

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Detailed divisions	7
Cambridge City	8
East Cambridgeshire District	13
Fenland District	16
Huntingdonshire District	19
South Cambridgeshire District	25
Conclusions	29
Parish electoral arrangements	29
3 Have your say	32

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council	34
B Submissions received	39
C Glossary and abbreviations	41

# Summary

## Who we are

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

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

## Electoral review

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

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

## Why Cambridgeshire?

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

## Our proposals for Cambridgeshire

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

## Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that Cambridgeshire County Council's 61 councillors should represent 53 single-member divisions and four two-member divisions. None of our proposed 57 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Cambridgeshire by 2020.

**You have until 6 July 2015 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 32 for how to have your say.**

# 1 Introduction

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

## What is an electoral review?

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

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

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

## Consultation

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

Stage starts	Description
21 October 2014	Decision on council size
28 October 2014	Division pattern consultation
12 May 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
7 July 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
29 September 2015	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

---

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

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

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

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

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

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

	<b>2014</b>	<b>2020</b>
Electorate of Cambridgeshire	478,908	521,380
Number of councillors	61	61
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Cambridgeshire.

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

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

---

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

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

## Submissions received

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

## Electorate figures

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

15 During our consultation on division arrangements, we received several queries from members of the public regarding the electorate forecasts. In each instance we raised these with Cambridgeshire County Council and, accordingly, made some changes to the projections for Cambridge City.

16 Having considered the further information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

17 Cambridgeshire County Council currently has 69 councillors. The County Council submitted a proposal to decrease the council size from 69 to 63 members. The Liberal Democrat Group on Cambridgeshire County Council submitted a proposal to increase council size from 69 to 71. We requested further information from the County Council as to whether it had considered alternative council sizes and why any alternatives be less effective than 63 councillors. The Council responded that it had considered alternative sizes based on 57, 59, 61 and 63 councillors.

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

19 As we developed our draft recommendations, we discovered that 63 councillors did not provide the best allocation of county councillors between Cambridgeshire's five districts. As detailed later in this report, we found it particularly difficult to develop a pattern of divisions in Fenland that would have good electoral equality and reflect community identities. As a consequence, we examined alternative division arrangements under council sizes of between 64 and 61 members. We have concluded that 61 councillors will ensure a good allocation of councillors across Cambridgeshire. As stated in our Guidance, we will use our discretion to vary the number of councillors from the figure previously agreed if we find that an alternative will provide 'a better fit' of divisions across the county. On this basis we have decided to put forward draft recommendations based on a council size of 61 members.

20 A council size of 61 provides the following allocation between the district councils in the county:

- Cambridge – twelve councillors
- East Cambridgeshire – eight councillors
- Fenland – nine councillors
- Huntingdonshire – seventeen councillors
- South Cambridgeshire – fifteen councillors

## Division patterns

21 During consultation on division patterns, we received 63 submissions. While we did not receive a submission from the County Council, the Cambridge Labour Party submitted a county-wide proposal. Cambridge City Council and the North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association submitted district-wide proposals for Cambridge City and Fenland respectively. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of the county.

22 As we developed our draft recommendations with the forecasts provided by the County Council, we discovered that a pattern of divisions based on 63 councillors did not provide for the best allocation between the five districts in Cambridgeshire. We noted it was particularly difficult in Fenland district to achieve good electoral equality based on the 10 divisions that were initially allocated to Fenland. We analysed potential division arrangements for the county based on alternate council sizes of 64, 62 and 61 councillors.

23 Having carefully considered the alternative council sizes and the evidence received, we consider that 61 councillors for Cambridgeshire would achieve the best allocation between the five districts. It would also achieve improved electoral equality, particularly in Fenland district. A pattern of divisions based on either 64 or 62 councillors would result in poor levels of electoral equality in East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire, and South Cambridgeshire districts.

24 Our draft recommendations are for 53 single-member divisions and four two-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

25 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 34–8) and on the large map accompanying this report. We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

## Detailed divisions

26 The tables on pages 8–28 detail our draft recommendations for each district in Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.



## Cambridge City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Arbury</b>	1	1%	This division lies in the north-west of the city and comprises the Arbury community.	This division is largely based on the city-wide proposals we received for Cambridge. However, we have made one amendment to these proposals. We propose that Ascham Road, Atherton Close, Gurney Way and parts of Gilbert and Milton roads are also included in Arbury division. In our view, this arrangement better reflects the Arbury community and achieves good electoral equality for the division.
<b>Barnwell</b>	1	0%	This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Barnwell community and part of the Romsey community.	This division is based on the city-wide proposals we received for Cambridge. The Barnwell community is wholly contained within a single division. We received an objection to the city-wide proposals from a political group on the basis that it would not reflect community identity as part of Romsey Town is separated from Barnwell by the railway line. We considered including all of Romsey Town in its own single-member division. However, this would result in poor electoral equality as there are too many electors north of Fairfax and Vinery roads. The railway line also forms a strong boundary to the west. Therefore, we have decided to adopt the proposals for Barnwell division which better reflect the statutory criteria.
<b>Castle &amp; Newnham</b>	2	-1%	This division lies in the west of the city and comprises the Newnham community to the south. To the north of Madingley Road are the remnants of the Castle, University Colleges and part of the Arbury community.	The city-wide proposals received for Cambridge proposed two single-member divisions which used Madingley Road as the boundary between the two divisions. However, both divisions had poor levels of electoral equality. Having visited the area, we considered that communities on either side of Madingley Road were of similar character and that this area would be better placed in a two-member division. Our two-member division would provide good electoral equality and

