

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for South Cambridgeshire

Report to the Electoral Commission

April 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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 Electoral Commission 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.

Report No: 281

CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|------|
| WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND? | 5 |
| SUMMARY | 7 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 13 |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS | 15 |
| 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS | 19 |
| 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION | 21 |
| 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS | 25 |
| 6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT? | 57 |
| | |
| APPENDIX | |
| A Final Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire: Detailed Mapping | 59 |

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

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to the Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No 3692). The Order also transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

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 and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of South Cambridgeshire.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of South Cambridgeshire's electoral arrangements on 17 April 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 27 November 2001, after which it undertook a nine-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, the Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations received by the LGCE during consultation on its draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission.**

We found that the existing 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 worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 29 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 21 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 182 – 183) 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 30 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight, and 12 wards should retain their existing boundaries.**

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 21 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 improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, 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:

- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parish of Little Wilbraham.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 4 June 2002:

**The Secretary
Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
30 Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Final 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, Dry Drayton and Lolworth | Map 2 |
| 3 | Barton | 1 | The parishes of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley | 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, Childerley, 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 | <i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Girton | Map 2 |
| 14 | Hardwick | 1 | The parish of Hardwick | Map 2 |
| 15 | Harston & Hauxton | 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 | <i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Milton (detached) | 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, Knapwell, 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 |

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Constituent areas | Map Reference |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 28 | The Abingtons | 1 | The parishes of Babraham, Great Abington, Hinxton, Little Abington and Pampisford | Map 2 |
| 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 | The parishes of Fen Ditton, Great Wilbraham, Horningsea, 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 Map 2, Map A1 and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Table 2: Final 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 | 3,968 | 1,984 | 13 | 3,890 | 1,945 | 3 |
| 3 | Barton | 1 | 1,877 | 1,877 | 7 | 1,840 | 1,840 | -3 |
| 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 | 1,219 | 1,219 | -31 | 1,850 | 1,850 | -2 |
| 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 | 2,010 | 2,010 | 6 |
| 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 | 3,112 | 1,556 | -11 | 3,310 | 1,655 | -13 |
| 14 | Hardwick | 1 | 1,843 | 1,843 | 5 | 1,800 | 1,800 | -5 |
| 15 | Harston & Hauxton | 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 | 3,207 | 1,604 | -9 | 3,140 | 1,570 | -17 |
| 23 | Orwell & Barrington | 1 | 1,804 | 1,804 | 3 | 1,780 | 1,780 | -6 |
| 24 | Papworth & Elsworth | 2 | 3,063 | 1,532 | -13 | 4,110 | 2,055 | 8 |
| 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 | 2,013 | 2,013 | 15 | 2,010 | 2,010 | 6 |
| 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 |
| | Totals | 57 | 99,996 | - | - | 108,020 | - | - |
| | Averages | - | - | 1,754 | - | - | 1,895 | - |

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 final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of South Cambridgeshire. The five districts in Cambridgeshire have now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 South Cambridgeshire's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1975 (Report no. 63). The electoral arrangements of Cambridgeshire County Council were last reviewed in December 1983 (Report no. 460). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

3 In making final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of South Cambridgeshire was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations 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 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so 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.

7 The LGCE was not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as South Cambridgeshire is concerned, it started from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, the LGCE found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. In particular, it did not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 17 April 2001, when the LGCE wrote to South Cambridgeshire District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It

also notified South 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. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The LGCE'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 representations, the end of Stage One, was 13 August 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 27 November 2001 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire*, and ended on 28 January 2002. During this period, comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 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.

11 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, the LGCE 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'.

12 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.

13 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,818 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,964 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 Milton ward where the councillor represents 76 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in South Cambridgeshire

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| | 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 | 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 | 9 |
| 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 | 223 |
| 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 | 1,490 | 1,490 | -24 |
| 14 | Elsworth | 1 | 1,633 | 1,633 | -10 | 1,620 | 1,620 | -18 |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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 | -18 |
| 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 | 7 |
| 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 |
| | Totals | 55 | 99,996 | - | - | 108,020 | - | - |
| | Averages | - | - | 1,818 | - | - | 1,964 | - |

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 were relatively over-represented by 39 per cent, while electors in Milton ward were significantly under-represented by 76 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received 48 representations, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council (Scheme A), together with an alternative district-wide scheme from a cross-party group of 15 members (Scheme B). It also received submissions from parish councils, local councillors, local residents and Cambridgeshire County Council. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire*.

15 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on Scheme B, which achieved an improvement in electoral equality and sought to address many of the areas of contention highlighted in relation to Scheme A, particularly in relation to 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, the LGCE moved away from the cross-party group's scheme in two areas and proposed a ward name change. It proposed that:

- South Cambridgeshire District Council should be served by 57 councillors, compared with the current 55, representing 34 wards, eight fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 32 of the existing wards should be modified, while 10 wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for the parishes of Little Wilbraham and Milton.

Draft Recommendation

South Cambridgeshire District Council should comprise 57 councillors, serving 34 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

16 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 23 of the 34 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only four wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average by 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

17 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 36 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

South Cambridgeshire District Council

18 South Cambridgeshire District Council “broadly accepted” the draft recommendations, subject to some minor modifications. It proposed that the proposed Harston ward be renamed Harston & Hauxton ward. It proposed that the parish of Childerley be removed from the proposed Bar Hill ward and transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward, commenting that Childerley and Caldecote parishes adjoin each other and that this proposal would be welcomed by the local community. It also proposed that the parish of Knapwell be removed from the proposed Bar Hill ward and transferred to the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward.

19 The Council also expressed concern at the linking of Girton and Madingley in the proposed Girton ward, commenting that the two parishes are separated by the “busy A14/A1307 road”. It commented that the “historical links of Madingley have clearly been towards the parishes to the west and south rather than to Girton”, although acknowledging that “it was difficult to see, however, an overall better solution” than the draft recommendations. The Council opposed the proposed warding of the detached Milton parish and the inclusion of the proposed South parish ward in a district ward with Fen Ditton parish. It argued that the proposals do not provide for “convenient or effective local government”. It requested that an exception be made to the LGCE’s approach to detached wards. In addition, it expressed concern as to whether anyone would be prepared to stand for election in the proposed South parish ward.

20 Finally, the District Council opposed the LGCE’s recommendation not to ward the parishes of Bourn and Caxton to facilitate the ongoing Cambourne development, as outlined in its Stage One submission. It stated that “the warding of those two parishes will better reflect the identities and interests of the communities concerned, both the new communities at Cambourne and the older communities in the villages of Bourn and Caxton”. It requested that the proposal to ward the parishes of Bourn and Caxton be reconsidered. In addition, it proposed that the two Cambourne parish wards be combined to form a new two-member Cambourne ward, with the remaining parts of Bourn and Caxton parishes, together with the parishes of Eltisley and Croxton forming a single-member Bourn ward. As detailed below, at Stage Three the District Council also requested that the projected electorate for Duxford parish be changed from 1400 to 1490.

Cambridgeshire County Council

21 Cambridgeshire County Council stated that “where there is consensus between District and Town/Parish Councils on what should be the outcome of the review, this should be respected by the Commission”. It also expressed concern regarding the timetable “which separates the District and County electoral reviews by twelve months”. It requested that these reviews take place at the same time. In addition, it also reiterated the importance of coterminosity between the proposed district wards and the future county divisions.

