

**PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEW OF  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**Submission to the  
Boundary Committee for England  
By Cambridgeshire County Council**

**July 2003**

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Council Size</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. The County Council's Proposal</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 - Cambridge City	10
4.2 - East Cambridgeshire	11
4.3 - Fenland	13
4.4 - Huntingdonshire	16
4.5 - South Cambridgeshire	22
<b>Appendix 1 - Consultation feedback summary</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Maps</b>	<b>35</b>
A2.1 - Cambridge City	36
A2.2 - East Cambridgeshire	37
A2.3 - Fenland	38
A2.4 - Huntingdonshire	39
A2.4a - St Ives	40
A2.4b - St Neots	41
A2.4c - Huntingdon	42
A2.4d – Huntingdonshire alternative	43
A2.5 - South Cambridgeshire	44
<b>Appendix 3 - Corrections</b>	<b>45</b>

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 11 March 2003, The Boundary Committee for England began a review of the electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council. Interested parties were invited to submit proposals for their consideration by 7 July 2003.
- 1.2 This document presents the proposal agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council. The Council's proposal was developed by a cross-party Working Group and five cross-party district-focused sub-groups. Initial proposals were drafted and a consultation document circulated to County Councillors, District Councils, Parish Councils, MPs, political parties and residents' associations. The consultation period began in April 2003 and ended on 30 May 2003.
- 1.3 Following the end of the consultation period, the sub-groups and then the Working Group met to agree changes to the proposal, reflecting local opinion. Comments received during the consultation are summarised in Appendix 1.
- 1.4 The Working Group examined the feedback received and explored ways to incorporate the representations into the proposal. In some cases this was not possible because the changes could not be integrated into a scheme that covered the whole district. In other situations, particularly where a representation was made for the retention of the status quo, the Council was unable to accept the representation within the parameters of the Review.
- 1.6 Throughout the Review, the County Council has been guided by the following principles, as prescribed by the Boundary Committee for England or agreed by the Working Group. Divisions proposed would, wherever possible:

- **Be coterminous with the new district ward boundaries**

The Council notes the benefits of coterminosity to both electors and councillors. In areas where coterminosity must be lost, the Council aims to ensure that a good level of electoral equality and community representation is attained.

- **Achieve a good level of electoral equality**

The council aims to create divisions that vary from the county average by less than 10%. Where higher levels of variation are proposed, the council aims that there should be a concurrent coterminosity or community benefit.

- **Be represented by a single County Councillor**

Councillors expressed unanimous opposition to the implementation of multi-member divisions in Cambridgeshire. Councillors agreed they are confusing for the electorate and for members and do not lead to clear local representation. In rural areas multi-member divisions tend to be geographically large and unwieldy, and they may group areas of low population density together that have no contact or common interest and are a long distance apart. Above all, Members felt that multi-member divisions at county level contradict the need for accountability and transparency as espoused by Government. It is difficult for elected members in a division where responsibility is shared to establish any meaningful relationships with parish councils or local organisations or with individual

electors. It is also difficult for electors to know to which member problems should be referred.

▪ **Not group ‘urban’ market towns areas with neighbouring rural parishes**

Councillors agreed that the market towns in Cambridgeshire have a unique and separate identity. Although they are local centres, and surrounding parishes look to them for services, the needs of residents tend to be more ‘urban’ in character and are certainly different to those of residents in small neighbouring settlements. In particular, the new Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan identifies market towns as one of the main locations for new housing. This means the market towns will be undergoing considerable expansion over the coming years, further distancing them from the declining populations of the rural villages.

## 2. Summary

2.1 The County Council proposes increasing the size of the Council from 59 to 68 members, reflecting the increase in workload set out in Section 3. A council size of 68 gives the following distribution of councillors between each Cambridgeshire district.

**Table 1: Distribution of Councillors between districts**

<b>District</b>	<b>Current number of councillors</b>	<b>2008 electorate</b>	<b>Proportion of electorate</b>	<b>Distribution of 68 Members</b>
Cambridge City	14	91,637	20.01%	14
East Cambridgeshire	7	59,243	12.93%	9
Fenland	9	73,258	15.99%	11
Huntingdonshire	15	124,658	27.22%	18
South Cambridgeshire	14	109,232	23.85%	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>458,028</b>		<b>68</b>

2.2 In Cambridge City the Council proposes 14 single-member divisions, each coterminous with one district ward. This district would be 100% coterminous and no division’s electorate varies more than 10% from the county average by 2008.