				<p>avoid dividing communities either side of Madingley Road. We also noted that Grange Road provides access between the Newnham area in the south and communities north of Madingley Road. This particular division is expected to see significant development over the coming years.</p>
<b>Cherry Hinton</b>	1	3%	<p>This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Cherry Hinton community.</p>	<p>This division is partly based on the city-wide proposals we received for Cambridge. A local resident proposed that Gazelle Way and Yarrow Road are included within Cambridge City. As divisions must be wholly contained within district boundaries, we are unable to accommodate such an arrangement. We have made some minor modifications to the proposals for Cherry Hinton division.</p> <p>We propose that this division includes properties on Perne Road which are between Cherry Hinton Road and Natal Road. This also includes Gisborne Road, Langham Road and Perne Avenue. In the south of the division, we propose that the boundary run to the rear of properties and roads which only access onto the south side of Cherry Hinton Road. This arrangement would better reflect community identities as these properties face towards the Cherry Hinton community. Cherry Hinton division would also provide good levels of electoral equality and provide for effective and convenient local government.</p>
<b>Chesterton</b>	1	5%	<p>This division lies to the north-east of the city centre and is bounded by the River Cam to the south. The division comprises the Chesterton community.</p>	<p>This division is partly based on the city-wide proposals we received for Cambridge. However, we have made several modifications to these proposals. In the west of the division, Ascham Road, Atherton Close, Gurney Way and parts of Gilbert Road and Milton Road are transferred to Arbury division (see above). We also propose that Trafalgar Road, Trafalgar Street and part of Chesterton and Milton roads are transferred to our proposed Castle &amp; Newnham division. In the north of the division, we propose that a section of Milton</p>

				Road which continues after the junction with Union Lane is transferred to King's Hedges division. In the north-east, we propose to include Evergreens and parts of Green End Road into King's Hedges division. This would better reflect the access routes between the High Street and properties which access onto Water Lane. We consider that these arrangements provide an improved reflection of community identities and better electoral equality.
<b>King's Hedges</b>	1	5%	This division lies to the north of the city centre and comprises the King's Hedges area and parts of the East Chesterton community.	King's Hedges division is largely based on the city-wide proposals submitted for Cambridge. We have made some modifications to these proposals which are explained in the Chesterton division section above. As a result, we are satisfied that this division reflects community identities and is projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Queen Edith's</b>	1	-8%	This division lies to the south-east of the city and comprises a community centred around Queen Edith's Way.	Queen Edith's division is largely based on the city-wide proposals submitted for Cambridge. We have made modifications to this division to improve electoral equality in neighbouring Trumpington division (see below). The boundary for Queen Edith's division runs to the rear of Cherry Hinton Road up to the city boundary and behind properties on Beaumont Road and Worts' Causeway. The boundary then follows the centre of Hills Road, behind Luard Road and the railway line. We are content that this division appears to reflect community identities and it provides for good electoral equality.
<b>Romsey</b>	1	1%	This division lies to the east of the city centre and comprises the greater part of the Romsey Town community.	This division is partly based on the city-wide proposals for Cambridge. The modifications we have made are explained in the Cherry Hinton division section (see above). We received an objection from a political group to the city-wide proposal for Romsey division, particularly its northern boundary. The group argued that it would not reflect community identity as part of Romsey Town would be

				included in Barnwell division To include all of Romsey Town in a single-member division would result in poor electoral equality. We therefore propose a Romsey division which includes most of the Romsey community. We consider this division would provide the best balance of the statutory criteria.
<b>St Paul's</b>	1	-4%	This division takes in part of the city centre and comprises a significant number of Cambridge University colleges within the ring road. It also comprises the Newton community and part of the Petersfield community. This division is undergoing large-scale housing development.	This division is based on the city-wide proposals received for Cambridge. We received an objection to these proposals from a political group. The group argued that dividing the Park Street area between two divisions 'does not respect that local community'. The group also argued that Gonville Place and Lensfield Road, both of which form the southern end of the Cambridge ring road, mark a division between communities on either side and should not be included in the same division. We are not persuaded we have received sufficient evidence to adopt this alternative proposal. We have decided to adopt the city-wide proposal for St Paul's division. We are content that this division reflects community identity and that it provides for good electoral equality.
<b>St Matthew's</b>	1	-1%	This division takes in the remaining parts of the city centre and comprises a number of Cambridge University colleges. It also contains part of the Petersfield community.	This division is based on the city-wide proposals received for Cambridge. We received an objection to these proposals from a political group. The group argued that the city-wide proposals ignore East Road as a division between communities. We do not consider that East Road divides communities. Moreover, we consider it to be a focal point for communities on either side. Therefore, we have decided to adopt the city-wide proposals for St Matthew's division. We are content that this division appears to reflect community identity and it provides for good electoral equality.
<b>Trumpington</b>	1	-10%	This division lies to the south of the city and comprises the Trumpington community. This	This division is largely based on the county-wide proposals for Cambridge. To improve electoral equality in this division, we propose that Luard Close, Sedley Taylor Road and the

			division is currently undergoing large-scale housing development along its southern fringe.	west side of Hills Road, including The Perse School, are included in Trumpington division. We further propose to include Alwyne Road, Babraham Road and Worts' Causeway from Queen Edith's division. We are content that this division appears to reflect community identity and it provides for good electoral equality.
--	--	--	---	---