Members of Parliament

22 Andrew Lansley MP submitted identical proposals to that of the District Council in relation to the Cambourne area, based on the warding of Bourn and Caxton parishes and the creation of a separate two-member ward covering the Cambourne area. He also opposed the proposed Girton ward, arguing that there is no “natural affinity” between the parishes of Girton and Madingley. He therefore proposed a revised single-member Barton ward comprising the parishes of Barton, Madingley, Grantchester and Coton as proposed by the District Council under Scheme A thus resulting in and a single-member Girton ward which would be coterminous with the parish of the same name.

District and County Councillors

23 County Councillor Farrar (Shelford division) proposed a new district-wide scheme based on a council size of 64 (seven more than under the draft recommendations), representing 40 wards. His proposals were based on the creation of an increased number of single-member wards throughout the district, reducing the number of multi-member, multi-parish wards. He stated that “the reason for my proposed increase...is, however, not that they have more electors to represent but to permit larger parishes to have their own members”. Under Councillor Farrar’s proposals, 17 wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average initially, improving to seven wards by 2006. Councillor Hall (Bar Hill ward) supported the proposed Cottenham ward. However, he proposed revised Bar Hill and Papworth & Elsworth wards. He proposed that the parishes of Bar Hill, Dry Drayton, Lolworth and Childerley combine to form a revised two-member Bar Hill ward and that the parishes of Boxworth and Knapwell combine with the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward to form a revised two-member Papworth & Elsworth ward.

24 Councillor Collinson (Cottenham ward) supported the proposed Cottenham ward. He considered “the proposal to be the most acceptable solution in terms of the constraints imposed by the district-wide review”. Councillor Kime broadly supported the proposed The Wilbrahams ward, but objected to the inclusion of the South parish ward of Milton parish. He also opposed the proposed Milton ward stating that “Milton is a large village with different concerns and needs of those of a small village like Horningsea” which, in addition, are separated by the River Cam. He stated that Horningsea parish has “a lot more in common” with Fen Ditton. County Councillor Johnstone (Willingham division) expressed concern over the proposed Willingham & Over ward, stating that “Willingham and Over are not parishes that can be easily joined”. She proposed that Over parish would be better combined with the parish of Swavesey “where the sense of community identity is far greater and facilities are shared”. In addition, she expressed concern regarding the coterminosity of the proposed wards with County Council divisions.

25 Councillor Ellwood (Elsworth ward) broadly supported the draft recommendations, but reiterated the Council’s proposals relating to the parishes of Childerley and Knapwell. He proposed that Childerley parish should form part of the proposed Caldecote ward and that Knapwell parish should form part of the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward.

Parish Councils

26 Arrington Parish Council expressed concern over the loss of the existing Arrington ward, and the subsequent inclusion of the parish in the proposed Gamlingay ward. It argued that the proposal is “only being based on electoral numbers and takes no account of village synergy. We feel that Gamlingay will overpower all the smaller villages in this ward”. Barrington Parish Council opposed the proposed Orwell & Barrington ward which it stated would “take away our

link with Shepreth”. It proposed that an alternative warding pattern be adopted that resulted in the creation of a ward containing both Barrington and Shepreth parishes. Caldecote Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Caldecote ward, subject to the inclusion of Childerley parish, with which it stated that it has “long association”. Caxton Parish Council opposed the proposed Bourn ward, arguing that the ongoing Cambourne development “should form its own ward”. Childerley Parish Council requested that it be transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward, stating that it has “close links” with Caldecote. In addition it commented that “the only road access to our parish is from the south near the parish of Caldecote”.

27 Dry Drayton Parish Council opposed the proposed Bar Hill ward, arguing that combining its parish with the parish of Bar Hill “is likely to put an unfair bias on representation of issues”. It proposed that the parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Dry Drayton, Knapwell and Lolworth be combined with Oakington & Westwick parish to “form a ward of an appropriate size”. Duxford Parish Council submitted a detailed response to the draft recommendations on a number of issues. First, it questioned the projected number of electors for the parishes of Duxford and Ickleton. It also expressed opposition to the creation of multi-member wards in the district. Finally, Duxford Parish Council stated that the criteria to eliminate detached wards “failed to take sufficient account of all other social and economical reasons for permitting such arrangements”. Based on this, it proposed that the case for the existing Ickleton detached ward be reconsidered.

28 Fulbourn Parish Council supported the proposed Fulbourn ward, which would result in the existing ward being retained. Gamlingay Parish Council supported the draft recommendations, while Great & Little Chishill Parish Council resubmitted its Stage One submission which opposed the proposed Melbourn ward, stating that it would “prefer to be part of a small village ward comprising Heydon, Ickleton and possibly Abington”. Hinxton Parish Council strongly opposed the proposed The Abingtons ward, arguing that “the plan to group Hinxton with Great and Little Abington is a nonsense as the parishes have nothing in common”. It asserted the Parish Council’s strong links with Ickleton parish, stating the two parishes “have a great deal of common ground”. Horningsea Parish Council reiterated the views expressed by Councillor Kime, as detailed above.

29 Knapwell Parish Meeting opposed the proposed Bar Hill ward, stating that “we feel that this is inappropriate, as the village has no affiliation with Bar Hill either physically or socially”. It commented that it has “closer association with the parish of Elsworth”. Longstowe Parish Council supported the proposed two-member Gamlingay ward. Madingley Parish Council opposed the proposed Girton ward, arguing that there is no “natural affinity” between the two parishes of Girton and Madingley. It stated that the Parish Council is very happy with the current ward structure. However it acknowledged that this was not necessarily appropriate. It therefore proposed a two-member Barton ward comprising the parishes of Barton, Comberton, Coton, Dry Drayton, Grantchester and Madingley.

30 Milton Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Milton ward. However, it strongly opposed the warding of Milton Parish and proposed that the whole of the parish form part of the revised Milton ward. In addition, it proposed that Chesterton Fen (Milton detached) be treated as a separate Parish Meeting. A parish councillor for Milton broadly reiterated the views of Milton Parish Council. He commented that “the reality is that Milton detached has no connection with the rest of Milton parish. The two communities are entirely separate, both culturally and, more perhaps more importantly, geographically”. He expressed concern regarding the administrative implications of the draft recommendation to ward the parish of Milton and suggested that an

alternative would be to create separate parishes for Milton and Milton detached and that, in the longer term, Milton detached be incorporated into Cambridge City.

31 Oakington & Westwick Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Cottenham ward, although it would have rather retained the existing Bar Hill ward. Pampisford Parish Council supported the proposed The Abingtons ward, and in addition stated that “the addition of Hinxton will be of benefit”. Papworth Everard Parish Council opposed the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward stating that “this arrangement would not best serve it nor the new villages now included in the larger ward”. It expressed concern that “one or both of the District Councillors could well come from Papworth Everard, as this is the biggest of the villages”. In addition, it expressed concern at the inclusion of Fen Drayton parish in the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward which it stated is “separated from the other parts of the new ward by the busy A14”. It requested that the existing Papworth ward be retained or that the parish of Papworth Everard be joined with the parishes of Caxton and Eltisley to form a new two-member ward.

