

# Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council

Electoral review

September 2016

## **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary 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 100049926 2016

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	7
Final recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	10
Cambridge City	11
East Cambridgeshire District	15
Fenland District	18
Huntingdonshire District	20
South Cambridgeshire District	25
Conclusions	31
Parish electoral arrangements	32
3 What happens next?	35

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council	36
B Submissions received	41
C Glossary and abbreviations	44

# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Cambridgeshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Cambridgeshire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Cambridgeshire. Overall, 32% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%.

## Our proposals for Cambridgeshire

Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 69 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a decrease in council size by eight to 61 members will ensure the Council can perform its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Cambridgeshire County Council's 61 councillors should represent 57 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. Four of our proposed 59 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Cambridgeshire by 2021.

**We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements in Cambridgeshire.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Cambridgeshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during our consultation have informed our final recommendations. This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
21 October 2014	Decision on council size
28 October 2014	Division pattern consultation
12 May 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
7 July 2015	Analysis of submissions received
3 November 2015	Further limited consultation for Cambridge City
9 February 2016	Publication of initial Final recommendations
10 May 2016	Publication of New Draft recommendations
6 September 2016	Publication of Final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

our recommendations.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Peter Knight CBE

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	<b>2014</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Cambridgeshire	478,908	521,380
Number of councillors	61	61
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547

10 Under our final recommendations, four of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Cambridgeshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the originally scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9%. The highest proportion of this growth across the county is expected in Cambridge with significant development in the Arbury and Trumpington areas.

15 During our initial consultation on division arrangements, we received several queries from members of the public regarding the electorate forecasts. In each instance we raised these with Cambridgeshire County Council. Following these discussions, we made some changes to the projections for Cambridge City at the beginning of the review but noted that, regardless of any change to the projected electorate, it would have little effect on electoral variances overall.

16 During the consultation on the new draft recommendations, towards the very end of the review, we received comments from a councillor about the electorate forecasts for St Neots. We contacted Cambridgeshire County Council, which had supplied and confirmed the original detailed forecasts on which boundaries across the county were based. It indicated that planning permission for the proposed Wintringham Park housing development in the east of St Neots had not now been granted. This has implications for electoral equality in the St Neots East & Gransden division. However, to make significant changes at this stage would have implications not only in this area but much more broadly. Our guidance makes clear that the forecasts provided, and agreed, at the beginning of a review are those that will be used as the base forecast throughout. To do otherwise, and make forecasting changes as developments start, are delayed or even abandoned, would make it impossible to draw reliable boundaries. This is why we work with local authorities to get the best possible forecast at the outset. While we acknowledge the uncertainty associated with future development sites in the St Neots area, and particularly in St Neots East & Gransden division, the area is still forecast to experience significant housing growth beyond 2021. It is likely, therefore, that the electoral variance for St Neots East & Gransden division will continue to improve over a longer period of time.

17 Having carefully considered all the evidence received, we have therefore decided that it would be inappropriate to move away from the original electorate forecasts as supplied to us, and agreed, at the start of this review. Given that we have undertaken two periods of further consultation, the publication of these final recommendations has already been delayed. Accordingly, whilst recognising that there might be greater variance in parts of St Neots than might normally be the case in the short- to medium-term, we are content that the forecasts remain a broadly accurate reflection of the likely electorate in 2021. The figures shown in Table A1 of this report are those originally supplied by the County Council.

## Council size

18 Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 69 councillors. The County Council submitted a proposal to decrease the council size from 69 to 63 members. The Liberal Democrat Group on Cambridgeshire County Council submitted a

proposal to increase council size from 69 to 71. We requested further information from the County Council as to whether it had considered alternative council sizes and why any alternatives would be less effective than 63 councillors. The Council responded that it had considered alternative sizes based on 57, 59, 61 and 63 councillors.

19 Having considered both submissions, we decided the County Council's evidence was more persuasive. The County Council demonstrated that it could operate efficiently and effectively under its proposed council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 63 councillors.

20 As we developed our draft recommendations, we discovered that 63 councillors did not provide the best allocation of county councillors between Cambridgeshire's five districts. We examined alternative division arrangements under council sizes of between 64 and 61 members. We concluded that 61 councillors would ensure a good allocation of councillors across Cambridgeshire. As stated in our guidance, we will use our discretion to vary the number of councillors from the figure previously agreed if we find that an alternative will provide 'a better fit' of divisions across the county. On this basis we put forward draft recommendations based on a council size of 61 members.

21 While some respondents expressed concern at this change, particularly in the East Cambridgeshire area, we remain of the view that 61 councillors will allow the authority to function effectively, while ensuring an effective allocation of councillors between the districts of Cambridgeshire. We also consider that it will continue to ensure the effective representation of electors in East Cambridgeshire. On the basis of information received during consultation, we have put forward final recommendations based on a council size of 61 members.

22 A council size of 61 provides the following allocation between the district councils in the county. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of district and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Cambridge City – 12 councillors (36%)
- East Cambridgeshire – eight councillors (64%)<sup>4</sup>
- Fenland – nine councillors (75%)
- Huntingdonshire – 17 councillors (42%)<sup>5</sup>
- South Cambridgeshire – 15 councillors (56%)<sup>6</sup>

## Division patterns

23 During consultation on division patterns, we received 63 submissions. While we did not receive a submission from the County Council, the Cambridge Labour Group submitted a county-wide proposal. Cambridge City Council and the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association submitted district-wide proposals for Cambridge City and Fenland respectively. The remainder of the submissions

---

<sup>4</sup> Coterminosity based on the final recommendations for East Cambridgeshire District Council.

<sup>5</sup> Coterminosity based on the draft recommendations for Huntingdonshire District Council.

<sup>6</sup> Coterminosity based on the draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District Council.

provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of the county.

## Draft recommendations

24 We received 313 submissions during consultation on our new draft recommendations. Submissions were received for each of the five districts in the county. In particular, we received proposals for alternative division arrangements in Cambridge, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland and South Cambridgeshire districts.