## East Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Ely East</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the east of the city, the cathedral area to the south and communities east of Lynn Road.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for Ely. We have made some minor modifications to the division to provide for clearer and more identifiable boundaries. These changes do not affect any electors. Ely East is forecast to have good electoral equality. We are also satisfied that it will reflect communities in the east of Ely.
<b>Ely West</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises much of the Ely community which is bounded by the A10 and A142 roads. The remainder of the division is made up of the rural area to the south and west of Ely.	This division is partly based on the county-wide submission for Ely. The county-wide proposals for this area included communities in the west of the city with rural areas to the east of the railway line and River Great Ouse. On our visit to Ely, we noted that the rural communities east of the railway line and river were a considerable distance from the west of Ely. We have decided to include the rural east area of Ely in Littleport East & Soham North division, using the river as the boundary. Our proposed division will provide for good electoral equality and better reflect community identity.
<b>Littleport East &amp; Soham North</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the eastern part of Littleport parish, the eastern part of Ely parish and northern part of Soham parish.	Our proposals are for the east of Littleport Town to be included with the rural part of Ely parish, east of the Peterborough to Ely railway line. We also propose to include the northern part of Soham parish to provide for acceptable electoral equality. The boundary in Soham would run behind Nightall Road, part of the middle of Pratt Street and behind properties on Bell Gardens and Weatheralls Close. We consider this division would provide the best balance of our statutory criteria.
<b>Littleport West</b>	2	8%	This division comprises Coveney, Downham,	Sutton Parish Council commented that it shares strong community links with adjoining rural parishes rather than with

			Haddenham, Mepal, Stretham, Sutton, Thetford, Wentworth, Wilburton, Witcham and Witchford parishes. The division also comprises parts of Littleport and Ely parishes.	Ely. Witchford Parish Council recommended changes to its parish boundaries which are not within the scope of this review. A local resident proposed the removal of Wentworth parish from Haddenham division. The county-wide proposal for this area provided for two single-member divisions. One of the proposed divisions had no direct access over the Peterborough to Ely railway line into Ely parish. We propose that this rural part of Ely parish, east of the railway line is included in our proposed Littleport East & Soham North division. As a consequence of this change, one of the divisions would have too few electors. To minimise electoral variances, we have decided to put forward a two-member division which includes the west of Littleport. We also propose to include Downham, Haddenham, Mepal, Stretham, Sutton, Thetford, Wentworth, Wilburton, Witcham and Witchford parishes in this division. We acknowledge that this division covers a large geographic area owing to the sparsely populated nature of the parishes that make up the division. However, we consider that our proposed division will reflect community identities and not divide them between divisions.
<b>Fordham Villages &amp; Soham South</b>	2	8%	This division comprises Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Wicken parishes. It also comprises the southern part of Soham parish.	We received a single submission in relation to this area. Wicken Parish Council commented on the strong links it has with the town of Soham and the few links it has with Burwell and Haddenham parishes. To provide for the best balance of the statutory criteria, we have decided to propose a two-member division which would divide the town of Soham. The boundary in Soham would run to the rear of Nightall Road, part of the middle of Pratt Street and behind properties on Bell Gardens and Weatheralls Close. We also propose that Burwell, Chippenham, Fordham, Isleham, Kennett, Reach, Snailwell, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Wicken parishes be included in the division to improve electoral equality. We are satisfied that this division reflects

				community identity and effective and convenient local government.
<b>Woodditton</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Ashley, Bottisham, Brinkley, Burrough Green, Cheveley, Dullingham, Kirtling, Lode, Stetchworth, Westley Waterlees and Woodditton parishes.	We have decided to retain the existing division of Woodditton. We consider that this division reflects community identity in this area and provides for effective and convenient local government.



## Fenland District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Chatteris</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the whole of Chatteris parish.	This division is based on the district-wide submission we received from a political group. We received a single submission from Chatteris Town Council. The Town Council welcomed proposals that included the entire parish in a single and separate division. Having considered the submission, we are satisfied that this arrangement best reflects the statutory criteria. We propose to adopt this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>March North &amp; Waldersey</b>	2	7%	This division comprises the northern part of March parish and the parishes of Christchurch, Elm and part of Wisbech St Mary parish.	We received a single submission for March from a county councillor who commented that the town would be better served by two councillors with a division arrangement that does not join March with nearby towns. In order to provide for good electoral equality, we have included the northern part of March with adjoining parishes. Our draft recommendations include the town, north of the River Nene and west of the High Street. The southern boundary of the division runs behind properties on Chandlers Way, Eastwood Avenue and behind Upwell Park. It also includes the rest of the rural part of March parish. The division has good road connections with Elm and Wisbech St Mary parishes.
<b>March South &amp; Rural</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the southern part of March parish and the parishes of Manea and Wimblington.	Our draft recommendations include the area of March south of River Nene and east of the High Street. The western boundary of the division would follow part of Isle of Ely Way (A141). The division has good road connections with Wimblington and Manea parishes to the south. Our proposed division will have good electoral equality and reflects community identity.