32 Teversham Parish Council “unanimously” supported the proposed Teversham ward, while Rampton Parish Council expressed support for the proposed Cottenham ward. Shudy Camps Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Balsham ward. However, it expressed concern that the ward “will become dominated by the larger village of Balsham”. Toft Parish Council expressed support for the proposed Caldecote ward, while Willingham Parish Council opposed the proposed three-member Willingham & Over ward. It expressed concern that “all three councillors could come from either Over or Willingham”. It said that it “would much prefer one resident councillor from Over and one from Willingham, together with one councillor representing both parishes”.

Other Representations

33 Two representations were received from local residents. One resident fully supported the draft recommendations, while the other commented on Milton detached and the administrative difficulties it creates between South Cambridgeshire district and Cambridge City. He requested that an external boundary review between these two local authorities be undertaken in order to correct this anomaly.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

34 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the other statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) – the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 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 also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to 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 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the 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 a 46 per cent increase in the electorate of South Cambridgeshire district. At Stage One 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 expected most of the growth to be in Bourn ward based around the ongoing Cambourne development, although a significant amount was 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

39 At Stage Three, Duxford Parish Council questioned the projected electorate figures for the parishes of Duxford and Ickleton. We sought clarification from the District Council with regard to this issue. However, in relation to Ickleton parish, the Council was content that the original figure was correct. It stated that “Ickleton is scheduled for no development at all and there is no reason to depart from the presented figures”. In relation to Duxford parish, the Council

acknowledged that, following further analysis, the 2006 figure needed to be amended. It stated that “we would wish for the forecast electorate for Duxford Parish to be amended to 1490 upon the basis of unforeseen but significant windfall development which has just come forward for approval”. This amendment would result in a revised 2006 total electorate figure of 108,020. Having given consideration to the District Council’s revised figures and the evidence it provided to support this amendment, we are satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

40 As already explained, the LGCE started its review by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although it was willing to carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

41 In its draft recommendations report, the LGCE adopted the Scheme B proposal for a council of 57 members as it considered that this number of councillors facilitated a scheme which provided for an improved level of electoral equality, while largely reflecting the views expressed by a number of Stage One respondents.

42 During Stage Three, County Councillor Farrar proposed an alternative district-wide scheme based on a council size of 64 members. His proposals were based on the creation of an increased number of single-member wards throughout the district, reducing the number of multi-member, multi-parish wards. He stated that “the reason for my proposed increase...is, however, not that they have more electors to represent but to permit larger parishes to have their own members”.

43 We have carefully considered Councillor Farrar’s proposals. However, at Stage Three, the LGCE was consulting on its draft recommendations which, subject to any comments received, would also be considered appropriate to form the final recommendations. With the LGCE having reached the conclusion that its draft recommendations should be based on a council size of 57, we are not minded to consider revised schemes based on a significantly different council size at this stage. In addition, we note that Councillor Farrar’s proposals differ greatly from the LGCE’s draft recommendations.

44 Moreover, we have not been persuaded that a proposed increase in council size from 57 to 64 has been sufficiently justified by the supporting evidence. We have also received no evidence of any local consultation on these proposals, or of any widespread support for this proposed increase in council size. Therefore, having considered the representations received at Stage Three, and given that South Cambridgeshire District Council now accepts the slight increase in council size, we are confirming as final the draft recommendation for a council size of 57.

Electoral Arrangements

45 As indicated above, the LGCE based its draft recommendations on Scheme B, the scheme submitted by a cross-party group of 15 members. While at first sight it may have appeared that this scheme gained less support from the members than Scheme A, the LGCE noted that 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, it noted that there were broad similarities in the two schemes, particularly in relation to the south-west of the district. The LGCE also concurred with the view expressed by its proponents that Scheme B sought 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, the LGCE moved away from the Scheme B proposals in two areas. It also proposed a ward name change.

46 At Stage Three, the draft recommendations generated a significant amount of local interest which has helped to inform us when preparing our final recommendations. The draft recommendations have received broad support from the District Council and a number of parish councils. We are therefore largely content to endorse them. The Council's proposed amendment to the 2006 electorate total did not affect the electoral variances under the draft recommendations. However, there are two significant issues which have arisen at Stage Three. First, a number of respondents, including the District Council, opposed the draft recommendations in relation to the Milton and Cambourne areas. Second, there were a number of submissions relating to the proposed Girton, Bar Hill, Barton and Papworth & Elsworth wards.

47 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. 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.

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

Arrington, Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards

49 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 (38 per cent more by 2006).

50 At Stage One, the Scheme A and Scheme B proposals for this area were identical. The existing Arrington ward, less Tadlow parish, would be combined 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. 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, 6 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).

51 A further 27 representations in relation to this area were received at Stage One. 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 supported in 26 proforma-style letters from local residents.

52 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that in relation to this area the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B were identical, and that they broadly respected the views expressed by Tadlow Parish Meeting and in the 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, the LGCE was content to put these proposals forward for consultation. In relation to the issue of combining Tadlow Parish Meeting with Orwell Parish Council, the LGCE noted that this would have resulted in a detached ward given that the two villages are geographically separated by a number of other villages.

53 Under the 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).

54 At Stage Three, the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident all expressed support for the draft recommendations in this area, while Longstowe Parish Council supported the proposed Gamlingay ward. Arrington Parish Council expressed concern over the loss of the existing Arrington ward, and the subsequent inclusion of the parish in the proposed Gamlingay ward. It argued that the proposal is “only being based on electoral numbers and takes no account of village synergy. We feel that Gamlingay will overpower all the smaller villages in this ward”.

55 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards as final. We note that these wards have received a degree of local support at Stage Three as well as achieving reasonable levels of electoral equality. We note the concerns of Arrington Parish Council with regards to the proposed Gamlingay ward. However, we are unable to look at one area in isolation and have been unable to identify any possible alternatives for this area which would provide for

acceptable levels of electoral equality while not having consequential adverse effects on neighbouring wards. In addition, we note that the proposed Gamlingay ward has been supported by Gamlingay and Longstowe parish councils.

56 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bassingbourn, Gamlingay and The Mordens wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Duxford, Ickleton, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards

57 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 (24 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).

58 At Stage One, Scheme A and Scheme B offered broadly identical proposals for this area. Each scheme 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. Both schemes proposed the retention of the existing Whittlesford ward, arguing that the combination of the parishes of Whittlesford and Thriplow “is traditional and respected”.

59 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 more, 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).

60 A further five representations in relation to this area were received at Stage One. Duxford Parish Council opposed the revised Duxford ward. It proposed alternative proposals under which 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 proposed 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.

61 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 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.

62 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that in relation to this area, the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B were identical and, had in addition, received support from Whittlesford Parish Council. The LGCE noted 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 have resulted in the retention of a detached Ickleton ward. As outlined in its *Guidance*, the LGCE was of the view that detached wards lend themselves to the creation of electoral areas which lack community identity and considered that there was insufficient justification to warrant the retention of such a ward in this area. The LGCE noted the concerns of Melbourn Parish Council, but took the view that it could not look at any one area in isolation, and due to the configuration of parishes in this area, considered that Scheme B provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

63 Under the 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).

64 At Stage Three, the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident all expressed support for the draft recommendations in this area. Duxford Parish Council submitted a detailed response to the draft recommendations relating to a number of issues. First, as detailed above, it questioned the projected number of electors for the parishes of Duxford and Ickleton. It also expressed opposition to the creation of multi-member wards in the district, stating that “these may tend to cause the election of representatives of a large community to the possible detriment (or the ignoring) of smaller parishes within an overall ward”. Finally, Duxford Parish Council stated that the LGCE’s approach to detached wards “failed to take sufficient account of all other social and economical reasons for permitting such arrangements”. Based on this, it proposed that the case of the existing Ickleton detached ward be reconsidered.