## Final recommendations

### **Cambridge City**

25 We received 147 submissions relating to Cambridge City. These included city-wide proposals for 12 single-member divisions for Cambridge. Over 80 respondents objected to the boundary between Abbey and Petersfield divisions and our two-member Trumpington & Queen Edith's division. For other areas of the city, we received submissions proposing boundary modifications to Arbury, Castle, Cherry Hinton, Newnham and Romsey divisions.

26 After considering the evidence from respondents, we have amended the boundary between Abbey and Petersfield divisions to follow the rear of properties on Silverwood Close and along part of New Street and Occupation Road. Abbey division would have an electoral variance of -16% by 2021. While we acknowledge that this is a relatively high variance, this was balanced against the very strong community evidence received to justify the proposed change. We have also adopted the single-member divisions of Trumpington and Queen Edith's, which take into account evidence received from local respondents that Trumpington and Queen Edith's should be in separate divisions.

27 We confirm Arbury, Castle, Cherry Hinton, Chesterton, King's Hedges, Market, Newnham and Romsey divisions as final.

### **East Cambridgeshire District**

28 We received 53 submissions relating to East Cambridgeshire District. All but two respondents objected to the new draft recommendations. In particular, our proposed two-member Fordham Villages & Soham South and Littleport West divisions were opposed by all the respondents. We also received multiple objections to divide Littleport between divisions and to include part of Littleport with Soham. Three alternative division patterns were submitted. One of these was based on nine councillors although the further draft recommendations had made it clear that the correct allocation for a council size of 61 was eight councillors and we were, therefore, unable to consider adopting this scheme. Two largely identical division patterns were based on the correct allocation of eight councillors and have helped shape our final recommendations. Our detailed assessment has been informed by all of the arguments submitted (including those based on the incorrect allocation) and we believe that we have been able to accommodate most of the local evidence received in our final recommendations.

29 We considered the pattern submitted by East Cambridgeshire District Council for nine single-member divisions under a council size of 63. The pattern proposed to

divide Sutton parish between two divisions. However, this was explicitly opposed by 15 respondents from Sutton parish who argued that on grounds of community identity, the parish be wholly contained in a single division. We also re-considered the wider impact on variances across the county of allocating nine single-member divisions to East Cambridgeshire. Doing so would result in unacceptably higher electoral variances across the county than under a council size of 61. Accordingly, we are not persuaded that the proposals of East Cambridgeshire District Council justify changing the allocation of councillors for the District.

30 We have decided to adopt the alternative pattern put forward by a Liberal Democrat councillor for eight single-member divisions. This particular division pattern has been strongly argued and better aligns with evidence put forward by other respondents in the district. We consider the proposals better reflect the three statutory criteria and have not divided the parishes of Littleport and Sutton both of which presented strong evidence in support of retaining their overall physical integrity. The proposals also ensure the rural areas of Ely parish are not included in divisions with Littleport or Soham, again reflecting local evidence that was presented to us during consultation. We consider our recommendations go with the grain of evidence submitted during previous phases of consultation. It is also consistent with some of the district ward boundaries agreed in the final recommendations for East Cambridgeshire. In particular, Littleport division is coterminous with its parish and district ward, the south of Soham is grouped with Wicken parish and the division boundary between Haddenham and Sutton is consistent with the district ward boundary as well.

### **Fenland District**

31 We received 15 submissions relating to Fenland District. All of the respondents objected to the new draft recommendations. In particular, our divisions covering March, Whittlesey, Wisbech St Mary parishes, and the south-west of Fenland were all opposed by respondents. Two alternative division patterns were submitted – one based on 10 councillors and one based on nine councillors.

32 We considered a division pattern of 10 single-member divisions for Fenland but were not persuaded that it would provide for clear and identifiable boundaries in March. As with our considerations in East Cambridgeshire, we are not persuaded that altering the allocation of councillors for the district would ensure good electoral equality or provide for clear division boundaries.

33 We considered an alternative pattern of nine single-member divisions submitted by a Liberal Democrat councillor. The alternative pattern resulted in the creation of a division which comprised Christchurch, Elm, Manea and Wisbech St Mary parishes. These parishes do not share clear road access. Furthermore, the division spans a large geographical area which would combine disparate communities that do not appear to share community identities. We have therefore decided to confirm our new draft recommendations for Fenland District as final.

### **Huntingdonshire District**

34 We received 77 submissions relating to Huntingdonshire District. The majority of the submissions came from respondents in St Neots. Out of the 77 submissions, 71 respondents and a petition from 247 local residents objected to our proposals which divided the Eaton Ford area between St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton and St Neots The Eatons. We are persuaded by the evidence received from local residents

and councillors in this area and have decided to modify our recommendations. We propose that the division boundary follows the River Great Ouse to unite Eaton Ford in St Neots The Eatons division. While this division would have an electoral variance of 12%, we consider the strong community evidence justifies this division. We have also modified our recommendations for St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton division. We have included an area of St Neots between Church Street and Cambridge Street in the division to achieve good electoral equality.

35 As noted in the electorate forecasts section of this report, we are aware that the overall electorate forecasts for the St Neots and surrounding area have been queried. However, for the reasons indicated, we have been unable to make changes at this stage and have used the original forecast put forward by the County Council as the basis of these final recommendations. Despite the potentially greater variance than envisaged in the original forecast, we believe that the ward divisions, including the changes described above, reflect both the statutory criteria and local wishes.

36 We have decided to confirm our recommendations for the remainder of the district as final.

### **South Cambridgeshire District**

37 We received 33 submissions relating to South Cambridgeshire District. We received support for our recommendations from 11 respondents. The remaining objections came from localised areas across South Cambridgeshire.

38 Alternative patterns for eight and six new divisions were put forward by the Cambridgeshire Labour Group and a Liberal Democrat councillor respectively. These covered the south and west of the district. The division patterns appeared to take into account some of the objections to our recommendations from respondents in Foxton, Meldreth and Shepreth parishes. However, the alternative division patterns transferred parishes which had supported our recommendations into completely new divisions. Taking all of the evidence into account we have decided to confirm our recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District as final.