<b>Roman Bank &amp; Peckover</b>	1	8%	This division comprises Gorefield, Leverington, Newton, Parson Drove and Tydd St Giles parishes, and parts of Wisbech and Wisbech St Mary parishes.	A local resident commented that Peckover does not have any community affiliation with the villages in the division and should be included with Wisbech Town. Having considered the submission, we are not persuaded by this proposal. Although Peckover is within Wisbech parish, the River Nene provides a clear divide between Peckover and Wisbech Town. We propose to include Peckover with Gorefield, Leverington, Newton and Tydd St Giles parishes in this division. To improve electoral equality, we also propose to include Parson Drove and part of Wisbech St Mary parish. These parishes have good road connections to other parts of the division. Our proposed division reflects community identity and will provide effective and convenient local government.
<b>Whittlesey North</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises Bassenhally, Stonald and part of the St Andrews area.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission we received. The division would comprise the district wards of Bassenhally and Stonald. To improve electoral equality for the division we propose to make amendments to the boundary in the St Andrews area. The boundary would follow King's Dyke and run to the rear of properties on Garden Grove, Turners Lane and St Mary's Street. We consider this arrangement would provide the best balance of the statutory criteria.
<b>Whittlesey South</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the district wards of Benwick, Coates & Eastrea and Lattersey and part of St the Andrews area. It also comprises Benwick and Doddington parishes and the rural part of March parish.	Doddington Parish Council supported a division pattern which placed the parish with part of March, Manea and Wimblington parishes. Whittlesey Town Council supported an arrangement for the south of Whittlesey to be included in a division with Benwick and Doddington. The Town Council commented that it would oppose an arrangement that included part of March with Whittlesey. Our proposals for Whittlesey South include the district wards of Benwick, Coates & Eastrea and Lattersey. It also includes parts of St

				Andrews district ward. The boundary follows King's Dyke, and then turns north towards Market Street. Benwick and Doddington parishes are also included in the division. To achieve good electoral equality for divisions including March Town, we have included the rural area west of Isle of Ely Way (A141) in Whittlesey South division. We consider this arrangement would provide the best balance of the statutory criteria.
<b>Wisbech North</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the Kirkgate, Staithe and Waterlees areas of Wisbech.	We received four submissions relating to Wisbech. All respondents suggested that Wisbech parish should be divided into three separate divisions. We are unable to accommodate such an arrangement while also achieving acceptable levels of electoral equality. In particular, a Wisbech division containing Peckover and the Waterlees Village area would result in the creation of a detached division. The River Nene also establishes a clear and identifiable boundary between Peckover and Waterlees. In addition, all three divisions would result in poor levels of electoral equality. Our proposed division provides for clear and identifiable ward boundaries and good electoral equality. The division also reflects communities and provides for effective and convenient local government.
<b>Wisbech South</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the Clarkson, Hill and Medworth areas of Wisbech.	As explained above we are unable to accommodate a pattern of three divisions for Wisbech. Our proposals for Wisbech South comprise the Clarkson, Hill and Medworth areas of the town. We are satisfied that our proposed division provides for clear and identifiable ward boundaries and good electoral equality.

## Huntingdonshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Alconbury &amp; Kimbolton</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises Alconbury, Alconbury Weston, Barham & Woolley, Brington & Molesworth, Buckworth, Bythorn & Keyston, Catworth, Covington, Easton, Ellington, Great Gidding, Great Staughton, Hail Weston, Hamerton & Steeple Gidding, Kimbolton, Leighton, Little Gidding, Old Weston, Perry, Spaldwick, Stow Longa, Tilbrook, Upton & Coppingford and Winwick parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission received for this part of Cambridgeshire. We propose that Glatton parish is transferred to Norman Cross division which will minimise electoral variances in this area. We also propose that Perry parish is included within the division to improve electoral equality. We acknowledge that our proposed Alconbury & Kimbolton division covers a large geographic area owing to the sparsely populated nature of the parishes that make up the division. However, we consider that our proposed division provides for effective and convenient local government and will reflect community identities.
<b>Brampton &amp; Buckden</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises Brampton, Buckden, Diddington, Grafham, Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy and Southoe & Midloe parishes.	A local resident proposed the area should be included with Gransden, Toseland and Yelling parishes. A district councillor, Buckden Parish Council and Southoe & Midloe Parish Council commented that any arrangement in this area should include Buckden, Diddington and Southoe parishes in the same division. Our draft recommendations have accommodated this arrangement. We also propose that Brampton, Grafham and Offord Cluny & Offord D'Arcy parishes are included in the division. This arrangement would provide for good electoral equality while reflecting the community evidence received during consultation.
<b>Godmanchester &amp; Huntingdon South</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Godmanchester parish and a part of Huntingdon parish to	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received no other specific comments relating to areas within our proposed division. We

