposing the options proposed under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, it proposed that if a revised ward was to be proposed then Stapleford should be retained as a ward name. Stow-cum-Quy Parish Council expressed support for the proposals submitted under Scheme B, which would result in the combining of the parish with the parishes of Great Wilbraham and Little Wilbraham, which it considers to be its “true remaining neighbours”. It strongly opposed any proposals which would result in the combining of the parish with the area north of the River Cam. Tadlow Parish Meeting expressed broad support for the proposals submitted under Scheme A and Scheme B, which would result in the combining of the parish with Guilden Morden, Steeple Morden and Abington Pigotts in a revised single-member The Mordens ward. Teversham Parish Council expressed strong support for the creation of a single district ward coterminous with the parish, as proposed under Scheme B. It opposed the creation of a separate parish ward, and consequently district ward, containing the Foxgloves Estate, as proposed under Scheme A, arguing that “the Estate is an integral part of Teversham parish”. Whittlesford Parish Council expressed support for the proposals submitted under both Scheme A and Scheme B, which would result in the existing ward being retained.

30 We received a joint submission from Waterbeach Parish Council, Landbeach Parish Council and two local councillors. Support was expressed for the proposals under Scheme A, which would result in Waterbeach, Landbeach and Milton parishes being combined in a new three-member Waterbeach & Milton ward. However, the fundamental view expressed was that Waterbeach and Landbeach parishes should not be separated in any proposed new warding, since “they are in fact one community physically linked and with much in common”.

## **Other Submissions**

31 We received two representations from local councillors. Councillor Collinson strongly supported the retention of Cottenham and Rampton parishes together in one ward. He expressed strong support for Scheme B, which he argued “works across the district in terms of numbers and avoids the artificial warding of several villages which was a feature of the ‘official’ scheme”. Councillor Flanagan proposed the creation of a single-member Oakington & Westwick ward, and expressed support for the views expressed by Oakington & Westwick Parish Council, as detailed above.

32 Finally, we received 26 proforma-style letters from local residents. They all expressed the same view as that expressed by Tadlow Parish Meeting, as detailed above.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

**33 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names and parish council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

34 As described earlier, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

35 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and maintaining local ties.

36 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

37 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered, and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

38 Since 1975 there has been approximately a 46 per cent increase in the electorate of South Cambridgeshire district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 8 per cent from 99,996 to 107,930 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Bourn ward based around the ongoing Cambourn development, although a significant amount is also expected in Hardwick, Longstanton and Papworth wards. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

39 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having looked at the District Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

40 As explained earlier, we start by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

41 South Cambridgeshire District Council presently has 55 members. The District Council proposed the retention of the existing council size under Scheme A, while the cross-party group of 15 members proposed a moderate increase of two to 57 under Scheme B. There was little argumentation provided for the proposed increase under Scheme B, although it was indicated in the Council's submission that "in general terms there will be a move to consider additional members as the population of the district grows" resulting in a significant projected increase in electorate occurring throughout the district over the next five years. When analysing the two district-wide schemes submitted at Stage One, we gave careful consideration to the issue of council size. We concluded that a council size of 57 facilitated a scheme which provided for an improved level of electoral equality while largely reflecting the views expressed by a number of respondents at Stage One. It would also involve no consequential warding of parishes. As discussed in more detail later, we have been persuaded that, on balance, Scheme B provides for the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

42 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that a council of 57 members would best meet the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

43 As indicated above, we propose basing our draft recommendations on Scheme B, the scheme submitted by a cross-party group of 15 members. While at first sight it may appear that this scheme gained less support from the members than Scheme A, we note that the proposed Scheme A, which was referred to as the 'official Council's scheme', only received support from 25 of the 47 members on the council who participated in the vote. In addition, we note that there are broad similarities in the two schemes, particularly in relation to the south-west of the district. We also concur with the view expressed by the Council that Scheme B seeks to address many of the areas of controversy highlighted in relation to Scheme A, particularly in relation to the issue of parish warding. However, in order to better reflect the identities and interests of the local community, and to correct an anomaly relating to an existing detached ward, we are moving away from the Scheme B proposals in two areas, together with a ward name change. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Arrington, Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards;
- (b) Duxford, Ickleton, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards;

- (c) Barrington & Shepreth, Foxton, Haslingfield, Meldreth and Orwell wards;
- (d) Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick wards;
- (e) Barton, Coton and Girton wards;
- (f) Elsworth, Longstanton, Papworth and Swavesey wards;
- (g) Bar Hill, Cottenham, Over and Willingham wards;
- (h) Histon and Waterbeach wards;
- (i) Milton, Teversham and The Wilbrahams wards;
- (j) Balsham, Castle Camps and Fulbourn wards;
- (k) Abington, Linton and Sawston wards;
- (l) Great Shelford, Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford wards.

44 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **Arrington, Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards**

45 The existing wards of Arrington, Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens are situated in the south-west of the district, bordering the counties of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. Arrington, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards are each currently represented by a single councillor while Bassingbourn ward is currently a two-member ward. Arrington ward comprises the parishes of Arrington, Croydon, Hatley, Little Gransden, Longstowe and Tadlow, Bassingbourn ward comprises the parishes of Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth and Litlington, Gamlingay ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name and The Mordens ward comprises the parishes of Abington Pigotts, Guilden Morden, Shingay cum Wendy and Steeple Morden. Under existing arrangements, Arrington, Bassingbourn and The Mordens wards would contain 39 per cent, 15 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (42 per cent, 21 per cent and 9 per cent fewer by 2006). Gamlingay ward contains 50 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (39 per cent more by 2006).