## Detailed divisions

39 The tables on pages 11–30 detail our final recommendations for each district in Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>7</sup> criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

---

<sup>7</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Cambridge City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Abbey</b>	1	-16%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Barnwell community.	The response to our proposed Abbey division mainly consisted of local residents in Petersfield who objected to roads adjoining Abbey Walk, St Matthew's Gardens and part of Sturton Street being included in this division. We are persuaded that the objections to our proposals for Abbey division are supported by strong community evidence and we have decided to modify our new draft recommendations. The boundary is moved north to follow the rear of properties on Silverwood Close and along part of New Street and Occupation Road. The electoral variance of Abbey division will be -16% by 2021. While this electoral variance is beyond what we would normally accept, the very strong evidence in support of this change makes a compelling case for an electoral variance in excess of 10%. Our modified Abbey division forms part of our final recommendations.
<b>Arbury</b>	1	-1%	This division lies in the north-west of the city and comprises the Arbury community.	We received a submission from the Cambridgeshire Labour Group which proposed a modified Arbury division. The proposal would require changes in neighbouring Castle division for which we had no evidence in support. Therefore, we have not modified our recommendations for this division. We did not receive any further submissions specifically relating to Arbury division. Therefore, we confirm the division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Castle</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the Castle area of Cambridge.	We received a submission from the Cambridgeshire Labour Group which proposed a modified Castle division. We are not persuaded we have received sufficient evidence to support making changes to Castle division. We also have received support from two respondents for our proposed Castle division. Therefore, we have not modified our

				proposals here and confirm the division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Cherry Hinton</b>	1	3%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Cherry Hinton community.	A local resident commented on our proposals for Cherry Hinton division. They proposed moving cul-de-sacs on Cherry Hinton Road, between Mowbray Road and Cherry Hinton Hall, into a division with Queen Edith's. It was also proposed that Queen Edith's Way and adjoining roads as well as land to the east of Limekiln Road be transferred to Cherry Hinton division. However, we are not persuaded to adopt these changes and recognise that our proposed division is supported by local respondents in Cambridge. We have therefore not amended our recommendations for Cherry Hinton division.
<b>Chesterton</b>	1	3%	This division lies to the north-east of the city centre and is bounded by the River Cam to the south. The division comprises the Chesterton community.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Chesterton division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>King's Hedges</b>	1	5%	This division lies to the north of the city centre and comprises the King's Hedges area and parts of the East Chesterton community.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for King's Hedges division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Market</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises the centre of Cambridge, Cambridge University colleges and residential areas west of East Road.	The Cambridgeshire Labour Group proposed to transfer properties on Evening Court and Kingsley Walk from Market division to Abbey division. However, we have not received any further evidence that would support making this change. We consider the Elizabeth Way Bridge to be a strong divide between communities on either side. We have therefore not amended our recommendations for Market division.

<b>Newnham</b>	1	-12%	This division comprises the Newnham area and Churchill College to the north of Madingley Road.	We received two submissions in support of our new draft recommendations for Newnham division. Therefore, we confirm the proposed Newnham division as final.
<b>Petersfield</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the Newtown and Petersfield areas of Cambridge.	<p>In response to our new draft recommendations for Petersfield division, we received over 40 submissions. The majority of respondents were local residents who objected to roads adjoining Abbey Walk, St Matthew's Gardens and part of Sturton Street being included in Abbey division. All of the local residents proposed the above roads be transferred to Petersfield division.</p> <p>We are persuaded that the objections to our proposals for Petersfield division are supported by strong community evidence and we have decided to modify our recommendations. The boundary is moved to include roads adjoining Abbey Walk, St Matthews Gardens and part of Sturton Street in Petersfield division. We consider this change reflects the community identities of local residents in this part of Cambridge.</p>
<b>Queen Edith's</b>	1	-2%	This division lies in the south east of the city and comprises the Queen Edith's community.	The majority of local residents in the Queen Edith's area of Cambridge were opposed to our proposed two-member Trumpington & Queen Edith's division. They preferred the division be split into two single-member divisions. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed to divide our two-member division using Hills Road and the site of Addenbrooke's Hospital. We are persuaded by this change as it reflects the strong community evidence submitted that Queen Edith's does not share strong community identities with Trumpington. We have modified our recommendations and propose a single-member Queen Edith's division. We consider this division effectively balances our three statutory

				criteria and it forms part of our final recommendations.
<b>Romsey</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the Romsey community between Cherry Hinton Road and the railway line.	The Cambridgeshire Labour Group proposed to transfer properties on the north side of Cherry Hinton Road from our proposed Trumpington & Queen Edith's division to Romsey division. However, the proposed change would result in an electoral variance in excess of 20%. We have not received further evidence to support this change. We also have received four submissions in support of our recommendations for Romsey division. Therefore, we have not amended our recommendations for this division and confirm it as final.
<b>Trumpington</b>	1	-3%	This division lies in the south-west of the city and comprises the Trumpington community.	The majority of local residents in the Trumpington area of Cambridge were opposed to our proposed two-member Trumpington & Queen Edith's division. They preferred the division be split into two single-member divisions. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed to divide our two-member division using Hills Road and Addenbrooke's Hospital. As mentioned in the Queen Edith's section of this report, we are persuaded by this change and have therefore modified our recommendations for this division. We consider this division satisfies our three statutory criteria and it forms part of our final recommendations.