			the south of American Lane and Priory Road.	therefore propose a Godmanchester & Huntingdon South division as part of our draft recommendations. It is largely similar to the existing division in this area.
<b>Huntingdon North &amp; Hartford</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the north of Huntingdon parish, including the areas of Hartford and Sapley.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received no other specific comments relating to areas within our proposed division. To better reflect the geographical location of the division, we proposed the name, Huntingdon North & Hartford.
<b>Huntingdon West</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the centre and west of Huntingdon parish.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received no other specific comments relating to areas within our proposed division. We therefore propose a Huntingdon West division as part of our draft recommendations. The division provides for community identity and effective convenient local government. It is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Norman Cross</b>	1	7%	This division comprises Alwalton, Chesterton, Conington, Denton & Caldecote, Elton, Folksworth & Wasingley, Glatton, Haddon, Holme, Morborne, Sawtry, Sibson-cum-Stibbington, Stilton and Water Newton parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. The proposals included Glatton parish in Alconbury & Kimbolton division. However, this arrangement would not provide for effective and convenient local government as Conington, Holme and Sawtry parishes would be cut off from the rest of the division. We propose to include Glatton parish in our proposed Norman Cross division. The A1(M) also provides strong road access between communities in the proposed division. This division is projected to have good electoral equality by 2020.
<b>Ramsey &amp; Bury</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Bury and Ramsey parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received a single submission from Ramsey Town Council. The Town Council commented that it would prefer to remain within its existing division. A division including only Ramsey parish would have too few

				electors to achieve good electoral equality. We therefore propose to include the parish of Bury in our proposed division. We consider that this arrangement would provide for good electoral equality and not divide communities in this area.
<b>Somersham &amp; Earith</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises Bluntisham, Colne, Earith, Old Hurst, Pidley cum Fenton, Somersham, Woodhurst and Wyton-on-the-Hill parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received a single submission from Earith Parish Council. The Parish Council commented that it would prefer to remain within its existing division. Our proposed division takes into account these comments. We consider that the division reflects community identities and is projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>St Ives North</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the north of St Ives parish.	A parish councillor commented that St Ives should be in its own single-member division. It was also suggested that if the town is to be divided, Ramsey Road or St Audrey Lane and Houghton Road would provide a clear boundary. As St Ives parish is too big for a single-member division, we propose the northern part forms a single-member division. The division boundary would run along part of Houghton Road and behind the rear of properties which access onto St Audrey Lane. We consider that this arrangement reflects community identities and provides for effective and convenient local government.
<b>St Ives South &amp; Needingworth</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the south of St Ives parish and Holywell-cum-Needingworth parish.	Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council commented that it would prefer to remain in its existing division. A local resident argued that St Ives has grown significantly and does not need an additional parish to be linked to it. St Ives parish is too big for a single-member division and too small for a two-member division. We have therefore divided St Ives parish between two single-member divisions. The southern part of St Ives parish would form a division with Holywell-cum-Needingworth parish. We are content that this division reflects community identity and provides for good electoral equality.

<b>St Neots East &amp; Gransden</b>	1	0%	This division comprises part of a new development in St Neots east of the railway line and Abbotsley, Great Gransden, Great Paxton, Toseland, Waresley-cum-Tetworth and Yelling parishes.	<p>This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. Great Gransden Parish Council, Great Paxton Parish Council and Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council all objected to proposals which included them with the Loves Farm development in St Neots parish. Due to the road network within the division, Great Paxton, Toseland and Yelling parishes do not have complete road access with Abbotsley, Great Gransden and Waresley-cum-Tetworth parishes in the south.</p> <p>We investigated an alternative pattern which was to transfer the Loves Farm development into a division in St Neots and include Little Paxton parish in a division with the rural parishes mentioned. However, we discovered that Little Paxton parish has no direct access with these parishes as there is no crossing over the River Great Ouse and railway line. Its only access would be via St Neots. In addition, including the Loves Farm development with a division in St Neots would lead to poor levels of electoral equality. Therefore we propose St Neots East &amp; Gransden as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that our proposed division provides the best balance of the statutory criteria and reflect communication links between its communities.</p>
<b>St Neots Eynesbury</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the east of St Neots which includes the Eynesbury area.	<p>This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We propose a minor amendment to the proposals which is for Church Meadow to be included in the division. On our visit to the area we discovered that Church Meadow and adjoining roads have road access over Fox Brook and into the Eynesbury area. Rather than following the brook between Church Street and Cambridge Street, the proposed boundary would run along the centre of Church Street and Cambridge Street where it would then meet Fox Brook. This would provide for a clear</p>