46 At Stage One, the District Council proposed identical proposals for this area under both Scheme A and Scheme B. It proposed combining the existing Arrington ward, less Tadlow parish, with the existing Gamlingay ward to form a revised two-member Gamlingay ward. Tadlow parish would be combined with the existing The Mordens ward, less Shingay cum Wendy parish, to form a revised single-member The Mordens ward. The Council stated that the combining of these parishes is “a natural one and likely to be popular”. Shingay cum Wendy parish would be combined with the existing Bassingbourn ward, together with Whaddon parish from the neighbouring Meldreth ward, to form a revised two-member Bassingbourn ward. Under Scheme A with a council size of 55 members, the proposed Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards would contain 2 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent, 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B with a council size of 57 members, the proposed Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards would contain 1 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent, 2 per cent and 3 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

47 We received a further 27 representations in relation to this area. Tadlow Parish Meeting broadly supported the proposals outlined by the District Council, specifically in relation to the combining of the parish with the parishes of Guilden Morden and Steeple Morden. It also stated that it had strong community links with the parish of Orwell. Concern was expressed at any revised warding which would result in combining the Parish Meeting with Gamlingay parish. This view was also expressed within 26 proforma-style letters from local residents.

48 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note, however, that in relation to this area the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B are identical. We also note that these proposals broadly respect the views expressed by Tadlow Parish Meeting and 26 proforma letters. Therefore, in view of the level of consensus in relation to this area and in the absence of any representations to the contrary, we are content to put these proposals forward for consultation. In relation to the issue of combining Tadlow Parish Meeting with Orwell Parish Council, we note that this is not possible due to the fact that the two villages are geographically separated by a number of other villages and such a combination would result in a detached ward.

49 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards would contain 1 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent, 2 per cent and 3 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Duxford, Ickleton, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards**

50 The existing wards of Duxford, Ickleton, Melbourn and Whittlesford are situated in the south of the district bordering the counties of Essex and Hertfordshire. Duxford, Ickleton and Whittlesford wards are each currently represented by a single councillor while Melbourn is currently a two-member ward. Duxford ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name, Ickleton ward (which is currently detached) comprises the parishes of Great & Little Chishill, Heydon, Hinxton and Ickleton, Melbourn ward is coterminous the parish of the same name and Whittlesford ward comprises the parishes of Thriplow and Whittlesford. Under existing arrangements, Duxford, Ickleton and Melbourn wards are all over-represented, containing 21 per cent, 23 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (29 per cent, 30 per cent and 11 per cent fewer by 2006). Whittlesford ward contains 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (4 per cent more by 2006).

51 At Stage One, the District Council proposed broadly identical proposals for this area under both Scheme A and Scheme B. It proposed combining the existing Duxford ward with Ickleton parish to form a revised single-member Duxford ward. Part of the remainder of the existing detached Ickleton ward, the parishes of Great & Little Chishill and Heydon, would be combined with the existing Melbourn ward to form a revised two-member Melbourn ward. The Council acknowledged that the parishes of Great & Little Chishill and Heydon “do not attach conveniently to other parishes”, and “whilst it is recognised that they lay to the other side of the A505, a busy primary road, it is not felt that this combination will be to the detriment of either Melbourn or the two smaller parishes”. The remaining part of the existing detached Ickleton ward, Hinxton parish, would form part of a revised Sawston ward under

Scheme A, and part of a new The Abingtons ward under Scheme B, as detailed below. Under both Schemes the Council proposed the retention of the existing Whittlesford ward, arguing that the combination of the parishes of Whittlesford and Thriplow “is traditional and respected”.

52 Under Scheme A with a council size of 55 members, the proposed Duxford, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards would contain 8 per cent, 13 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent fewer, 5 per cent more and 4 per cent more than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B with a council size of 57 members, the proposed Duxford, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards would contain 12 per cent, 17 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent, 9 per cent and 8 per cent more than the average by 2006).

53 We received a further five representations in relation to this area. Duxford Parish Council opposed the Council’s revised Duxford ward. It proposed alternative proposals where by Duxford parish would be combined with Hinxton parish, and Ickleton parish would be combined with Heydon, Great & Little Chishill and Fowlmere parishes, resulting in the retention of a detached ward. Great & Little Chishill Parish Council strongly opposed the Council’s revised Melbourn ward. It fundamentally opposed the combining of the parish with Melbourn, which it considered to be “almost a small town”. It proposed that the parish should form part of a “small village ward” with Heydon, Ickleton and possibly Abington.

54 Ickleton Parish Council expressed concern at the proposal to combine the parish with the neighbouring Duxford parish in a revised Duxford ward. It supported the proposals submitted by Duxford Parish Council, as detailed above. Melbourn Parish Council opposed the Council’s revised Melbourn ward and proposed that if Melbourn needed to be combined with a neighbouring parish then it should be with Shepreth, “the centre of which is one mile from Melbourn”. It argued that this would be a more viable proposal than combining the parish with Heydon and Great & Little Chishill parishes, which “are some five or six miles from Melbourn and are separated from it by the A505 trunk road”. Finally, Whittlesford Parish Council expressed support for the retention of the existing Whittlesford ward.

55 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note, however, that in relation to this area the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B are identical, and in addition they have received support from Whittlesford Parish Council. We note the concerns expressed by Duxford, Great & Little Chishill and Ickleton parish councils. However, their proposals, which were largely based on the retention of the existing warding arrangements, would in turn result in the retention of a detached Ickleton ward. As outlined in our *Guidance*, we are of the view that detached wards lend themselves to the creation of electoral areas which lack community identity and therefore we are not minded to recommend the retention of a detached ward as part of our draft recommendations. We note the concerns of Melbourn Parish Council, but we are unable to look at any one area in isolation and due to the configuration of parishes in this area we consider that the District Council’s proposal provides for the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area.