## East Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Burwell</b>	1	10%	The division comprises Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell and Swaffham Prior.	Our new draft recommendations were opposed by the District Council and local respondents. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed an alternative division called Burwell. We are content that the proposed division takes into account the views of respondents who objected to our proposals and provides for effective and convenient local government. We note the division's electoral variance is 10%. However, we are satisfied that the evidence in support of this division justifies this relatively high electoral variance.
<b>Ely North</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the north and east of Ely and the areas of Chettisham and Prickwillow.	We received objections to our new draft recommendations which included part of Ely and its rural area with Littleport and Soham. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed two alternative divisions within Ely's parish boundaries. We consider these two divisions better reflect community identities and will result in good electoral equality.
<b>Ely South</b>	1	3%	This division comprises north west and south west areas of Ely and the area of Stuntney.	We also note the proposed divisions respect the separate identities of Ely, Littleport and Soham. Therefore, we have modified our recommendations here.
<b>Littleport</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Littleport parish.	Our new draft recommendations were opposed by the District Council, councillors and local residents. We received an alternative division pattern from a Liberal Democrat councillor who proposed a Littleport division which would be coterminous with Littleport parish. We consider this division better reflects community identities and have therefore adopted it as part of our final recommendations.

<b>Soham North &amp; Isleham</b>	1	12%	This division comprises the Isleham parish and the northern part of Soham parish.	Our new draft recommendations were opposed by the District Council, Soham Town Council and local respondents. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed a division which included North Soham with the parish of Isleham. We are content that the proposed division takes into account the views of respondents who objected to our proposals. In particular, Soham North & Isleham division does not include any parts of Ely and Littleport. We note the division's electoral variance is 12%. However, we are satisfied that the evidence in support of this division has justified this relatively high electoral variance.
<b>Soham South &amp; Haddenham</b>	1	7%	This division comprises Haddenham, Wilburton, Stretham, Thetford, Wicken and part of Soham parish.	Our new draft recommendations were opposed by the District Council, councillors and local residents. A Liberal Democrat councillor proposed a division which included South Soham with parishes in the west of the district. We are satisfied that the proposed division takes into account the evidence provided by local respondents and therefore adopt it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Sutton</b>	1	3%	This division comprises Coveney, Downham, Mepal, Sutton, Wentworth, Witcham and Witchford parishes.	Our new draft recommendations were opposed by respondents in this part of East Cambridgeshire. We received an alternative division pattern from a Liberal Democrat councillor who proposed a Sutton division. We are content that the proposed division reflects community identities and will provide for good electoral equality. We have therefore adopted it as part of our final recommendations.

<b>Woodditton</b>	1	7%	This division comprises Ashley, Bottisham, Brinkley, Burrough Green, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kirtling, Lode, Stetchworth, Swaffham Bulbeck, Westley Waterless and Woodditton parishes.	We did not receive any specific comments relating to Woodditton division. However, in order to achieve good electoral equality between divisions we have accepted the proposal of a Liberal Democrat councillor to include Swaffham Bulbeck parish in Woodditton division. Subject to this change we confirm our proposals for Woodditton division as final.
-------------------	---	----	--	--

## Fenland District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Chatteris</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the whole of Chatteris parish.	<p>We received 15 submissions relating to Fenland District. All of the respondents objected to our recommendations for March, Whittlesey, Wisbech St Mary and the south-west of Fenland. Alternative patterns were received providing for both nine and 10 single-member divisions.</p> <p>We have decided to base our final recommendations on nine county councillors for Fenland. We considered the wider impact that 10 county councillors would have on electoral equality in other districts in Cambridgeshire. We found that electoral variances would be higher under 63 councillors and the allocation of members between districts would not be correct.</p> <p>The alternative pattern of nine single-member divisions resulted in the creation of a division which comprised Christchurch, Elm, Manea and Wisbech St Mary parishes. The proposed division did not have clear road access. To transverse the proposed division by road, particularly between Elm and Christchurch parishes, requires leaving the county. Although the division would result in good electoral equality, we consider it does not reflect community identities or provide for effective and convenient local government.</p> <p>We also looked at whether we could propose an alternative pattern of nine single-member divisions for Fenland district which did not include the above division. However, we were unable to find an alternative pattern that would adequately meet the statutory criteria.</p>
<b>March North &amp; Waldersey</b>	2	7%	This division comprises the northern part of March parish and the parishes of Christchurch, Elm and part of Wisbech St Mary parish.	
<b>March South &amp; Rural</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the southern part of March parish and the parishes of Manea and Wimblington.	
<b>Roman Bank &amp; Peckover</b>	1	8%	This division comprises Gorefield, Leverington, Newton, Parson Drove and Tydd St Giles parishes. It also includes parts of Wisbech and Wisbech St Mary parishes.	
<b>Whittlesey North</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises Bassenhally, Stonald and part of the St Andrews area of Whittlesey.	
<b>Whittlesey South</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the district wards of Benwick, Coates & Eastrea and Lattersey and part of the St Andrews area. It also comprises Benwick and Doddington parishes and	

			the rural part of March parish.	We therefore propose that these six divisions are confirmed as part of our final recommendations. While we note the views and objections of respondents to our recommendations for Fenland District, we are satisfied that the proposed divisions will ensure both good electoral equality and provide for effective and convenient local government.
<b>Wisbech East</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises the district wards of Kirkgate, Octavia Hill and Staithe.	Other than the alternative division patterns put forward for Fenland District we did not receive any specific comments on our new draft recommendations for Wisbech East and Wisbech West divisions. Both divisions provide for good electoral equality and are coterminous with district wards. Therefore, we confirm Wisbech East and Wisbech West divisions as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Wisbech West</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the district wards of Clarkson, Medworth and Waterlees.	

## Huntingdonshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Alconbury &amp; Kimbolton</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises Alconbury, Alconbury Weston, Barham & Woolley, Brington & Molesworth, Buckworth, Bythorn & Keyston, Catworth, Covington, Easton, Ellington, Great Gidding, Great Staughton, Hail Weston, Hamerton & Steeple Gidding, Kimbolton, Leighton, Little Gidding, Old Weston, Perry, Spaldwick, Stow Longa, Tilbrook, Upton & Coppingford and Winwick parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Alconbury & Kimbolton division. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Brampton &amp; Buckden</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises Brampton, Buckden, Diddington, Grafham, Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy and Southoe & Midloe parishes.	We received support for our new draft recommendations from a local organisation. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Godmanchester &amp; Huntingdon South</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Godmanchester parish and a part of Huntingdon parish to the south of American Lane and Priory Road.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Godmanchester & Huntingdon South division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.