				and identifiable division boundary. It also would lead to improved electoral equality.
<b>St Neots Priory Park &amp; Little Paxton</b>	1	2%	This division comprises the parish of St Neots north of the High Street and Little Paxton parish.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. To improve electoral equality for the division, we propose to transfer Church Meadow and adjoining roads into St Neots Eynesbury division. The boundary would run as described in the St Neots Eynesbury section above. We are content that this division reflects community identity.
<b>St Neots The Eatons</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the west of St Neots which includes the Eaton Ford area.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. The division, in our view, reflects community identities and uses clearly identifiable division boundaries.
<b>The Hemingfords &amp; Fenstanton</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Fenstanton, Hemingford Abbots, Hemingford Grey, Hilton and Houghton & Wyton parishes.	<p>We received two submissions in relation to this area. Houghton &amp; Wyton Parish Council commented that it would prefer to remain within its existing division. A parish councillor commented that the only access between Houghton &amp; Wyton and Hemingford Abbots parishes is via a footbridge over the River Great Ouse. Having visited the area, we are satisfied that the footbridge provides a good connection between Houghton &amp; Wyton parish and the other parishes within the division.</p> <p>We have decided to retain the existing division. We consider The Hemingfords &amp; Fenstanton division reflects the communities in this area. The division is also projected to have good electoral equality.</p>



<b>Warboys &amp; The Stukeleys</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Abbots Ripton, Broughton, Kings Ripton, The Stukeleys, Upwood & The Raveleys, Warboys, Wistow and Wood Walton parishes.	We received two submissions relating to this part of Cambridgeshire. Warboys Parish Council supported an arrangement that placed it with Broughton parish. However, it further stated that it would object to an arrangement which divided the parish between two divisions or where it was in division with The Stukeleys parish. The Stukeleys Parish Council commented that it would prefer to remain within its existing division. We investigated whether it was possible to transfer The Stukeleys parish into a division with Huntingdon parish. However, this would result in poor levels of electoral equality. We therefore propose this division as part of draft recommendations. We consider that our proposed division provides the best balance of the statutory criteria.
<b>Yaxley &amp; Farcet</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Farcet and Yaxley parishes.	We have decided to retain the existing division of Yaxley & Farcet. The division reflects community identities and is projected to have good electoral equality. It also provides for effective and convenient local government.

## South Cambridgeshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Bar Hill</b>	1	3%	This division comprises Bar Hill, Dry Drayton, Girton and Madingley parishes.	This division is substantially different to the county-wide submission for this area. As a result of changes in the west of the district, we propose that Bar Hill division comprises the four parishes mentioned in the description. We consider that the division will reflect community identities and have good electoral equality.
<b>Cambourne</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Bourn, Boxworth, Cambourne, Childerley, Knapwell and Lolworth parishes.	This division is substantially different to the county-wide submission for this area. A local resident commented that Cambourne should have its own county councillor. The county-wide submission proposed a division in this area with poor road access between communities. Our draft recommendations for Cambourne include six parishes, divided by the A428 but with good road access over the dual carriageway.
<b>Cottenham &amp; Willingham</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Cottenham, Rampton and Willingham parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We therefore propose Cottenham & Willingham division as part of our draft recommendations. The division reflects community identity and provides for effective convenient local government. It is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Duxford</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises Duxford, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great & Little Chishill, Heydon, Hinxton, Ickleton, Shepreth, Thriplow and Whittlesford parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. However, we propose a minor modification which is to include Hinxton parish in the division.

<b>Fulbourn</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the southern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Fulbourn, Great Wilbraham, Little Wilbraham, Stow cum Quy and Teversham parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We have made modifications to the proposals in order that the proposed division follows clear and identifiable boundaries. We propose that Fen Ditton parish is divided between Fulbourn and Waterbeach divisions. We also include Great Wilbraham parish in the proposed division.
<b>Gamlingay</b>	1	-7%	The division comprises Abington Pigotts, Arrington, Barrington, Croydon, Gamlingay, Guilden Morden, Hatley, Little Gransden, Longstowe, Orwell, Shingay cum Wendy, Steeple Morden, Tadlow and Wimpole parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission. Hatley and Longstowe parish councils commented that they would prefer to remain in a division with the village of Gamlingay. Our draft recommendations take into consideration the evidence received for this area. We consider that the division reflects community identities and provides for effective and convenient local government. It is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Hardwick</b>	1	2%	This division comprises Barton, Caldecote, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Great Eversden, Harlton, Hardwick, Kingston, Little Eversden and Toft parishes.	We received a single submission from Barton Parish Council which preferred to remain in the existing Hardwick division. As a result of modifications in the west of the district, we propose a substantially different Hardwick division with 11 parishes. We consider that the division reflects community identity and provides for effective and convenient local government. It is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Histon &amp; Impington</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Histon, Impington and Orchard Park parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridge. We are satisfied that our proposals provide a fair reflection of community identities and interests in this area and will minimise electoral variances.
<b>Linton</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Balsham, Bartlow, Carlton, Castle Camps, Great	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We propose a minor modification which is to include Great Abington and Little