65 Great & Little Chishill Parish Council resubmitted its Stage One submission which opposed the proposed Melbourn ward, stating that it would “prefer to be part of a small village ward comprising Heydon, Ickleton and possible Abington”.

66 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for Duxford, Melbourn and Whittlesford wards as final. We note that these wards have received a degree of local support at Stage Three as well as achieving

reasonable levels of electoral equality. As detailed above, we also accept the revised 2006 electorate figure for Duxford Parish Council proposed by the District Council.

67 We note the views expressed by Duxford and Great & Little Chishill parish councils. However, we have not been persuaded to depart from the draft recommendations and propose the retention of a detached ward in this area. Due to the configuration of parishes in this area, we are of the view that the draft recommendations provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

68 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Melbourn and Whittlesford wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. However, the proposed Duxford ward would contain 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006 as a result of an amendment to the projected electorate figure for Duxford Parish Council, as detailed above. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

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

69 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. Each of the five wards are 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).

70 At Stage One, Scheme A and Scheme B contained identical proposals for this area. They 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. 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. Finally, both Scheme A and Scheme B proposed that the existing Foxton ward be retained, arguing that this is a “traditional association”. However, the schemes proposed that the ward be renamed Fowlmere & Foxton ward.

71 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).

72 Two further representations were received in relation to this area. Great & Little Eversden Parish Council broadly supported Scheme A and Scheme B, opposing any arrangements which would result in the division of the two parishes. However, it expressed a 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”.

73 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that in relation to this area, the proposals outlined under Scheme A and Scheme B were identical. These proposals ensured that the parishes of Great Eversden and Little Eversden were contained within the same district ward, which received an element of support at Stage One. The LGCE also noted that the proposed Caldecote ward received broad support from Kingston Parish Council. In relation to the request for the existing Orwell ward to be retained, it noted 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 was 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 the LGCE considered that the proposals outlined by Scheme B provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria.

74 Under the 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).

75 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident both expressed support for the draft recommendations, while Toft Parish Council supported the proposed Caldecote ward. The District Council broadly supported the draft recommendations in this area. However, it proposed that the parish of Childerley be removed from the proposed Bar Hill ward and transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward, on the grounds that Childerley and Caldecote parishes adjoin each other and that this proposal would be welcomed by the local community. Barrington Parish Council opposed the proposed Orwell & Barrington ward, commenting that it would “take away our link with Shepreth”. It proposed that an alternative warding pattern be adopted that resulted in the creation of a ward containing both Barrington and Shepreth parishes. Caldecote Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Caldecote ward, subject to the inclusion of Childerley parish, with which it stated it had “long association”. Childerley Parish Council requested that it be transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward, stating that it has “close links” with Caldecote. In addition it commented that “the only road access to our parish is from the south near the parish of Caldecote”.

76 Councillor Ellwood (Elsworth ward) broadly supported the draft recommendations. However, he reiterated the Council's proposals relating to the parish of Childerley. He proposed that Childerley parish should form part of the proposed Caldecote ward, stating that the parish has "a natural affinity with Caldecote, no connection whatsoever with Bar Hill".

77 Having considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for Fowlmere & Foxton, Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Meldreth and Orwell & Barrington wards as final. We concur with the view expressed by the District Council, Councillor Ellwood and Caldecote and Childerley parish councils with regards to the parish of Childerley. We note that the proposal to transfer Childerley parish to the proposed Caldecote ward has received broad local support, including from the parishes involved and a local councillor and would result in improved electoral equality. We therefore propose a revised Caldecote ward containing the parishes of Caldecote, Childerley, Kingston and Toft.

78 We note the concerns expressed by Barrington Parish Council with regard to its request to retain its link with Shepreth parish. As in the case of Arrington Parish Council, we are unable to look at one area in isolation and have been unable to identify any possible alternatives which would retain the link between Barrington and Shepreth while providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality in the surrounding area. In addition, we note that there was broad support for the surrounding wards in this area at Stage Three.

79 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Fowlmere & Foxton, Haslingfield & The Eversdens, Meldreth and Orwell & Barrington wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. The revised Caldecote ward would contain 31 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average initially (2 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Bourn, Comberton and Hardwick wards

80 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 (223 per cent and 76 per cent more than the average by 2006 due to major ongoing development planned for the area).

81 At Stage One, Scheme A and Scheme B contained identical proposals in relation to the existing Comberton and Hardwick wards. However, they differed in respect of the existing Bourn ward. First, both schemes proposed retaining the existing single-member Comberton ward. As detailed above, under both Scheme A and Scheme B it was proposed that the parishes of Caldecote and Toft from the existing Hardwick ward be combined with the parish of Kingston from the existing Orwell ward to form a revised single-member Caldecote ward. In addition, it was 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 Cambourne. 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.

82 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, both 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 Cambourne development area.

83 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that these proposals were identical to the proposals outlined in Scheme A in relation to the proposed Comberton and Hardwick wards. In relation to the proposed Bourn ward, it proposed adopting the proposals under Scheme A, which resulted in the retention of the existing ward, while increasing its level of representation from one to three. The LGCE considered that this proposal better reflected the identities and interests of the community in this area, particularly in relation to the ongoing Cambourne development, since maintaining the current ward for district warding purposes retained 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, the LGCE were unable to facilitate this proposal as there were insufficient electors on the February 2001 electoral register for these parishes to be warded and at this stage of the development, it considered that it would be unable to identify clear boundaries which would have a degree of longevity. This proposed parish warding was not integral to the LGCE's draft recommendations in this area.

84 Under the 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).

85 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident supported the draft recommendations for this area. The District Council expressed support for the proposed Comberton and Hardwick wards. However, it opposed the proposed Bourn ward. It also opposed the LGCE's recommendation not to ward the parishes of Bourn and Caxton to facilitate the ongoing Cambourne development, as outlined in its Stage One submission. It stated that "the warding of those two parishes will better reflect the identities and interests of the communities concerned, both the new communities at Cambourne and the older communities in the villages of Bourn and Caxton". It requested that the decision not to ward the parishes of Bourn and Caxton, asserting that there were 761 and 49 electors respectively on the December 2001 electoral register and that, contrary to what was stated in the draft recommendations, it would be possible to identify suitable boundaries. In addition, the Council proposed that the two Cambourne parish wards be combined to form a new two-member Cambourne ward, with the remaining parts of Bourn and Caxton parishes, together with the parishes of Eltisley and Croxton forming a single-member ward.

86 Andrew Lansley MP submitted proposals identical to those of the District Council in relation to the Cambourne area, based on the warding of Bourn and Caxton parishes and the creation of a

separate two-member ward covering the Cambourne area. He stated that “I feel sure that Cambourne itself will wish to have councillors focused on the needs of the village, and the four villages, I know, would prefer to have one member who is focused on the rural aspect and needs of their residents”. Caxton Parish Council opposed the proposed Bourn ward, arguing that the ongoing Cambourne development “should form its own ward”.