<b>Huntingdon North &amp; Hartford</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the north of Huntingdon parish, including the areas of Hartford and Sapley.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Huntingdon North & Hartford division. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Huntingdon West</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the centre and west of Huntingdon parish.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Huntingdon West division. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Ramsey &amp; Bury</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Bury and Ramsey parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Ramsey & Bury division. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>St Ives North &amp; Wyton</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the north of St Ives parish and Wyton-on-the-Hill parish.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for St Ives North & Wyton division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>St Ives South &amp; Needingworth</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the south of St Ives parish and Holywell-cum-Needingworth parish.	Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council objected to our new draft recommendations. It argued that the parish should be transferred to Somersham & Earith division. However, the proposed change would result in this division having an electoral variance of over 30%. We do not consider persuasive evidence has been received to justify such a high electoral variance and confirm the proposed St Ives South & Needingworth division as final.

<b>St Neots East &amp; Gransden</b>	1	0%	This division comprises part of a new development in St Neots, east of the railway and Abbotsley, Great Gransden, Great Paxton, Toseland, Waresley-cum-Tetworth and Yelling parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on the boundaries for St Neots East & Gransden division. However, as stated earlier in this report, the electorate forecasts for the division were challenged by a local councillor. The councillor commented that a future housing development to be located in the east of St Neots should not have been taken into account. Under the councillor's adjusted forecasts, St Neots East & Gransden division would have an electoral variance in excess of 20%. The County Council verified the comments of the councillor. However, the Council has also stated that the area in question is still forecast to experience significant housing growth beyond 2021. As stated earlier in this report, while we recognise the uncertainty with regard to likely growth in this area, we have decided to use the original forecasts for St Neots as agreed at the start of this review. We have therefore decided to confirm our proposed division as final.
<b>St Neots Eynesbury</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the east of St Neots which includes the Eynesbury area.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on the boundaries for St Neots Eynesbury division. However, we have transferred an area between Cambridge Street and Church Street to neighbouring St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton division in order to improve electoral equality there. Subject to this change, we confirm St Neots Eynesbury as part of our final recommendations.
<b>St Neots Priory Park &amp; Little Paxton</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the parish of St Neots north of Fox Brook and Little Paxton parish.	Little Paxton Parish Council supported our recommendations as it related to the parish. The majority of comments relating to this division were from local residents who objected to part of Eaton Ford being included in this division. We are persuaded by the evidence submitted by local residents who proposed that Eaton Ford not be

				divided between divisions. Therefore, we have decided to modify our recommendations for this division. The result of this change would be an electoral variance of 11%, so we have transferred an area between Cambridge Street and Church Street to this division to improve electoral equality.
<b>St Neots The Eatons</b>	1	12%	This division comprises the Eaton Ford and Eaton Socon areas of St Neots.	We received 71 submissions and a petition from local respondents in the Eaton Ford area of St Neots. All of the respondents objected to splitting Eaton Ford between two divisions. It was proposed that the division boundary follow the River Great Ouse. We have considered the views of respondents in Eaton Ford and decided to modify our recommendations for St Neots The Eatons. Local respondents have put forward strong community evidence that Eaton Ford should not be divided between divisions. The river also provides a strong barrier between communities on either side. While this modification results in an electoral variance of 12%, we consider the strength of community evidence justifies this relatively high electoral variance.
<b>Sawtry &amp; Stilton</b>	1	7%	This division comprises Alwalton, Chesterton, Conington, Denton & Caldecote, Elton, Folksworth & Washingley, Glatton, Haddon, Holme, Morborne, Sawtry, Sibson-cum-Stibbington, Stilton and Water Newton parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Sawtry & Stilton division. We are satisfied that the division provides the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.

<b>Somersham &amp; Earith</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Bluntisham, Broughton, Colne, Earith, Kings Ripton, Old Hurst, Pidley-cum-Fenton, Somersham and Woodhurst parishes.	We received a submission from Kings Ripton Parish Council which preferred to be included in Warboys & The Stukeleys division. This proposal was supported by Wood Walton Parish Council. However, we do not consider the evidence received justified an electoral variance in excess of 10%. Therefore, we have not amended our recommendations for this division.
<b>The Hemingfords &amp; Fenstanton</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Fenstanton, Hemingford Abbots, Hemingford Grey, Hilton and Houghton & Wyton parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for The Hemingfords & Fenstanton division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Warboys &amp; The Stukeleys</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Abbots Ripton, The Stukeleys, Upwood & The Raveleys, Warboys, Wistow and Wood Walton parishes.	Wood Walton Parish Council argued that Kings Ripton parish should be transferred to this division. In comparison with other divisions in the district, we are not persuaded we have received sufficient evidence to justify an electoral variance above 10%. We have therefore decided to confirm our recommendations for Warboys & The Stukeleys division as final.
<b>Yaxley &amp; Farcet</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Farcet and Yaxley parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Yaxley & Farcet division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.

## South Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bar Hill</b>	1	2%	This division comprises Bar Hill, Dry Drayton, Lolworth and Girton parishes.	We received support from two parish councils relating to this division. We are satisfied that Bar Hill division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Cambourne</b>	1	-10%	This division comprises Bourn, Cambourne, Little Gransden and Longstowe parishes.	We received submissions from Little Gransden and Longstowe parish councils which wished to be grouped in Gamlingay division. However, this change would result in Cambourne division having an electoral variance of 14%. While we have accepted higher electoral variances in other parts of Cambridgeshire, we do not consider the evidence for this change is sufficiently persuasive. We consider that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and have decided to confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Cottenham &amp; Willingham</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Cottenham, Rampton and Willingham parishes.	Cottenham Parish Council objected to our new draft recommendations. The parish wished to be included with Histon and Impington parishes in a two-member division. However, a two-member division comprising the three parishes would result in an electoral variance of 20%. We do not consider the evidence persuasively justifies such a high electoral variance or to create another two-member division. It would also require substantial modifications to adjoining divisions for which we have no evidence. We have decided to confirm our recommendations for Cottenham & Willingham division as final.