56 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Duxford, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards would contain 12 per cent, 17 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than

the district average respectively (1 per cent, 9 per cent and 8 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Barrington & Shepreth, Foxton, Haslingfield, Meldreth and Orwell wards**

57 The existing wards of Barrington & Shepreth, Foxton, Haslingfield, Meldreth and Orwell are situated in the centre of the district, broadly to the west of Cambridge. All five wards are each currently represented by a single councillor. Barrington & Shepreth ward comprises the parishes of Barrington and Shepreth, Foxton ward comprises the parishes of Fowlmere and Foxton, Haslingfield ward comprises the parishes of Harlton and Haslingfield, Meldreth ward comprises the parishes of Meldreth and Whaddon and Orwell ward comprises the parishes of Great Eversden, Kingston, Little Eversden, Orwell and Wimpole. Under existing arrangements, Barrington & Shepreth, Haslingfield and Meldreth wards contain 24 per cent, 20 per cent and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (31 per cent, 28 per cent and 16 per cent fewer by 2006). Foxton and Orwell wards each contain equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the district average at present (3 per cent fewer and 8 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2006).

58 At Stage One, the District Council proposed identical proposals for this area under both Scheme A and Scheme B. The Council proposed combining Barrington parish from the existing Barrington & Shepreth ward with the parishes of Orwell and Wimpole from the existing Orwell ward to form a new single-member Orwell & Barrington ward, arguing that “the Council felt that this combination would be very workable”. The remaining part of Barrington & Shepreth ward, Shepreth parish, would be combined with the existing Meldreth parish to form a revised single-member Meldreth ward, arguing that the association of Meldreth with Shepreth is “popular”. Whaddon parish would be included in a revised Bassingbourn ward, as detailed earlier. Part of the remaining Orwell ward, Kingston parish, would be combined with part of the existing Hardwick ward, the parishes of Caldecote and Toft, to form a new single-member Caldecote ward, while the remaining part of Orwell ward, the parishes of Great Eversden and Little Eversden, would be combined with the existing Haslingfield ward to form a new single-member Haslingfield & The Eversdens ward. The Council argued that the villages to be combined “have an affinity with each other”. Finally, under both Scheme A and Scheme B the Council proposed that the existing Foxton ward be retained, arguing that this is a “traditional association”. However, the Council proposed that the ward be renamed Fowlmere & Foxton ward.

59 Under Scheme A with a Council size of 55 members, the proposed Caldecote, Fowlmere & Foxton, Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Meldreth and Orwell & Barrington wards would contain 34 per cent fewer, equal to the average, 14 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and 9 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B with a council size of 57 members, the proposed Caldecote, Fowlmere & Foxton, Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Meldreth and Orwell & Barrington wards would contain 32 per cent fewer, 4 per cent more, 18 per cent more, 5 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

60 We received two further representations in relation to this area. Great & Little Eversden Parish Council broadly supported the Council's proposals, opposing any arrangements which would result in the division of the two parishes. However, it expressed the preference that the existing Orwell ward, of which the parish is currently a part, be retained. Kingston Parish Council proposed that the existing Orwell ward, of which it currently forms a part, be retained. However, it acknowledged that if changes were necessary it broadly supported a single-member Caldecote ward, as proposed under both Scheme A and Scheme B. In addition, Kingston Parish Council also opposed any proposal which would result in the division of the parishes of Great Eversden and Little Eversden, stating that, "although nominally separate civil parishes, they have always shared a single Parish Council".

61 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note, however, that in relation to this area the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B are identical. These proposals also ensure that the parishes of Great Eversden and Little Eversden are contained within the same district ward, which has received an element of support at Stage One. We also note that the proposed Caldecote ward has received broad support from Kingston Parish Council. In relation to the request for the existing Orwell ward to be retained, we note that, under a council size of 57, Orwell ward would contain 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006, but that the adjoining wards of Hardwick and Haslingfield would contain 83 per cent more and 26 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2006. It is therefore necessary that the warding arrangements in this area be addressed in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality in all wards, and we consider that the proposals outlined by the District Council provide for the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

62 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Caldecote, Fowlmere & Foxton, Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Meldreth and Orwell & Barrington wards would contain 32 per cent fewer, 4 per cent more, 18 per cent more, 5 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick wards**

63 The existing wards of Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick are situated in the west of the district with Bourn ward bordering Huntingdonshire district. Each of the three wards are currently represented by a single councillor. Bourn ward comprises the parishes of Bourn, Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley, Comberton ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name and Hardwick ward comprises the parishes of Caldecote, Hardwick and Toft. Under existing arrangements, Comberton ward contains 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (10 per cent fewer by 2006). Bourn and Hardwick wards are significantly under-represented, containing 6 per cent and 57 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (224 per cent and 76 per cent more than the average by 2006 due to major ongoing development planned for the area).

64 At Stage One, the District Council proposed identical proposals under Scheme A and Scheme B in relation to the existing Comberton and Hardwick wards, however, it put forward

alternative proposals in relation to the existing Bourn ward. Firstly, both schemes proposed retaining the existing single-member Comberton ward, arguing that it “is a natural single parish ward”. As detailed above, the Council proposed combining the parishes of Caldecote and Toft from the existing Hardwick ward with the parish of Kingston from the existing Orwell ward to form a revised single-member Caldecote ward. In addition, it proposed that the remaining part of Hardwick ward, Hardwick parish, should form a revised single-member Hardwick ward. Under Scheme A, the Council proposed retaining the existing Bourn ward, but increasing its level of representation from one to three members in order to accommodate the developing new settlement of Cambourn. Under Scheme B, a revised two-member Bourn ward was proposed, coterminous with Bourn parish, with the remaining part of the existing Bourn ward, the parishes of Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley, forming a new single-member Caxton ward.

65 Under Scheme A with a council size of 55 members, Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick wards would contain 65 per cent fewer, 3 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more, 10 per cent fewer and 8 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B with a council size of 57 members, Bourn, Caxton, Comberton and Hardwick wards would contain 67 per cent fewer, 56 per cent fewer, equal to the average and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (12 per cent more, 10 per cent more, 7 per cent fewer and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). In addition to these proposals, the Council, under Scheme A and Scheme B, proposed that the parishes of Bourn and Caxton be warded to facilitate the eventual creation of a new parish for the proposed Cambourn development area.