87 Finally, as part of alternative proposals submitted by Madingley Parish Council, a revised two-member Barton ward would be created by combining the parishes of Barton, Comberton, Coton, Dry Drayton, Grantchester and Madingley. This is discussed in more detail below.

88 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for Bourn, Comberton and Harwick wards as final. We note that the proposed Comberton and Harwick wards received an element of local support as well as achieving acceptable levels of electoral equality. As discussed in more detail below, while we broadly concur with the views expressed by Madingley Parish Council, we have not been persuaded that there is justification in combining the proposed Comberton ward in a revised Barton ward.

89 We acknowledge the views expressed by the District Council, Andrew Lansley MP and Caxton Parish Council. While we have been made aware that there are electors now present in both the Council’s proposed Bourn Cambourne and Caxton Cambourne parish wards, the LGCE based its proposals on the February 2001 register, at which point, the proposed Caxton Cambourne parish ward contained no electors. We therefore are unable to consider the warding of Caxton parish as part of this review. We do however, consider that by retaining the existing Bourn ward, the whole of the Cambourne development is contained within the same district ward which we consider to be in the best interests of the local community. In addition, we consider that there would be considerable benefit in South Cambridgeshire District Council conducting a parish review. We have no power to recommend changes to parish administrative boundaries as part of this PER. However, under the provisions of the Local Government and Ratings Act 1997, district councils may undertake reviews of the parish arrangements in their areas and make recommendations to the Secretary of State.

90 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bourn, Comberton and Harwick wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Barton, Coton and Girton wards

91 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).

92 At Stage One, Scheme A and Scheme B contained different proposals in this area. 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).

93 Under Scheme B, the existing Barton ward would be combined 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 argument being 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).

94 Two further representations were received 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.

95 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that these proposals were likely to 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, it was 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, the LGCE considered that the proposals outlined in Scheme B provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria, and were content to put them forward as part of its draft recommendations.

96 Under the draft recommendations, 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).

97 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident supported the draft recommendations. As detailed above, the District Council proposed that the parish of Childerley be removed from the proposed Bar Hill ward and transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward,

noting that Childerley and Caldecote parishes adjoin each other and commenting that the proposal would be welcomed by the local community. It also proposed that the parish of Knapwell be removed from the proposed Bar Hill ward and transferred to the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward, stating that “there are clear advantages here because Knapwell adjoins and has an identity and interests with Elsworth and has no convenient access to the Bar Hill parishes other than Boxworth”.

98 The Council also expressed concern at the linking of Girton and Madingley in the proposed Girton ward, expressing the view that the two parishes are separated by the “busy A14/A1307 road”. It commented that the “historical links of Madingley have clearly been towards the parishes to the west and south rather than to Girton”, although acknowledged that “it was difficult to see, however, an overall better solution”.

99 Andrew Lansley MP opposed the proposed Girton ward, arguing that there is no “natural affinity” between the parishes of Girton and Madingley. He therefore proposed a revised single-member Barton ward comprising the parishes of Barton, Madingley, Grantchester and Coton resulting in a single-member Girton ward coterminous with the parish of the same name. Under MP Lansley’s proposals, Barton and Girton wards would contain 7 per cent more and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent and 13 per cent fewer by 2006).

100 Councillor Hall (Bar Hill ward) proposed revised Bar Hill and Papworth & Elsworth wards. He proposed that the parishes of Bar Hill, Dry Drayton, Lolworth and Childerley combine to form a revised two-member Bar Hill ward and that the parishes of Boxworth and Knapwell combine with the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward to form a revised two-member Papworth & Elsworth ward. He stated that “Bar Hill, Dry Drayton (out of which Bar Hill was carved) and Lolworth form a natural unit. Boxworth and Knapwell have more in common with Papworth & Elsworth ward”. Under Councillor Hall’s proposals, Bar Hill and Papworth & Elsworth wards would contain 9 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (1 per cent fewer and 13 per cent more by 2006).

101 Councillor Ellwood (Elsworth ward) broadly supported the draft recommendations. However, he reiterated the Council’s proposals relating to the parishes of Childerley and Knapwell. As detailed above, he proposed that Childerley parish should form part of the proposed Caldecote ward, stating that the parish has “a natural affinity with Caldecote, no connection whatsoever with Bar Hill”. He also proposed that Knapwell parish should form part of the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward, stating that the parish has “a natural affinity with Elsworth, no connection with Bar Hill”.

102 As detailed above, Childerley Parish Council requested that it be transferred to the proposed Caldecote ward, stating that it has “close links” with Caldecote. In addition it commented that “the only road access to our parish is from the south near the parish of Caldecote”. Dry Drayton Parish Council opposed the proposed Bar Hill ward, arguing that the combining of its parish with the parish of Bar Hill “is likely to put an unfair bias on representations of issues”. It proposed that the parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Dry Drayton, Knapwell and Lolworth be combined with Oakington & Westwick parish to “form a ward of an appropriate size”.

103 Knapwell Parish Meeting opposed the proposed Bar Hill ward, stating that “we feel that this is inappropriate, as the village has no affiliation with Bar Hill either physically or socially”. It commented that it has “closer association with the parish of Elsworth”. Madingley Parish Council opposed the proposed Girton ward, arguing that there is no “natural affinity” between

the two parishes of Girton and Madingley. It stated that the Parish Council is very happy with the current ward structure. However, it acknowledged that this was not necessarily appropriate. As mentioned above, it therefore proposed a two-member Barton ward comprising the parishes of Barton, Comberton, Coton, Dry Drayton, Grantchester and Madingley. It stated that this proposed ward “would combine a number of low population villages that have similar problems and are affected by similar issues”. Under Madingley Parish Council’s proposals, Bar Hill, Barton and Girton wards would contain 3 per cent more, 17 per cent more and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent fewer, 8 per cent more and 13 per cent fewer by 2006).

104 Having considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to modify the draft recommendations in this area. We concur with the views expressed by the District Council with regards to the parishes of Childerley and Knapwell. The proposal by the District Council to transfer Knapwell parish to the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward and Childerley parish to the proposed Caldecote ward has received broad local support, including from the parishes involved and a local councillor. We therefore propose revised Bar Hill, Caldecote and Papworth & Elsworth wards based on the District Council’s proposal. These amendments would have a negligible effect on electoral equality.

105 We note the views of a number of respondents regarding the proposed Girton ward and the link between the parishes of Girton and Madingley. We concur with the view expressed that these two parishes are somewhat separate, being situated either side of the A14/A1307. As detailed above, both Andrew Lansley MP and Madingley Parish Council proposed alternative warding arrangements in this area. We considered both of these proposals, taking into account the effect on electoral equality and the consequential effect on neighbouring wards. Both proposals provided for a revised two-member Girton ward, coterminous with the parish of Girton. This revised ward would contain 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average initially, 13 per cent fewer by 2006. The revised single-member Barton ward proposed by Andrew Lansley MP would contain 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average initially, 3 per cent fewer by 2006 and, in addition, would facilitate our revised Bar Hill ward, as detailed above. Madingley Parish Council’s revised two-member Barton ward would contain 17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average initially, 8 per cent more by 2006. However, this would not facilitate our proposed amendments to Bar Hill ward.