<b>Duxford</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Duxford, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great & Little Chishill, Heydon, Hinxton, Ickleton, Pampisford, Shepreth, Thriplow and Whittlesford parishes.	<p>We received five submissions in support of our proposed Duxford division. Respondents supported Shepreth and Foxton parishes being grouped together in the same division. Pampisford Parish Council also supported our proposed division. However, Foxton Parish Council commented that the parish should be grouped in a division with Melbourn parish. A few local respondents also proposed that Foxton and Shepreth parishes be grouped in a division with Melbourn parish. An alternative division pattern was submitted by the Cambridgeshire Labour Group and a Liberal Democrat councillor which was different to our new draft recommendations.</p> <p>After considering the evidence received, we have decided not to modify our recommendations. Our proposed Duxford division is supported by a number of respondents and the alternative division pattern received would require changes to adjoining divisions for which we have little or no evidence to support. Therefore, we have decided to confirm Duxford division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Fulbourn</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the southern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Fulbourn, Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham, Stow-cum-Quy and Teversham parishes.	<p>We received two submissions objecting to our proposed Fulbourn division. Fen Ditton Parish Council preferred to be wholly included in Fulbourn division. This was supported by Horningsea Parish Council which also preferred to be included in Fulbourn division.</p> <p>As regards to Fen Ditton parish, we are constrained by the fact that a detached Waterbeach division would result if Fen Ditton was wholly contained in Fulbourn division. Therefore, we are unable to amend our new draft recommendations in this respect. We consider that transferring Horningsea parish to this division will not provide for effective and convenient local government as that part of Fen Ditton parish in</p>

				Waterbeach division would be isolated from the rest of the division. Therefore, we confirm our proposed Fulbourn division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Gamlingay</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises Abington Pigotts, Arrington, Barrington, Croydon, Gamlingay, Guilden Morden, Hatley, Litlington, Orwell, Shingay-cum-Wendy, Steeple Morden, Tadlow and Wimpole parishes.	<p>We received six submissions specifically relating to this division. Hatley Parish Council supported our proposed Gamlingay division. Two parishes grouped in Cambourne division preferred to be grouped in Gamlingay division. This was supported by a local resident. We also received alternative division patterns from the Cambridgeshire Labour Group and a Liberal Democrat councillor which were significantly different from our new draft recommendations.</p> <p>After considering the evidence received, we have decided not to modify our recommendations. The alternative division proposed would include parishes from Hardwick division. These parishes have previously provided evidence to justify remaining in that division. We have therefore decided to confirm Gamlingay division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Hardwick</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Barton, Caldecote, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Great Eversden, Harlton, Hardwick, Kingston, Little Eversden, Madingley and Toft parishes.	<p>We received five submissions relating to Hardwick division. Barton Parish Council supported Madingley parish being included in the division. Although Harlton parish is included in our proposed division, it and Haslingfield parish preferred to be grouped together in the same division. The two alternative division patterns received for Hardwick division did not place Harlton and Haslingfield in the same division.</p> <p>After considering the evidence received, we have decided not to modify our recommendations. The proposal to include Haslingfield in Hardwick division resulted in an electoral variance of 28%. We do not consider the evidence is persuasive enough to justify such a high electoral variance.</p>

				We also consider that the proposal to transfer Harlton parish to Gamlingay division would go against the evidence provided by the parish that it be located in Hardwick division. Therefore, we confirm Hardwick division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Histon &amp; Impington</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Histon, Impington and Orchard Park parishes.	We did not receive any submissions that commented specifically on our proposals for Histon & Impington division. We are satisfied that the division provides for the best balance of our statutory criteria and confirm it as final.
<b>Linton</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Balsham, Bartlow, Carlton, Castle Camps, Great Abington, Hildersham, Horseheath, Linton, Little Abington, Shudy Camps, Weston Colville, West Wickham and West Wratting parishes.	Little Abington Parish Council supported our proposed division. We did not receive any other submissions relating to this division and we confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Longstanton, Northstowe &amp; Over</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Longstanton, Oakington & Westwick and Over parishes.	Longstanton Parish Council supported our proposed division. We did not receive any other submissions relating to this division and we confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Melbourn &amp; Bassingbourn</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Melbourn, Meldreth and Whaddon parishes.	We received seven submissions relating to Melbourn & Bassingbourn division. A local resident supported our recommendations. We received proposals to group Foxton and Shepreth parishes with Meldreth parish in Melbourn & Bassingbourn division. We also received an alternative division pattern from the Cambridgeshire Labour Group and a Liberal Democrat councillor. After considering the evidence received, we have decided not to modify our

				<p>recommendations. Our proposed Melbourn &amp; Bassingbourn division is supported by some respondents and we have support for Foxton and Shepreth parishes being in the neighbouring Hardwick division. The alternative division patterns received would also require changes to adjoining divisions for which we have little evidence to support. Therefore, we confirm Melbourn &amp; Bassingbourn division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Papworth &amp; Swavesey</b>	1	3%	<p>This division comprises Boxworth, Caxton, Conington, Childerley, Croxton, Elsworth, Eltisley, Fen Drayton, Graveley, Knapwell, Papworth Everard, Papworth St Agnes and Swavesey parishes.</p>	<p>Swavesey Parish Council objected to our recommendations and preferred to be grouped in a division with Fen Drayton, Over and Willingham parishes. We have decided not to modify our recommendations as this alternative proposal would require changes to adjoining divisions for which we have no evidence. Therefore, we confirm Papworth &amp; Swavesey division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Sawston &amp; Shelford</b>	2	-2%	<p>This division comprises Babraham, Great Shelford, Harston, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Little Shelford, Newton, Sawston and Stapleford parishes.</p>	<p>We received three submissions relating to Sawston &amp; Shelford division. Haslingfield Parish Council preferred to be located in neighbouring Hardwick division. The two alternative division patterns from the Cambridgeshire Labour Group and a Liberal Democrat councillor proposed two single-member divisions.</p> <p>We have decided not to modify our recommendations. To transfer Haslingfield parish to Hardwick division would result in an electoral variance of 14% for Sawston &amp; Shelford division. While we have accepted higher electoral variances in other parts of Cambridgeshire, we do not consider the evidence for this change is persuasive enough to justify an electoral variance in excess of 10%. The proposals for two single-member divisions would also require changes to adjoining divisions for which we have little evidence to</p>