66 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. However, we note that these proposals are identical to the proposals outlined in Scheme A in relation to the proposed Comberton and Hardwick wards. In relation to the proposed Bourn ward, we propose adopting the proposals under Scheme A, which would result in the retention of the existing ward, while increasing its level of representation from one to three. We consider that this proposal will better reflect the identities and interests of the community in this area, particularly in relation to the ongoing Cambourn development, since maintaining the current ward for district warding purposes would contain the whole of this development within the same district ward. However, in relation to the proposal regarding the warding of the parishes of Bourn and Caxton, we have been unable to facilitate this proposal as there are insufficient electors on the 2001 electoral register for these parishes to be warded, and in addition, at this stage of the development, we would be unable to identify clear boundaries which would have a degree of longevity. This proposed parish warding is not integral to our draft recommendations in this area.

67 Under our draft recommendations, Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick wards would contain 63 per cent fewer, equal to the average and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (12 per cent more, 7 per cent fewer and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Barton, Coton and Girton wards**

68 The existing wards of Barton, Coton and Girton are situated in the centre of the district to the west and north-west of Cambridge. Barton and Coton wards are each currently represented by a single councillor, while Girton ward is currently represented by two councillors. Barton ward comprises the parishes of Barton and Grantchester, Coton ward comprises the parishes of Coton, Dry Drayton and Madingley and Girton ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under existing arrangements, Barton, Coton and Girton wards are all over-represented, containing 39 per cent, 33 per cent and 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (44 per cent, 38 per cent and 16 per cent fewer by 2006).

69 At Stage One, the District Council submitted different proposals in this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. Under Scheme A the Council proposed combining the existing Barton ward with the parishes of Coton and Madingley from the existing Coton ward to form a revised single-member Barton ward. The Council stated that the “four villages of Barton, Madingley, Grantchester and Coton sit well as one ward”. The remaining part of Coton ward, the parish of Dry Drayton, would be combined with the parish of Bar Hill from the existing Bar Hill ward and the parish of Lolworth from the existing Elsworth ward to form a revised two-member Bar Hill ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Bar Hill ward, the southern part of the existing Oakington & Westwick parish (the proposed Oakington South parish ward), would be combined with the existing Girton ward to form a revised two-member Girton ward, with the Council stating that there is a direct road link between the two areas to be combined. Under these proposals and a council size of 55, the proposed Bar Hill, Barton and Girton wards would contain 4 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent, 6 per cent and 4 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

70 Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining the existing Barton ward with Coton parish from the existing Coton ward to form a revised single-member Barton ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Coton ward, Madingley parish, would be combined with the existing Girton ward to form a revised two-member Girton ward, the Council arguing that “there is a natural affinity between these two parishes”. The remaining part of the existing Coton ward, the parish of Dry Drayton, would be combined with the parish of Bar Hill from the existing Bar Hill ward and the parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Knapwell and Lolworth from the existing Elsworth ward to form a revised two-member Bar Hill ward. Under these proposals and a council size of 57, Bar Hill, Barton and Girton wards would contain 16 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more, 11 per cent fewer and 8 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

71 We received two further representations in relation to this area. Oakington & Westwick Parish Council strongly opposed the proposed warding of the parish which would occur under Scheme A. It argued that “the strength of the village community would be diluted even more than it is now by it being split into two parts”. It proposed that the existing Bar Hill ward be retained. Councillor Flanagan proposed the creation of a single-member Oakington & Westwick ward, and endorsed the views expressed by Oakington & Westwick Parish Council.

72 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that these proposals would receive a degree of support from Oakington & Westwick Parish Council and Councillor Flanagan, the fundamental point being that Oakington & Westwick parish would remain unwarded. However, we have been unable to endorse the proposal for the existing Bar Hill ward to be retained or for Oakington & Westwick parish to form a single district ward. Under a council size of 57, the existing Bar Hill ward would contain 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006, while a single district ward coterminous with Oakington & Westwick Parish Council would contain 39 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. On balance, and in the light of the representations received at Stage One, we consider that the proposals outlined in Scheme B provide for the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and we are content to put them forward as part of our draft recommendations.

73 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Bar Hill, Barton and Girton wards would contain 16 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more, 11 per cent fewer and 8 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Elsworth, Longstanton, Papworth and Swavesey wards**

74 The existing wards of Elsworth, Longstanton, Papworth and Swavesey are situated in the north of the district bordering Huntingdonshire district. All four wards are each currently represented by a single councillor. Elsworth ward comprises the parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Conington, Elsworth, Fen Drayton, Knapwell and Lolworth, Longstanton ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name, Papworth ward comprises the parishes of Graveley, Papworth Everard and Papworth St Agnes and Swavesey ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under existing arrangements, Elsworth, Longstanton and Papworth wards contain 10 per cent, 34 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (17 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 42 per cent more by 2006). Swavesey ward contains 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent more by 2006).

75 At Stage One the District Council proposed the retention of the existing Longstanton and Swavesey wards under both Scheme A and Scheme B, arguing that they are natural single-parish wards. Under Scheme A the Council proposed combining the existing Papworth ward with the existing Elsworth ward, less Lolworth parish, as detailed above, to form a new two-member Papworth & Elsworth ward, stating that it was “felt that that the proposals for this ward would be able to deliver effective local government”. Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining the existing Papworth ward with the parishes of Conington, Elsworth and Fen Drayton from the existing Elsworth ward to form a new two-member Papworth & Elsworth ward, with the remaining part of the existing Elsworth ward forming part of a revised Bar Hill ward, as detailed below.