			Abington, Hildersham, Horseheath, Linton, Little Abington, Shudy Camps, Weston Colville, West Wickham and West Wrattling parishes.	Abington parishes in the proposed division to ensure good electoral equality.
<b>Melbourn &amp; Bassingbourn</b>	1	0%	This division comprises Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth, Litlington, Melbourn, Meldreth and Whaddon parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received a submission from Whaddon Parish Council which preferred to remain in a division with Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth parish. Our draft recommendations take into consideration the evidence received for this area and reflects community identities.
<b>Northstowe &amp; Over</b>	1	1%	This division comprises Longstanton, Oakington & Westwick and Over parishes.	This division is based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We received a submission from Over Parish Council which proposed a division covering itself, Fen Drayton, Swavesey and Willingham parishes. However, this would result in Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick parishes having too few electors to create a viable division between them. We therefore consider our division arrangement to be the best balance of the statutory criteria and would propose it as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Papworth &amp; Swavesey</b>	1	0%	This division comprises Caxton, Conington, Croxton, Elsworth, Eltisley, Fen Drayton, Graveley, Papworth Everard, Papworth St Agnes and Swavesey parishes.	We received two submissions from parishes in this area. Caxton Parish Council commented that it would prefer Caxton to have separate representation from Cambourne. Fen Drayton Parish Council commented that it would prefer to remain in its existing division. We have substantially modified the county-wide proposals for this division to provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations are to propose a division comprising 11 parishes which share good road connections over the A14

				and A428. We consider that the division reflects community identity and is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Sawston</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Babraham, Pampisford, Sawston and Stapleford parishes.	We received two submissions relating to Sawston division. A resident provided localised comments in relation to all four parishes in the division. Stapleford Parish Council commented that it preferred to remain in the same division as Great and Little Shelford. However, to accommodate this arrangement would result in poor levels of electoral equality in both this division and Shelford division. We consider that our proposed division best reflects the statutory criteria.
<b>Shelford</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Great Shelford, Harston, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Little Shelford and Newton parishes.	We received six submissions relating to parishes within our proposed division. Great Shelford, Harston, Hauxton and Little Shelford parishes all commented that they would prefer to be in the same division. Two local residents preferred that Harston and Newton parishes were in the same division. Our draft recommendations take into consideration the evidence received for this area. We consider that this proposed division reflects community identities and provides for effective and convenient local government. It is also projected to have good electoral equality.
<b>Waterbeach</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the northern part of Fen Ditton parish. It also comprises Horningsea, Landbeach, Milton and Waterbeach parishes.	This division is largely based on the county-wide submission for this part of Cambridgeshire. We have made modifications to the proposals so that it has clear and identifiable boundaries. We propose that Fen Ditton parish is divided between Waterbeach and Fulbourn divisions in order to avoid the creation of a detached division.

## Conclusions

27 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2020 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	61	61
Number of electoral divisions	57	57
Average number of electors per councillor	7,851	8,547
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	16	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	4	0

### **Draft recommendation**

Cambridgeshire County Council should comprise 61 councillors serving 53 single-member divisions and four two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

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

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

parish electoral arrangements.

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

Ely Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Central (returning one member), North (returning five members), North West (returning three members), Rural East (returning one member), Rural North (returning one member), South (returning three members) and South East (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

Huntingdon Town Council should return 19 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Central (returning two members), East (returning four members), North East (returning four members), South (returning two members) and West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

March Town Council should return 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Central (returning one member), East (returning three members), Eastwood (returning one member), North (returning three members), Rural North (returning one member), Rural South (returning one member) and South (returning

two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

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



### 3 Have your say

39 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

40 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Cambridgeshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

41 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at **[consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

Submissions can also be made by emailing **[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)** or by writing to:

**Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP**

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Cambridgeshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

42 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices at Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

43 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

44 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

45 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Cambridgeshire County Council in 2017.