106 On balance, we therefore propose adopting Andrew Lansley MP’s proposed Girton and Barton wards. We recognise that the revised Girton ward would contain 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. However, we have been persuaded by the views expressed that there is sufficient justification for the parishes of Girton and Madingley not being contained within the same district ward. In addition, we note that the level of electoral equality for the proposed Barton ward improves from 11 per cent fewer than the district average by 2006 under the draft recommendations to 3 per cent fewer by 2006 under our final recommendations.

107 We considered the alternative proposal submitted by Councillor Hall. We note that the proposals are broadly similar to those submitted by the District Council, in so far as Knapwell Parish Meeting would form part of a proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward. However, his proposals would not facilitate the transfer of Childerley Parish Council to the proposed Caldecote ward which, as detailed above, has received significant support at a local level. In addition, under Councillor Hall’s proposals, Papworth & Elsworth ward would contain 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. We are not of the view that

this level of electoral inequality can be justified and consider that our revised wards in this area address a number of issues which have arisen at Stage Three as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality.

108 We note the concerns of Dry Drayton Parish Council with regards to the proposed Bar Hill ward. However, due to our decision to amend this area in accordance with the District Council's proposals, as detailed above, we have been unable to facilitate the Parish Council's proposals. In addition, we are of the view that its proposals would not be supported by Childerley Parish Council or Knapwell Parish Meeting and, in addition, would involve amending the proposed Cottenham ward which has received significant support at Stage Three.

109 Under our final recommendations, Bar Hill, Barton and Girton wards would contain 13 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer and 13 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals in this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Elsworth, Longstanton, Papworth and Swavesey wards

110 The existing wards of Elsworth, Longstanton, Papworth and Swavesey are situated in the north of the district bordering Huntingdonshire district. Each of the four wards are 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 (18 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).

111 At Stage One both Scheme A and Scheme proposed the retention of the existing Longstanton and Swavesey wards, 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. Under Scheme B the existing Papworth ward would be combined 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.

112 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, 9 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).

113 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, and as a consequence of its decision to base its proposals on the 57-member scheme, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B.

114 Under the 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).

115 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident supported the draft recommendations in this area. The District Council expressed support for the proposed Longstanton and Swavesey wards. However, as detailed above, it proposed that Papworth & Elsworth ward be amended, resulting in the incorporation of Knapwell Parish Meeting. This view was also expressed by Knapwell Parish Meeting and Councillor Ellwood, also detailed above.

116 Papworth Everard Parish Council opposed the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward stating that “this arrangement would not best serve it nor the new villages now included in the larger ward”. It expressed concern that “one or both of the District Councillors could well come from Papworth Everard, as this is the biggest of the villages”. In addition, it expressed concern at the inclusion of Fen Drayton Parish Council in the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward which it stated is “separated from the other parts of the new ward by the busy A14”. It requested that the existing Papworth ward be retained or that the parish of Papworth Everard be joined with the parishes of Caxton and Eltisley to form a new two-member ward.

117 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Longstanton and Swavesey wards as final. We note that these wards have received an element of local support at Stage Three, as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality. However, we propose a revised Papworth & Elsworth ward based on the proposals submitted by the District Council, Councillor Ellwood and Knapwell Parish Meeting. We note that this proposal has received broad local support and have therefore been persuaded that Knapwell Parish Meeting would be better represented in the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward.

118 We acknowledge the views expressed by Papworth Everard Parish Council. However, its proposals would have a significant consequential impact on the surrounding wards in this area as well as providing for wards with unacceptably high levels of electoral inequality. We did, however, look at the possibility of removing the parish of Fen Drayton from the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward as we broadly concur with the view that it has better geographical links with Swavesey. However, this modification would result in the proposed Papworth & Elsworth and Swavesey wards containing 10 per cent fewer and 38 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2006. While we broadly accept that there would be merit in Fen Drayton forming part of the proposed Swavesey ward, we have not been persuaded that the identities and interests of the local community are such as to justify the high levels of electoral inequality that would result from such a proposal.

119 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Longstanton and Swavesey wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. The revised Papworth & Elsworth ward would contain 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (8 per cent more by 2006). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Bar Hill, Cottenham, Over and Willingham wards

120 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 (9 per cent, 28 per cent, 13 per cent and 53 per cent more by 2006).

121 At Stage One, the District Council, under Scheme A, 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).

122 Scheme B 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).

123 A further five representations were received 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 was strongly of the view that Rampton and Cottenham parish councils should remain in the same district ward. Councillor Collinson strongly supported the retention of Cottenham and Rampton parishes 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 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.

124 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that Scheme A had received a significant amount of opposition and that respondents' concern had been addressed under Scheme B, specifically in relation to the proposed Cottenham ward and the proposed warding of Oakington & Westwick parish. The LGCE therefore considered that the Scheme B proposals provided for an improved level of electoral equality, while reflecting a number of views expressed at Stage One. As detailed above, the LGCE was not 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.

125 Under the 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).

126 At Stage Three, the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident all expressed support for the proposed wards in this area. Councillor Hall (Bar Hill ward) supported the proposed Cottenham ward, Councillor Collinson (Cottenham ward) also supported the proposed Cottenham ward, stating that he considers "the proposal to be the most acceptable solution in terms of the constraints imposed by the district-wide review". Oakington & Westwick Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Cottenham ward, although it would rather that the existing Bar Hill ward be retained. Rampton Parish Council also expressed support for the proposed Cottenham ward.

127 County Councillor Johnstone (Willingham Division) expressed concern over the proposed Willingham & Over ward, stating that "Willingham and Over are not parishes that can be easily joined". She proposed that Over parish would be better combined with the parish of Swavesey "where the sense of community identity is far greater and facilities are shared". In addition, she expressed concern regarding the coterminosity of the LGCE's proposed wards with County Council divisions. Willingham Parish Council opposed the proposed three-member Willingham & Over ward. It expressed concern that "all three councillors could come from either Over or Willingham". It requested that it "would much prefer one resident councillor from Over and one from Willingham, together with one councillor representing both parishes".

128 As detailed above, Dry Drayton Parish Council proposed that the parishes of Boxworth, Childerley, Dry Drayton, Knapwell and Lolworth be combined with Oakington & Westwick parish to "form a ward of an appropriate size".

129 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Cottenham and Willingham & Over wards as final. We consider that these proposed wards have received a significant amount of support at Stage Three as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality.

130 We note the concerns of County Councillor Johnstone with regards to our proposed Willingham & Over ward. However, by combining Over parish with Swavesey ward, as proposed by Councillor Johnstone, the revised two-member Willingham and two-member Swavesey wards would contain 21 per cent fewer and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2006. We have not been persuaded by the argumentation

provided that these levels of electoral inequality can be justified. In relation to the comments put forward by Willingham Parish Council with regard to the proposed Willingham & Over ward, we have not been persuaded by the evidence received that the draft recommendations would adversely affect the identities and interests of the local community. In addition, we note that under existing arrangements, Willingham ward is significantly under-represented. However, in our view, this is successfully resolved by amalgamating the two wards of Willingham and Over and increasing the level of representation for the proposed ward from two to three.

131 As detailed above, we note the concerns of Dry Drayton Parish Council. However, due to our decision to amend this area in accordance with the District Council's proposals, as detailed above, we have been unable to facilitate the Parish Council's proposals. In addition, this proposal would involve amending the proposed Cottenham ward which has received significant support at Stage Three.