				support. Therefore, we confirm our proposed Sawston & Shelford division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Waterbeach</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the northern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Horningsea, Landbeach, Milton and Waterbeach parishes.	Horningsea Parish Council preferred to be grouped in neighbouring Fulbourn division. However, we considered this change would not provide for effective and convenient local government as that part of Fen Ditton included in Waterbeach division would be isolated and effectively detached from the rest of the division. Therefore, we confirm Waterbeach division as part of our final recommendations.

# Conclusions

40 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2021
Number of councillors	61	61
Number of electoral divisions	59	59
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	23	4
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	5	0

**Final recommendation**  
 Cambridgeshire County Council should comprise 61 councillors serving 57 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

**Mapping**  
**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Cambridgeshire. You can also view our final recommendations for Cambridgeshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## Parish electoral arrangements

41 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

42 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the district councils in Cambridgeshire have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

43 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ely, Fen Ditton, Huntingdon, March, Soham, St Neots, St Ives, Whittlesey and Wisbech St Mary parishes.

44 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ely parish.

### **Final recommendation**

City of Ely Council should retain 15 town councillors, representing four wards: Cathedral (returning one member), Ely East (returning three members), Ely North (returning five members) and Ely West (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Fen Ditton parish.

### **Final recommendation**

Fen Ditton Parish Council should return nine parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: East (returning six members) and West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

46 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Huntingdon parish.

### **Final recommendation**

Huntingdon Town Council should return 19 town councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Central (returning two members), East (returning four members), North East (returning four members), South (returning two members)

and West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

47 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for March parish.

**Final recommendation**

March Town Council should return 12 town councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Central (returning one member), East (returning three members), Eastwood (returning one member), North (returning three members), Rural North (returning one member), Rural South (returning one member) and South (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

48 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Soham parish.

**Final recommendation**

Soham Town Council should comprise 15 town councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Soham Central (returning three members), Soham North (returning six members) and Soham South (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

49 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for St Neots parish.

**Final recommendation**

St Neots Town Council should return 21 town councillors, as at present, representing five wards: East (returning four members), Eaton Ford (returning four members), Eaton Socon (returning three members), Eynesbury (returning six members) and Priory Park (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

50 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for St Ives parish.

**Final recommendation**

St Ives Town Council should return 17 town councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Beech (returning one member), North (returning seven members), South (returning seven members) and West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

51 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Whittlesey parish.

**Final recommendation**

Whittlesey Town Council should return 14 town councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Bassenhally (returning three members), Coates & Eastrea (returning three members), Delph (returning one member), Elm (returning one member), Lattersey (returning two members), St Andrews (returning one member), St Marys North (returning one member), St Marys South (returning one member) and Stonald (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

52 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Wisbech St Mary parish.

**Final recommendation**

Wisbech St Mary Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Murrow (returning three members) and Wisbech St Mary (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

53 We have now completed our review of Cambridgeshire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

#### Equalities

54 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
Cambridge City								
1	Abbey	1	7,005	7,005	-11%	7,150	7,150	-16%
2	Arbury	1	7,411	7,411	-6%	8,425	8,425	-1%
3	Castle	1	6,484	6,484	-17%	8,453	8,453	-1%
4	Cherry Hinton	1	8,618	8,618	10%	8,813	8,813	3%
5	Chesterton	1	8,547	8,547	9%	8,845	8,845	3%
6	King's Hedges	1	8,976	8,976	14%	8,943	8,943	5%
7	Market	1	7,858	7,858	0%	8,380	8,380	-2%
8	Newnham	1	7,521	7,521	-4%	7,564	7,564	-12%
9	Petersfield	1	8,904	8,904	13%	9,262	9,262	8%
10	Queen Edith's	1	7,694	7,694	-2%	8,342	8,342	-2%
11	Romsey	1	8,967	8,967	14%	9,314	9,314	9%
12	Trumpington	1	5,174	5,174	-34%	8,259	8,259	-3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council**