## Equalities

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

## Appendix A

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Cambridge City								
1	Arbury	1	7,593	7,593	-3%	8,615	8,615	1%
2	Barnwell	1	8,288	8,288	6%	8,538	8,538	0%
3	Castle & Newnham	2	14,854	7,427	-5%	16,858	8,429	-1%
4	Cherry Hinton	1	8,684	8,684	11%	8,839	8,839	3%
5	Chesterton	1	8,679	8,679	11%	8,977	8,977	5%
6	King's Hedges	1	9,029	9,029	15%	8,996	8,996	5%
7	Queen Edith's	1	7,183	7,183	-9%	7,828	7,828	-8%
8	Romsey	1	8,408	8,408	7%	8,670	8,670	1%
9	St Paul's	1	7,844	7,844	0%	8,231	8,231	-4%
10	St Matthew's	1	8,002	8,002	2%	8,490	8,490	-1%
11	Trumpington	1	4,595	4,595	-41%	7,708	7,708	-10%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
East Cambridgeshire District								
12	Ely East	1	6,914	6,914	-12%	8,960	8,690	5%
13	Ely West	1	7,581	7,581	-3%	7,960	7,960	-7%
14	Littleport East & Soham North	1	9,085	9,085	16%	9,260	9,260	8%
15	Littleport West	2	17,317	8,659	10%	18,510	9,225	8%
16	Fordham Villages & Soham South	2	16,525	8,263	5%	18,500	9,250	8%
17	Woodditton	1	8,108	8,108	3%	8,460	8,460	-1%
Fenland District								
18	Chatteris	1	8,100	8,100	3%	8,980	8,980	5%
19	March North & Waldersey	2	17,889	8,945	14%	18,351	9,176	7%
20	March South & Rural	1	7,924	7,924	1%	9,229	9,229	8%
21	Roman Bank & Peckover	1	8,992	8,992	15%	9,250	9,250	8%
22	Whittlesey North	1	7,565	7,565	-4%	7,910	7,910	-7%
23	Whittlesey South	1	8,436	8,436	7%	8,530	8,530	0%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
24	Wisbech North	1	7,926	7,926	1%	8,551	8,551	0%
25	Wisbech South	1	8,043	8,043	2%	8,299	8,299	-3%
Huntingdonshire District								
26	Alconbury & Kimbolton	1	7,866	7,866	0%	7,890	7,890	-8%
27	Brampton & Buckden	1	8,013	8,013	2%	8,320	8,320	-3%
28	Godmanchester & Huntingdon South	1	6,834	6,834	-13%	7,813	7,813	-9%
29	Huntingdon North & Hartford	1	8,500	8,500	8%	8,497	8,497	-1%
30	Huntingdon West	1	6,788	6,788	-14%	8,310	8,310	-3%
31	Norman Cross	1	9,077	9,077	16%	9,110	9,110	7%
32	Ramsey & Bury	1	8,179	8,179	4%	8,670	8,670	1%
33	Somersham & Earith	1	8,298	8,298	6%	8,400	8,400	-2%
34	St Ives North	1	7,373	7,373	-6%	7,815	7,815	-9%
35	St Ives South & Needingworth	1	7,790	7,790	-1%	7,845	7,845	-8%
36	St Neots East & Gransden	1	4,669	4,669	-41%	8,560	8,560	0%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
37	St Neots Eynesbury	1	7,960	7,960	1%	8,111	8,111	-5%
38	St Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	1	8,504	8,504	8%	8,723	8,723	2%
39	St Neots The Eatons	1	8,687	8,687	11%	8,466	8,466	-1%
40	The Hemingfords & Fenstanton	1	7,628	7,628	-3%	8,100	8,100	-5%
41	Warboys & The Stukeleys	1	6,112	6,112	-22%	8,500	8,500	-1%
42	Yaxley & Farcet	1	8,479	8,479	8%	8,650	8,650	1%
South Cambridgeshire District								
43	Bar Hill	1	7,365	7,365	-6%	8,790	8,790	3%
44	Cambourne	1	7,251	7,251	-8%	7,750	7,750	-9%
45	Cottenham & Willingham	1	8,163	8,163	4%	8,900	8,900	4%
46	Duxford	1	7,860	7,860	0%	7,870	7,870	-8%
47	Fulbourn	1	7,086	7,086	-10%	9,069	9,069	6%
48	Gamlingay	1	7,769	7,769	-1	7,940	7,940	-7%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
49	Hardwick	1	8,560	8,560	9%	8,760	8,760	2%
50	Histon & Impington	1	7,986	7,986	2%	8,850	8,850	4%
51	Linton	1	8,420	8,420	7%	8,440	8,440	-1%
52	Melbourn & Bassingbourn	1	8,515	8,515	8%	8,540	8,540	0%
53	Northstowe & Over	1	5,888	5,888	-25%	8,590	8,590	1%
54	Papworth & Swavesey	1	6,735	6,735	-14%	8,550	8,550	0%
55	Sawston	1	7,505	7,505	-4%	8,100	8,100	-5%
56	Shelford	1	7,575	7,575	-4%	8,860	8,860	4%
57	Waterbeach	1	7,909	7,909	1%	8,091	8,091	-5%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>478,908</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>521,380</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Averages</b>		<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>7,851</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>8,547</b>	<b>–</b>

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

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

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

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

### District councils

- Cambridge City Council
- South Cambridgeshire District Council

### County councillors

- Councillor B. Hunt
- Councillor S. Count
- Councillor T. Orgee

### District councillors

- Councillor B. Boddington
- Councillor R. West
- Councillor S. King

### Parish councillor

- Councillor C. Saunderson

### Political groups and parties

- Cambridge Labour Party Group
- Cambridge Liberal Democrat Group
- North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association

### Parish and town councils

- Barton Parish Council
- Buckden Parish Council
- Caxton Parish Council
- Chatteris Town Council
- Ely Town Council
- Doddington Parish Council
- Earith Parish Council
- Fen Drayton Parish Council
- Girton Parish Council
- Graveley Parish Council
- Great Buckden Parish Council
- Great Gransden Parish Council



- Great Paxton Parish Council
- Great Shelford Parish Council
- Harston Parish Council
- Hatley Parish Council
- Hauxton Parish Council
- Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council
- Houghton & Wyton Parish Council
- Little Gransden Parish Council
- Little Shelford Parish Council
- Longstowe Parish Council
- Madingley Parish Council
- Manea and Elm Parish Councils
- Over Parish Council
- Ramsey Town Council
- Sawston Parish Council
- Southoe & Midloe Parish Council
- St Ives Town Council
- Stapleford Parish Council
- Stukeleys Parish Council
- Sutton Parish Council
- Swavesey Parish Council
- Warboys Parish Council
- Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council
- Whaddon Parish Council
- Whittlesey Town Council
- Wicken Parish Council
- Witcham Parish Council
- Witchford Parish Council

#### **Local residents**

- 11 local residents

## Appendix C

### Glossary and abbreviations

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

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