132 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the proposed Cottenham and Willingham & Over wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals in this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Histon and Waterbeach wards

133 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 (7 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer by 2006).

134 At Stage One, both Scheme A and Scheme B proposed the retention of the existing Histon ward. However, they proposed that it be renamed Histon & Impington ward. It was argued that "Histon and Impington have for some time been treated as a single settlement in many respects". Scheme B proposed retaining the existing Waterbeach ward, while Scheme A 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 (7 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).

135 One further submission was received in relation to this area. It 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 resulted 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.

136 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. However, it noted that the proposal to retain the existing Histon ward was identical under both schemes and that the schemes were broadly similar in relation to the existing Waterbeach ward. The LGCE concurred 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, it noted 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. The LGCE noted that both schemes respected the strong ties between the parishes of Waterbeach and Landbeach, but considered that the proposals under Scheme B resulted in an acceptable level of electoral equality.

137 Under the 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).

138 At Stage Three, the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident all expressed support for the draft recommendations in this area.

139 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Histon & Impington and Waterbeach wards as final. We consider that these wards have received an element of support at Stage Three as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality, given the good reflection of communities.

140 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the proposed Histon & Impington and Waterbeach wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Milton, Teversham and The Wilbrahams wards

141 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, part of 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).

142 At Stage One, Scheme A 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).

143 Scheme B 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).

144 Two further submissions were received in relation to this area. Stow cum Quy Parish Council expressed support for the Scheme B proposals, which would result in combining the parish with the parishes of Great Wilbraham and Little Wilbraham, which it considered 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”.

145 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its 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 were unaware of the detached Milton ward and, as a result, the issue was not addressed under either scheme. The LGCE therefore proposed warding Milton parish, 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 would result in the proposed Milton ward being over-represented by 15 per cent. However, the LGCE was unable to determine any other viable alternatives which would correct this anomaly, avoid the creation of a detached district ward and have regard to the identities and interests of the local community in this area.

146 Under the 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).

147 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident supported the draft recommendations for this area, while Teversham Parish Council “unanimously” supported the proposed Teversham ward. The District Council supported the proposed Teversham ward.

However, it opposed the proposed warding of the detached Milton parish and the inclusion of the proposed South parish ward in a district ward with Fen Ditton parish. It stated that “whilst it is fully recognised by everyone here that detached wards are to be avoided if at all possible, it should be recognised that the south parish ward is detached from the rest of Milton by less than 100 metres of grass field to the north of the A14 whereas it is separated entirely from Fen Ditton parish by the River Cam”. It argued that the proposals did not provide for “convenient or effective local government” and requested that an exception be made to retain the detached ward for electoral purposes, arguing that “there is no demand or request for this locally either from the proposed South parish ward electors or the proposed Milton parish ward electors”. In addition, it expressed concern as to whether anyone would be prepared to stand for election in the proposed South parish ward.

148 Councillor Kime broadly supported the proposed The Wilbrahams ward. However, he objected to the inclusion of South parish ward of Milton parish. He argued that South parish ward “is actually the other side of the river with absolutely no access at all to cross over it”. He also opposed the proposed Milton ward stating that “Milton is a large village with different concerns and needs of those of a small village like Horningsea”, which, in addition, are separated by the River Cam. He stated that Horningsea parish has “a lot more in common” with Fen Ditton. These views were reiterated by Horningsea Parish Council.

149 Milton Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Milton ward. However, it strongly opposed the warding of the detached Milton Parish and proposed that the whole of the parish form part of the revised Milton ward. In addition, it proposed that Chesterton Fen (Milton detached) be treated as a separate Parish Meeting. A parish councillor for Milton broadly reiterated the views of Milton Parish Council. He commented that “the reality is that Milton detached has no connection with the rest of Milton parish. The two communities are entirely separate, both culturally and, more perhaps more importantly, geographically”. He expressed concern regarding the administrative implications of the draft recommendation to ward the parish of Milton and suggested that an alternative would be to create separate parishes for Milton and Milton detached and that in the longer term, Milton detached be incorporated in Cambridge City.

150 Finally, a local resident commented on Milton detached and the administrative difficulties it creates between South Cambridgeshire district and Cambridge City. He requested an external boundary review between these two local authorities in order to correct this anomaly.

151 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the LGCE’s draft recommendations for Teversahm ward as final. This proposal has received an element of local support at Stage Three as well as providing for an acceptable level of electoral equality. We note the views expressed by a number of respondents in relation to the proposed Milton and The Wilbrahams wards. While we acknowledge that the most appropriate solution to this anomaly would be either the inclusion of the Milton detached area within Cambridge City or a parish review in order to create a separate Parish Meeting for the detached area, neither of these outcomes are possible within the remit of this PER. However, following further analysis of the Milton issue, taking into account all the representations received, we have been persuaded that part of Milton ward should remain detached.

152 While we are not minded to put forward a detached ward (part) except in the most exceptional circumstances, we have been persuaded by the views expressed that by combining Milton detached with Fen Ditton, it could well be argued that a detachment is still occurring as the two areas are geographically separated by the River Cam. On balance therefore, we are of the

view that the identities and interests of the local community would be better reflected if the two parts of Milton parish are retained within the same district ward. In addition, having concluded that the River Cam is a significant barrier in this area, we are of the view that Horningsea Parish Council would be better represented in the proposed The Wilbrahams ward, rather than the proposed Milton ward. We therefore propose retaining the existing Milton ward, coterminous with Milton parish (detached), together with a revised The Wilbrahams ward containing the parishes of Fen Ditton, Great Wilbraham, Horningsea, Little Wilbraham and Stow cum Quy.

153 Under our final recommendations, Teversham ward would contain the same number of electors per councillor as under the draft recommendations. Milton and The Wilbrahams wards would contain 9 per cent fewer and 15 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (17 per cent fewer and 6 per cent more by 2006). While we acknowledge that the proposed Milton ward would have a high level of electoral inequality by 2006, we are of the view that our proposals provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria, taking into account specific local circumstances. Our 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

154 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 Wrating, 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).

155 At Stage One the District Council, under Scheme A, 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).

156 Scheme B 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).

157 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. The LGCE noted that the proposed Balsham ward was broadly similar under Scheme A and Scheme B. However, it considered that the retention of the existing Fulbourn ward, as proposed under Scheme B,

provided for a better reflection of community identity in this area, and did not require a consequential warding of the parish of Fulbourn.

158 Under the 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).

159 At Stage Three the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident expressed support for the draft recommendations for this area, while Fulbourn Parish Council supported the proposed Fulbourn ward, which resulted in the existing ward being retained. Shudy Camps Parish Council broadly supported the proposed Balsham ward. However, it expressed concern that the ward “will become dominated by the larger village of Balsham”.

160 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Balsham and Fulbourn wards as final. We note that these wards have received an element of support at Stage Three, as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality. We acknowledge the views expressed by Shudy Camps Parish Council with regards to the proposed Balsham ward. However, due to the size and configuration of parishes in this area, we are of the view that the draft recommendations provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria and have been unable to identify any viable alternatives.

161 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the proposed Balsham and Fulbourn wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Abington, Linton and Sawston wards

162 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).

163 At Stage One the District Council, under Scheme A, 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 Hinxton, 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).