76 Under Scheme A, with a council size of 55, the proposed Longstanton, Papworth & Elsworth and Swavesey wards would contain 34 per cent fewer, 10 per cent fewer and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent, 10 per cent and 1 per cent more than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B, with a council size of 57,

the proposed Longstanton, Papworth & Elsworth and Swavesey wards would contain 32 per cent fewer, 15 per cent fewer and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent more than the average by 2006).

77 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that there is an element of consensus between Scheme A and Scheme B, in particular the proposed retention of the existing Longstanton and Swavesey wards. As a consequence of our decision to base our proposals on the 57-member scheme, we are content to adopt the Scheme B proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations.

78 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Longstanton, Papworth & Elsworth and Swavesey wards would contain 32 per cent fewer, 15 per cent fewer and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Bar Hill, Cottenham, Over and Willingham wards**

79 The existing wards of Bar Hill, Cottenham, Over and Willingham are situated in the north of the district bordering the districts of East Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire. Bar Hill and Cottenham wards are each currently represented by two councillors, while Over and Willingham are currently single-member wards. Bar Hill ward comprises the parishes of Bar Hill and Oakington & Westwick, Cottenham ward comprises the parishes of Cottenham and Rampton, Over ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name and Willingham ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under existing arrangements, all four wards are significantly under-represented, containing 18 per cent, 25 per cent, 16 per cent and 46 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10 per cent, 28 per cent, 13 per cent and 53 per cent more by 2006).

80 At Stage One the District Council put forward different proposals for this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. Under Scheme A it proposed combining part of the existing Bar Hill ward, the southern part of the existing Oakington & Westwick parish (the proposed Oakington South parish ward), with the existing Girton ward to form a revised two-member Girton ward, as detailed above. The remaining part of Oakington & Westwick parish (the proposed Oakington Westwick parish ward) would be combined with Cottenham parish from the existing Cottenham ward to form a revised three-member Cottenham ward, while the remaining part of the existing Bar Hill ward, Bar Hill parish, would form part of a revised Bar Hill ward, as detailed above. The remaining part of the existing Cottenham ward, Rampton parish, would be combined with the existing Over and Willingham wards to form a new three-member Willingham & Over ward. Under these proposals and a council size of 55, the proposed Cottenham and Willingham & Over wards would contain 9 per cent and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

81 Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining part of the existing Bar Hill ward, Bar Hill parish, with part of the existing Coton and Elsworth wards to form a revised two-member Bar Hill ward, as detailed above. It proposed combining the remaining part of the existing Bar

Hill ward, the parish of Oakington & Westwick, with the existing Cottenham ward to form a revised three-member Cottenham ward, arguing that this would be popular with both Cottenham and Rampton. Finally, it proposed that the existing Over and Willingham wards be combined to form a new three-member Willingham & Over ward. Under these proposals and a council size of 57, Cottenham and Willingham & Over wards would contain 6 per cent more and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

82 We received a further five representations in relation to this area. Cottenham Parish Council expressed concern at the proposal under Scheme A to separate Cottenham and Rampton parish councils, stating that “there has been many years of a link between the villages of Cottenham and Rampton”. Rampton Parish Council expressed strong opposition to the proposals under Scheme A and expressed support for the proposals under Scheme B, which would combine Rampton parish in a ward with Cottenham and Oakington & Westwick parishes. It strongly proposed that Rampton and Cottenham parish councils should remain in the same district ward, arguing that “the connections with Rampton are too great to be discarded just to suit numbers”. Councillor Collinson strongly supported the retention of Cottenham and Rampton parishes together in one ward. He expressed strong support for Scheme B, which he argued “works across the district in terms of numbers and avoids the artificial warding of several villages which was a feature of the ‘official’ scheme”. As detailed above, Oakington & Westwick Parish Council strongly opposed the proposed warding of the parish which would occur under Scheme A, and Councillor Flanagan proposed the creation of a single-member Oakington & Westwick ward, and endorsed the views expressed by Oakington & Westwick Parish Council.

83 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that Scheme A received a significant amount of opposition in relation to this area, and note that these areas of concern are addressed under Scheme B, specifically in relation to the proposed Cottenham ward and the proposed warding of Oakington & Westwick parish. We therefore consider that the Scheme B proposals provide for an improved level of electoral equality, while reflecting a number of views expressed at Stage One. As detailed above, we have not been persuaded to adopt the proposals put forward by Oakington & Westwick Parish Council and Councillor Flanagan in relation to the retention of the existing Bar Hill ward and the creation of a district ward coterminous with Oakington & Westwick Parish Council.

84 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Cottenham and Willingham & Over wards would contain 6 per cent more and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Histon and Waterbeach wards**

85 The existing wards of Histon and Waterbeach are situated in the north-eastern corner of the district bordering East Cambridgeshire district. Histon ward is currently represented by three councillors while Waterbeach ward is currently represented by two councillors. Histon ward comprises the parishes of Histon and Impington, while Waterbeach ward comprises the parishes of Landbeach and Waterbeach. Under existing arrangements Histon and Waterbeach

wards contain 16 per cent and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer by 2006).

86 At Stage One the District Council proposed the retention of the existing Histon ward under both Scheme A and Scheme B however, it proposed that it be renamed Histon & Impington ward. The Council argued that “Histon and Impington have for some time been treated as a single settlement in many respects”. Under Scheme B the Council proposed retaining the existing Waterbeach ward, while under Scheme A it proposed combining Waterbeach ward with the existing Milton ward to form a new three-member Waterbeach & Milton ward. The Council stated that “Milton shares its northern boundary with Landbeach and Waterbeach and is linked with them by the major road (A10)”. The Council was unaware that the existing Milton ward is detached, and as a result this issue was not addressed under either Scheme A or B. Under Scheme A, with a council size of 55, the proposed Histon & Impington and Waterbeach & Milton wards would contain 16 per cent and 31 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent and 19 per cent more than the average by 2006). Under Scheme B, with a council size of 57, the proposed Histon & Impington and Waterbeach wards would contain 21 per cent and 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (11 per cent and 2 per cent more than the average by 2006).