Division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
East Cambridgeshire District								
13	Burwell	1	8,797	8,797	12%	9,440	9,440	10%
14	Ely North	1	6,975	6,975	-11%	9,030	9,030	6%
15	Ely South	1	8,461	8,461	8%	8,840	8,840	3%
16	Littleport	1	6,657	6,657	-15%	7,740	7,740	-9%
17	Soham North & Isleham	1	8,796	8,796	12%	9,536	9,536	12%
18	Soham South & Haddenham	1	8,363	8,363	7%	9,134	9,134	7%
19	Sutton	1	8,720	8,720	11%	8,820	8,820	3%
20	Woodditton	1	8,761	8,761	12%	9,110	9,110	7%
Fenland District								
21	Chatteris	1	8,115	8,115	3%	8,975	8,975	5%
22	March North & Waldersey	2	17,889	8,945	14%	18,351	9,176	7%
23	March South & Rural	1	7,909	7,909	1%	9,234	9,234	8%
24	Roman Bank & Peckover	1	8,992	8,992	15%	9,250	9,250	8%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
25	Whittlesey North	1	7,559	7,559	-4%	7,888	7,888	-8%
26	Whittlesey South	1	8,442	8,442	8%	8,552	8,552	0%
27	Wisbech East	1	8,025	8,025	2%	8,397	8,397	-2%
28	Wisbech West	1	7,944	7,944	1%	8,453	8,453	-1%
<b>Huntingdonshire District</b>								
29	Alconbury & Kimbolton	1	7,866	7,866	0%	7,890	7,890	-8%
30	Brampton & Buckden	1	8,013	8,013	2%	8,320	8,320	-3%
31	Godmanchester & Huntingdon South	1	6,834	6,834	-13%	7,813	7,813	-9%
32	Huntingdon North & Hartford	1	8,500	8,500	8%	8,497	8,497	-1%
33	Huntingdon West	1	6,788	6,788	-14%	8,310	8,310	-3%
34	Ramsey & Bury	1	8,179	8,179	4%	8,670	8,670	1%
35	St Ives North & Wyton	1	8,341	8,341	6%	8,786	8,786	3%
36	St Ives South & Needingworth	1	7,789	7,789	-1%	7,844	7,844	-8%
37	St Neots East & Gransden	1	4,669	4,669	-41%	8,560	8,560	0%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
38	St Neots Eynesbury	1	7,709	7,709	-2%	7,860	7,860	-8%
39	St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	1	7,651	7,651	-3%	7,870	7,870	-8%
40	St Neots The Eatons	1	9,791	9,791	25%	9,570	9,570	12%
41	Sawtry & Stilton	1	9,077	9,077	16%	9,110	9,110	7%
42	Somersham & Earith	1	7,692	7,692	-2%	7,790	7,790	-9%
43	The Hemingfords & Fenstanton	1	7,628	7,628	-3%	8,100	8,100	-5%
44	Warboys & The Stukeleys	1	5,751	5,751	-27%	8,140	8,140	-5%
45	Yaxley & Farcet	1	8,479	8,479	8%	8,650	8,650	1%
<b>South Cambridgeshire District</b>								
46	Bar Hill	1	7,337	7,337	-7%	8,760	8,760	2%
47	Cambourne	1	7,224	7,224	-8%	7,720	7,720	-10%
48	Cottenham & Willingham	1	8,163	8,163	4%	8,900	8,900	4%
49	Duxford	1	8,130	8,130	4%	8,140	8,140	-5%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council**

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
50	Fulbourn	1	7,086	7,086	-10%	9,069	9,069	6%
51	Gamlingay	1	8,070	8,070	3%	8,230	8,230	-4%
52	Hardwick	1	8,718	8,718	11%	8,920	8,920	4%
53	Histon & Impington	1	7,986	7,986	2%	8,850	8,850	4%
54	Linton	1	8,420	8,420	7%	8,440	8,440	-1%
55	Longstanton, Northstowe & Over	1	5,888	5,888	-25%	8,590	8,590	1%
56	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1	7,836	7,836	0%	7,870	7,870	-8%
57	Papworth & Swavesey	1	7,010	7,010	-11%	8,830	8,830	3%
58	Sawston & Shelford	2	14,810	7,405	-6%	16,690	8,345	-2%
59	Waterbeach	1	7,909	7,909	1%	8,091	8,091	-5%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>478,908</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>521,380</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,851</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,547</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cambridgeshire County Council. Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council>

### District councils

- East Cambridgeshire District Council

### Political groups

- Cambridge Liberal Democrats
- Cambridgeshire Labour Group
- Littleport, Little Downham & Sutton Branch, NE Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrats
- North East Cambridgeshire Liberal Democrats
- Petersfield Ward Labour Party
- South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association

### Member of Parliament

- Lucy Frazer QC MP

### Councillors (county, district and parish)

- Councillor D. Adey (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor C. Ambrose Smith (East Cambridgeshire District Council and Littleport Parish Council)
- Councillor B. Ashwood (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor A. Bailey (Cambridgeshire County Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor C. Boden (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor G. Booth (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor M. Bradley (East Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Councillor S. Count (Fenland District Council)
- Councillor M. Curtis (Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor L. Dupré (Cambridgeshire County Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council) *submitted an additional submission*
- Councillor D. Giles (St Neots Town Council) *submitted an additional submission*
- Councillor S. Giles (Huntingdonshire District Council)
- Councillor L. Harford (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor D. Harty (Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council)

- Councillor B. Hunt (Cambridgeshire County Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council) *submitted an additional submission*
- Councillor D. Jenkins (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor M. Leeke (Cambridgeshire County Council) *submitted an additional submission*
- Councillor I. Lindsay (City of Ely Council)
- Councillor Z. O'Connell (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor R. Robertson (Cambridge City Council)
- Councillor A. Sinnott (Cambridge City Council) *submitted an additional submission*
- Councillor A. Taylor (Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor A. Walsh (Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council)
- Councillor J. Webber (East Cambridgeshire District Council and Littleport Parish Council)
- Councillor J. Windle (Whittlesey Town Council)

### **Local organisations**

- Eatons Community Association
- Huntingdonshire Volunteer Centre
- Petersfield Area Community Trust
- Residents' Association of Old Newnham
- Trumpington Residents' Association

### **Parish and town councils**

- Barton Parish Council
- City of Ely Council
- Cottenham Parish Council
- Fen Ditton Parish Council
- Foxton Parish Council
- Haddenham Parish Council
- Harlton Parish Council
- Haslingfield Parish Council
- Hatley Parish Council
- Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council
- Horningsea Parish Council
- Kings Ripton Parish Council
- Little Abington Parish Council
- Little Gransden Parish Council
- Little Paxton Parish Council
- Lolworth Parish Meeting
- Longstanton Parish Council

- Longstowe Parish Council
- Meldreth Parish Council
- Mepal Parish Council
- Pampisford Parish Council
- Reach Parish Council
- Shepreth Parish Council
- Soham Town Council
- St Neots Town Council
- Sutton Parish Council
- Swavesey Parish Council
- Toft Parish Council
- Whittlesey Town Council
- Wisbech St Mary Parish Council
- Witcham Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council
- Woodwalton Parish Council

### **Petitions**

- Eaton Ford Residents' Association

### **Local residents**

- 236 local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