164 Scheme B 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 it was argued, avoids the division of the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington. Finally, it was 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).

165 Three further representations were received 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. It also 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.

166 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that these proposals had received a significant degree of local support at Stage One, especially in relation to the parishes of Great Abington and Little Abington. The LGCE concurred 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. It was not, however, persuaded that the 'Abingtons' and Hildersham parishes should be contained within the same district ward, as proposed by Little Abington Parish Council; this 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 were not significantly high levels of electoral inequality, on balance the LGCE was minded to put forward the proposals under Scheme B for the purposes of its draft recommendations. Finally, in relation to the proposals made by Stapleford Parish Council, the LGCE noted that the retention of the existing ward resulted in a variance of 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. The LGCE did not consider that there was sufficient justification for this level of electoral inequality to be retained. It did, 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.

167 Under the 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).

168 At Stage Three, the District Council, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident all expressed support for the draft recommendations in this area. Pampisford Parish Council

supported the proposed The Abingtons ward, and commented that “the addition of Hinxtton will be of benefit”. Hinxtton Parish Council strongly opposed the proposed The Abingtons ward, arguing that “the plan to group Hinxtton with Great and Little Abington is a nonsense as the parishes have nothing in common”. It asserted the Parish Council’s strong links with Ickleton parish, stating the two parishes “have a great deal of common ground”.

169 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. We note that these wards have received an element of local support at Stage Three, as well as providing for acceptable levels of electoral equality.

170 We note the concerns of Hinxtton Parish Council with regards to its inclusion in the proposed The Abingtons ward. While we accept the view that Hinxtton and Ickleton are closely linked, we also consider that Hinxtton is linked by the A11 with the other parishes which form the proposed The Abingtons ward. We did, however, look at the possibility of transferring Hinxtton Parish to the proposed Duxford ward in order to retain its links with Ickleton parish. This change would result in revised Duxford and The Abingtons wards containing 18 per cent more and 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2006. Based on our conclusions above, we are not of the view that there is sufficient justification for these high levels of electoral inequality. In addition, we note that Pampisford Parish Council welcomed the inclusion of Hinxtton Parish Council in the proposed The Abingtons ward.

171 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the proposed Linton, Sawston and The Abingtons wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Great Shelford, Harston, Little Shelford and Stapleford wards

172 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, 18 per cent, 41 per cent and 25 per cent fewer by 2006).

173 At Stage One, Scheme A and Scheme B contained identical proposals in relation to a revised Harston ward; they differed in respect of the other wards in this area. 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 8 per cent more than the average by 2006).

174 Scheme B 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).

175 One further representation was received 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.

176 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to base its draft recommendations for this area on Scheme B, as detailed above. It noted that there was broad consensus between Scheme A and Scheme B, with both schemes putting forward identical proposals in relation to the proposed Harston ward. However, the LGCE proposed one minor amendment in relation to the proposed ward name for The Shelfords ward, as detailed above.

177 Under the 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).

178 At Stage Three, Gamlingay Parish Council and a local resident expressed support for the draft recommendations. The District Council also expressed support for the proposed Harston and The Shelfords & Stapleford wards. However, it proposed that the proposed Harston ward be renamed Harston & Hauxton ward, which it argues, “is likely to have the wide support of both communities”.

179 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Harston and The Shelfords & Stapleford wards as final. However, we propose renaming the proposed Harston ward Harston & Hauxton ward as proposed by the District Council. We concur with the view that this name is a better reflection of the constituent parts of the proposed ward.

180 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for the proposed Harston & Hauxton and The Shelfords & Stapleford wards would be the same as under the final recommendations. Our proposals in this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

181 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

182 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE’s consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse its draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- Knapwell parish should form part of the proposed Papworth & Elsworth ward;
- Childerley parish should form part of the proposed Caldecote ward;
- Madingley parish should form part of the proposed Barton ward;
- the existing Girton ward should be retained;
- the existing Milton ward (part detached) should be retained;
- the proposed Harston ward should be renamed Harston & Hauxton ward.

183 We conclude that, in South Cambridgeshire:

- there should be a increase in council size from 55 to 57;
- there should be 34 wards, eight fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 30 of the existing wards should be modified.

184 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

| | 2001 electorate | | 2006 forecast electorate | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Current arrangements | Final recommendations | Current arrangements | Final 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 | 1,964 | 1,895 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 26 | 13 | 29 | 4 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 16 | 4 | 21 | 0 |

185 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 26 to 13, with four wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with only four wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

Final 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, in Appendix A and on the large map inside the back cover.

Parish Council Electoral Arrangements

186 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable 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 should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. The draft recommendations report proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for Milton parish to reflect the proposed district wards.

187 The parish of Milton is currently served by 15 councillors and is unwarded. Part of 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. Consequently, this anomaly was not addressed under either Scheme A or Scheme B. The draft recommendations report proposed warding the parish of Milton and combining each of the parish wards with areas with which they share closer geographical links. It proposed that the proposed Milton parish ward, which would be represented by 14 councillors, should form part of the revised Milton ward, while the proposed South parish ward, which would be represented by one councillor, should form part of the revised The Wilbrahams ward.

188 At Stage Three, The District Council, Councillor Kime, Horningsea Parish Council, Milton Parish Council, a Parish Councillor (Milton) and a local resident all expressed opposition to the draft recommendation to ward Milton parish, with Milton parish ward forming part of the proposed Milton ward and South parish ward forming part of the proposed The Wilbrahams ward.

189 Having carefully considered all the representations received in relation to this issue, we have decided not to confirm the draft recommendations in this area, as detailed above. We therefore do not propose any consequential warding of the parish of Milton as part of our final recommendations.

Final Recommendation

Milton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, and should remain unwarded. The parish should be coterminous with the proposed detached Milton district ward, as at present, and is illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

190 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, it was 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 did not have consequential effects on the proposed district wards in this area, the LGCE were content to put it forward for consultation.

191 At Stage Three, we received no comments regarding the warding of Little Wilbraham Parish Council and are therefore content to confirm the proposals as final.

Final 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 the revised The Wilbrahams district ward, and are illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

192 As discussed previously in paragraphs 82 and 83, at Stage One it was proposed that the parishes of Bourn and Caxton be warded in order to facilitate the ongoing Cambourne development site. The LGCE were 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. The LGCE recommended that when the PER of South Cambridgeshire District Council has been completed, there would be considerable benefit if, in the future, South Cambridgeshire District Council conducted such a review.

193 At Stage Three, the District Council, Andrew Lansley MP and Caxton Parish Council all opposed the decision not to ward the parishes of Bourn and Caxton, reiterating the proposal that parish warding should be undertaken and in addition, that a separate district ward be created to encompass the Cambourne development.

194 As detailed above, we are unable to facilitate this proposal based on the fact that there were no electors on the February 2001 register, the base register used for the purpose of this review, for the proposed Caxton Camborne ward. We reiterate the views expressed by the LGCE in its draft recommendations report, that there would be considerable benefit in South Cambridgeshire District Council conducting a parish review in order to address this issue.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

195 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in South Cambridgeshire and submitted our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692).

196 It is now up to the Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 4 June 2002.

197 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary
Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
30 Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW

APPENDIX A

Final 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 the report.

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

Map A1: Final Recommendations for South Cambridgeshire: Key Map