87 We received one further submission in relation to this area. We received a joint submission from Waterbeach Parish Council, Landbeach Parish Council and two local councillors. Support was expressed for the proposals under Scheme A, which would result in Waterbeach, Landbeach and Milton parishes being combined in a new three-member Waterbeach & Milton ward. However, the fundamental view expressed was that Waterbeach and Landbeach parishes should not be separated in any proposed new warding, arguing that, “They are in fact one community physically linked and with much in common.” As highlighted above, neither schemes involved separating the two parishes.

88 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. However, we note that the proposal to retain the existing Histon ward is identical under both schemes and that the schemes are broadly similar in relation to the existing Waterbeach ward. We concur with the views expressed under both schemes and in the joint submission received from Waterbeach Parish Council, Landbeach Parish Council and two local councillors that there are strong community links between the parishes of Waterbeach and Landbeach. However, we note that under Scheme A the proposed Waterbeach & Milton ward would be under-represented by 19 per cent by 2006, while under Scheme B the proposed Waterbeach ward would contain 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. We note that both schemes respect the strong ties between the parishes of Waterbeach and Landbeach, but consider that the proposals under Scheme B would also result in an acceptable level of electoral equality.

89 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Histon & Impington and Waterbeach wards would contain 21 per cent and 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (11 per cent and 2 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Milton, Teversham and The Wilbrahams wards**

90 The existing wards of Milton, Teversham and The Wilbrahams are situated in the east of the district bordering East Cambridgeshire district. Each of the three wards is currently represented by a single councillor. Milton ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name, however, this parish is detached, resulting in the creation of a detached district ward. Teversham ward comprises the parishes of Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Teversham, while The Wilbrahams ward comprises the parishes of Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham and Stow cum Quy. Under existing arrangements Milton and Teversham wards are significantly under-represented, containing 76 per cent and 55 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (60 per cent and 44 per cent more by 2006). The Wilbrahams ward contains 35 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (39 per cent fewer by 2006).

91 At Stage One the District Council made different proposals for this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. Under Scheme A it proposed that the existing Milton ward be combined with the existing Waterbeach ward, as detailed above. In relation to the existing Teversham ward, the Council proposed that the existing ward be combined with the parish of Stow cum Quy from the neighbouring The Wilbrahams ward, less the southern end of Teversham parish (the proposed Teversham Foxgloves parish ward), to form a revised single-member Teversham ward. The remaining part of the existing Teversham ward (the proposed Teversham Village parish ward) would be combined with the northern part of the existing Fulbourn ward (the proposed Fulbourn Beechwood parish ward) to form a new single-member East Hinton ward, which the Council argued “reflects the nature of that settlement on the edge of Cambridge”. Finally, the remaining part of the existing The Wilbrahams ward would be combined with the remaining part of the existing Fulbourn ward (the proposed Fulbourn Village parish ward) to form a new two-member Fulbourn & Wilbraham ward. Under these proposals the proposed East Hinton, Fulbourn & Wilbraham and Teversham wards would contain 12 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent more, 7 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

92 Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining the existing Milton ward with the parish of Horningsea from the existing Teversham ward to form a revised two-member Milton ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Teversham ward, the parish of Fen Ditton, would be combined with the existing The Wilbrahams ward to form a revised single-member The Wilbrahams ward, while Teversham parish would be coterminous with a revised single-member Teversham ward. Under these proposals the proposed Milton, The Wilbrahams and Teversham wards would contain 1 per cent fewer, equal to the average and 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10 per cent fewer, 8 per cent fewer and 6 per cent more than the average by 2006).

93 We received two further submissions in relation to this area. Stow cum Quy Parish Council expressed support for the proposals submitted under Scheme B, which would result in combining the parish with the parishes of Great Wilbraham and Little Wilbraham, which it considers to be its “true remaining neighbours”. It strongly opposed any proposals which would result in combining the parish with Milton and the area north of the River Cam. Teversham Parish Council expressed strong support for the creation of a single-member district ward coterminous with the parish, as proposed under Scheme B. It opposed the

creation of a separate parish ward, and consequently district ward, containing the Foxgloves Estate, as proposed under Scheme A, arguing that “the Estate is an integral part of Teversham parish”.

94 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above, subject to one amendment. As previously discussed, South Cambridgeshire District Council currently has two detached wards, Ickleton and Milton. The Ickleton ward anomaly was addressed under both schemes, however, the Council was unaware of the detached Milton ward and as a result the issue was not addressed under either scheme. We therefore propose an amendment resulting in Milton parish being warded, with the proposed Milton parish ward forming part of the proposed Milton ward and the proposed South parish ward, the area bounded by the River Cam and the railway line, forming part of the proposed The Wilbrahams ward. This amendment would result in the proposed Milton ward being over-represented by 15 per cent, however, we have been unable to determine any other viable alternatives which would correct this anomaly and have regard to the identities and interests of the local community in this area. In addition, we note that the proposals under Scheme B would be supported by both Teversham Parish Council and Stow cum Quy Parish Council and we are content to put these proposals forward for consultation, subject to the amendment mentioned above.

95 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Milton, The Wilbrahams and Teversham wards would contain 6 per cent fewer, 10 per cent more and 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (15 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 6 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of this report.

### **Balsham, Castle Camps and Fulbourn wards**

96 The existing wards of Balsham, Castle Camps and Fulbourn are situated in the south-eastern corner of the district. Balsham and Castle Camps wards are each currently single-member wards, while Fulbourn is currently represented by two councillors. Balsham ward comprises the parishes of Balsham, Carlton, Weston Colville and West Wrattling, Castle Camps ward comprises the parishes of Bartlow, Castle Camps, Horseheath, Shudy Camps and West Wickham and Fulbourn ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under the existing arrangements Balsham and Fulbourn wards contain 16 per cent and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent more and 9 per cent fewer by 2006). Castle Camps ward contains 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (25 per cent fewer by 2006).

97 At Stage One the District Council made alternative proposals for this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. Under Scheme A it proposed that part of the existing Fulbourn ward form part of a new East Hinton ward, as detailed above, while the remainder would form part of a new Fulbourn & The Wilbrahams ward, resulting in the consequential warding of Fulbourn parish. It proposed combining the whole of the existing Balsham ward with the whole of the existing Castle Camps ward to form a revised two-member Balsham ward. Under these proposals and a council size of 55, the proposed Balsham ward would contain 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (10 per cent fewer by 2006).

98 Under Scheme B the Council proposed the retention of the existing Fulbourn ward. It proposed combining the existing Balsham ward with the existing Castle Camps ward, less the parish of Bartlow, to form a revised two-member Balsham ward. Bartlow parish would then form part of a revised two-member Linton ward, as detailed below. Under these proposals and a council size of 57, the proposed Balsham and Fulbourn wards would contain equal to the average and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

99 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that the proposed Balsham ward is broadly similar under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, we consider that the retention of the existing Fulbourn ward, as proposed under Scheme B, provides for a better reflection of community identity in this area, and does not require a consequential warding of the parish of Fulbourn.

100 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed Balsham and Fulbourn wards would contain equal to the average and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Abington, Linton and Sawston wards**

101 The existing wards of Abington, Linton and Sawston are situated in the south-eastern corner of the district. Abington ward is currently represented by a single councillor, Linton ward is currently represented by two councillors and Sawston ward is currently represented by three councillors. Abington ward comprises the parishes of Babraham, Great Abington, Little Abington and Pampisford. Linton ward comprises the parishes of Hildersham and Linton and Sawston ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under existing arrangements Abington and Linton wards contain 16 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (24 per cent and 12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Sawston ward contains 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent fewer by 2006).

102 At Stage One the District Council made alternative proposals for this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. Under Scheme A the Council proposed combining the existing Linton ward with Great Abington parish from the existing Abington ward to form a revised two-member Linton ward. Part of the remainder of the existing Abington ward, the parishes of Babraham and Little Abington, would be combined with the existing Stapleford ward to form a revised single-member Stapleford ward, with the Council stating that all three villages lay on the Haverhill Road. The rest of the existing Abington ward, the parish of Pampisford, would be combined with the existing Sawston ward and the parish of Hinxtton, from the existing Ickleton ward, to form a revised three-member Sawston ward. Under these proposals and a council size of 55, the proposed Linton, Sawston and Stapleford wards would contain 15 per cent, 12 per cent and 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent more than the average by 2006).

103 Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining Bartlow parish from the existing Castle Camps ward with the existing Linton ward, as detailed above, to form a revised two-

member Linton ward. The existing Abington ward would be combined with Hinxton parish from the existing Ickleton ward to form a new single-member The Abingtons ward, which the Council argued avoids the division of the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington. Finally, the Council proposed that the existing Sawston ward be retained. Under these proposals and a council size of 57, the proposed Linton, Sawston and The Abingtons wards would contain 3 per cent more, 7 per cent more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent, 2 per cent and 9 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

104 We received three further representations in relation to this area. Great Abington Parish Council strongly opposed Scheme A, which would result in the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington being placed in different district wards. It stated that the two parishes share a number of community links. Under Scheme B Great Abington and Little Abington parishes would form part of the same district ward. Little Abington Parish Council strongly opposed the Council's proposals under Scheme A which would result in separating Great Abington and Little Abington parish councils and combine Little Abington with Stapleford, with which it argued it has "no links whatsoever, one being a rural parish outside the green belt and the other being on the boundary of Cambridge City". It expressed broad support for Scheme B, which would unite the 'Abingtons' in the same district ward, and in addition it stated that a natural linkage for Little Abington parish would also be with Hildersham parish. Stapleford Parish Council expressed support for the existing warding arrangements, opposing the options proposed under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, it proposed that if a revised ward was to be proposed, then Stapleford should be retained as a ward name.

105 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that these proposals would receive a significant degree of local support at Stage One, especially in relation to the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington. We concur with the view that a better reflection of the identities and interests of the local community would be achieved if these two parishes were to be retained in the same district ward. We have not, however, been persuaded that the 'Abingtons' and Hildersham parish should be contained within the same district ward, as proposed by Little Abington Parish Council. This proposal would result in the proposed The Abingtons and Linton wards containing 1 per cent more and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2006. While these are not significantly high levels of electoral equality, on balance we are minded to put forward the proposals under Scheme B for the purposes of our draft recommendations, although we welcome further views on this issue from interested parties at Stage Three. Finally, in relation to the proposals made by Stapleford Parish Council, we note that the retention of the existing ward would result in a variance of 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. We do not consider that there is sufficient justification for this level of electoral inequality to be retained. We do, however, suggest changing the proposed ward name of The Shelfords to The Shelfords & Stapleford in order to reflect the views expressed by Stapleford Parish Council, as detailed below.

106 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Linton, Sawston and The Abingtons wards would contain 3 per cent more, 7 per cent more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent, 2 per cent and 9 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Great Shelford, Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford wards**

107 The existing wards of Great Shelford, Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford are situated in the centre of the district to the south of Cambridge. Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford wards are each all currently represented by a single councillor, while Great Shelford ward is currently represented by two councillors. Great Shelford ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name, Harston ward comprises the parishes of Harston and Newton, Little Shelford ward comprises the parishes of Hauxton and Little Shelford and Stapleford ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under existing arrangements Great Shelford, Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford wards contain 9 per cent, 9 per cent, 35 per cent and 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (15 per cent, 17 per cent, 41 per cent and 25 per cent fewer by 2006).

108 At Stage One the District Council made alternative proposals for part of this area under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, it proposed identical proposals in relation to a revised Harston ward. Under Scheme A, as detailed above, the Council proposed a revised three-member Stapleford ward, comprising the parishes of Babraham, Little Abington and Stapleford. In addition, the Council proposed combining the existing Great Shelford ward with the parish of Little Shelford, from the existing Little Shelford ward, and the parish of Newton from the existing Harston ward, to form a new two-member The Shelfords ward. Finally, the remaining part of the existing Little Shelford ward, Hauxton parish, would be combined with the remaining part of the existing Harston ward, Harston parish, to form a revised single-member Harston ward, arguing that this proposed link “is popular”. Under these proposals and a council size of 55, the proposed Harston and The Shelfords wards would contain 5 per cent and 16 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent fewer and 9 per cent more than the average by 2006).

109 Under Scheme B the Council proposed combining the existing Stapleford ward with the existing Great Shelford ward, together with the parish of Little Shelford from the existing Little Shelford ward, and the parish of Newton from the existing Harston ward, to form a new three-member The Shelfords ward. Under Scheme B the proposals for a revised single-member Harston ward be the same as under Scheme A. Under these proposals and a council size of 57, the proposed Harston and The Shelfords wards would contain 9 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more than the average by 2006).

110 We received one further representation in relation to this area. As detailed above, Stapleford Parish Council expressed support for the existing warding arrangements, opposing the options proposed under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, it proposed that, if a revised ward was to be proposed, then Stapleford should be retained as a ward name.

111 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to base our draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. We note that there is broad consensus between Scheme A and Scheme B, with both schemes putting forward identical proposal in relation to the proposed Harston ward. We do, however, propose one minor amendment in relation to the proposed ward name for The Shelfords ward, as detailed above.

112 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Harston and The Shelfords & Stapleford wards would contain 9 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Electoral Cycle**

113 We received one response regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. Under both Scheme A and Scheme B, the District Council, stated that "currently, the Council is elected by thirds. There is no recommendation to change this."

114 We have carefully considered the comment received. At present the majority view appears to be that the present electoral cycle should be retained and we therefore propose no change.

## **Conclusions**

115 Having considered all the evidence and submissions received during the first stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 55 to 57;
- there should be 34 wards;
- the boundaries of 32 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight, and 10 wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

116 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on Scheme B, the district-wide scheme submitted by a cross-party group of 15 members. However, we propose departing from them in the following areas:

- We propose adopting the Council's proposed Bourn ward as outlined under Scheme A.
- We propose revised Milton and The Wilbrahams wards in order to correct an anomaly which resulted in a detached ward.

- We propose changing the name of the Council's proposed The Shelfords ward to The Shelfords & Stapleford ward.

117 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

*Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	55	57	55	57
Number of wards	42	34	42	34
Average number of electors per councillor	1,818	1,754	1,962	1,894
Number of wards with a variance of more than 10 per cent from the average	26	11	29	4
Number of wards with a variance of more than 20 per cent from the average	16	4	21	0

118 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 26 to 11. By 2006 only four wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

South Cambridgeshire District Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 34 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inside the back cover of this report. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

### **Parish Council Electoral Arrangements**

119 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parish of Milton to reflect the proposed district wards.

120 The parish of Milton is currently served by 15 councillors and is unwarded. The parish is currently detached. Under existing arrangements the detached Milton parish results in the creation of the detached Milton district ward. As previously discussed, the District Council was unaware that the parish was detached and consequently did not address this anomaly within either Scheme A or Scheme B. As we are not minded to recommend the creation or retention of detached wards, we propose warding the parish of Milton and combining each of the parish wards with areas with which they share closer geographical links. We propose that the proposed Milton parish ward, which will be represented by 14 councillors, should form part of the revised Milton ward, while the proposed South parish ward, which will be represented by one councillor, should form part of the revised The Wilbrahams ward.

**Draft Recommendation**

Milton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Milton ward (returning 14 councillors) and South ward (returning one councillor). Milton parish ward should form part of the revised Milton district ward and South parish ward should form part of the revised The Wilbrahams district ward, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

121 The parish of Little Wilbraham is currently served by seven councillors and is not warded. At Stage One, at the request of the Parish Council, the District Council proposed under both Scheme A and Scheme B that the parish be divided into two wards in order to reflect the distinct areas of Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom. As this proposal does not have consequential effects on our proposed district wards in this area, we are content to put it forward for consultation.

**Draft Recommendation**

Little Wilbraham Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Little Wilbraham (returning five councillors) and Six Mile Bottom (returning two councillors). Both parish wards will be contained within our revised The Wilbrahams district ward, and are illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

122 As discussed previously in paragraphs 65 and 66, the District Council proposed that the parishes of Bourn and Caxton be warded in order to facilitate the ongoing Cambourn development site. We have been unable to facilitate this proposal for the reasons outlined above. Under the provisions of the Local Government and Rating Act 1997, district councils may undertake reviews of the parish arrangements in their own areas. We recommend that when we have completed the PER of South Cambridgeshire District Council, there would be considerable benefit if in the future, South Cambridgeshire District Council conducted such a review.

123 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish councils in the district.

**Draft Recommendation**

Parish council elections should continue to take place every four years, at the same time as elections for the district ward of which they are part.

*Map 2: Draft Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire*



## 5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

124 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 28 January 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

125 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
South Cambridgeshire Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

126 In the light of responses received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Electoral Commission, which cannot make the Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire: Detailed Mapping**

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within South Cambridgeshire district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on the large map at the back of this report.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for eastern part of the district.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire: Key Map*

## APPENDIX B

### Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, [www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm](http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm), requires all Government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-departmental public bodies, such as the Local Government Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

*Table B1: LGCE Compliance with Code Criteria*

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.