2.3 In East Cambridgeshire the Council proposes creating 9 coterminous single-member divisions. With the exception of one, the divisions all have an electorate within 20% of the county average.

2.4 In Fenland the Council proposes creating 11 single-member divisions, 9 of which are fully coterminous with the district wards. Two of the proposed divisions have an electorate of more than 20% below the county average, but the high level of coterminosity balances this.

2.5 In Huntingdonshire, the Council proposes 18 single-member divisions, of which 5 would be coterminous. No division has an electorate that varies by more than 20% from the county average.

2.6 In South Cambridgeshire the Council proposes creating 16 coterminous divisions, none of which has an electorate that varies by more than 20% from the county average.

### **3. COUNCIL SIZE**

#### **3.1 BACKGROUND**

3.1.1 The Review of Local Government in Cambridgeshire took place in 1998. The population of the two new authorities was:

- New Cambridgeshire 542,900 – 59 *Councillors*
- Peterborough 152,900 – 57 *Councillors*
- Total for Old Cambridgeshire had it still existed 695,800 – 77 *Councillors*

3.1.2 Cambridgeshire is one of the fastest growing counties in the country, with some 70% of population growth due to inward migration. It had an estimated population of 553,600 in mid-2001, an increase of more than 4,000 each year for the past 10 years. It is estimated that by 2016 another 85,000 people will be living in the county.

3.1.3 The Council adopted and implemented its new constitution with effect from 15th May 2001. It moved to a Cabinet system of governance based on the main components of the structure detailed below, and other groups.

#### **3.2 CABINET**

3.2.1 The Cabinet consists of the Leader together with nine Councillors. Each Cabinet Member is assigned a portfolio. Cabinet meets at least ten times per year. Meetings of Cabinet/SMT (Strategic Management Team) are also held approximately fourteen times a year.

3.2.2 A report prepared for the Interim Scheme of Members' Allowances detailing experience over 1999/00 and 2000/01 showed that 'average' leading Members (i.e. in receipt of a Special Responsibility Allowance because of their additional responsibilities) attended meetings on approximately 75 days a year.

3.2.3 The use of attendance allowances paid to calculate attendances tends to understate the time commitment because only attendance eligible for allowances was recorded. Members also commit time for which allowances were no longer payable. This was particularly the case for leading Members.

3.2.4 The report estimated under the new arrangements that an 'average' leading Member would devote some 80 to 90 days per annum to Council business. (This equates to a 7 – 20% increase in the number of days per annum devoted by an 'average' leading Member to Council business.) However, averages mask wide variations for individual Members: for example, the Leader of the Council may need to devote more days compared to a minor portfolio holder.

### **3.3 SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

- 3.3.1 The Council has four scrutiny committees dealing with Environment and Transport, Health and Social Care, Education, Libraries and Heritage, and Policy to discharge the functions conferred by Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000. The Policy Scrutiny Committee also acts as the Council's Audit Committee. The Council can also appoint up to three ad-hoc Scrutiny Panels, for a fixed period, as and when necessary.
- 3.3.2 Scrutiny Committees comprise seven County Councillors (and cannot include Cabinet Members and opposition Spokesmen for that service). They meet approximately seven times a year. Extraordinary meetings can be called from time to time as and when appropriate. They have their own work programme. The Council is encouraging Scrutiny Committees to meet away from Shire Hall (Headquarters based in Cambridge) more frequently and to seek input from a wider range of sources. This will require additional work between meetings resulting in an increase demand on member time.
- 3.3.3 Four standing scrutiny chairman have been appointed. Together with three other Councillors they form a Scrutiny Management Committee to manage the whole scrutiny process. This meets three times a year.
- 3.3.4 Continuity of membership is very important in developing scrutiny. The use of substitutes and changes of membership therefore do not enhance the effectiveness of the scrutiny function.
- 3.3.5 A report prepared for the Interim Scheme of Members' Allowances estimated that Scrutiny Chairs spend 38 special responsibility days on scrutiny and 36 days on ordinary Councillor duties. Their role has been recognised with the introduction of a Special Responsibility Allowance.
- 3.3.6 The number of Member Led Reviews and ad-hoc scrutiny Panels, which require Member input and the extent of Member input into these meetings was unclear when the Constitution was approved. In practice, at any one time each Scrutiny Committee usually has one Member Led Review in progress and there is one ad hoc scrutiny panel running. The investigative style of these groups means that they can be more time-consuming for the members involved than membership of the parent Committee.

### **3.4 HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SCRUTINY**

- 3.4.1 The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee oversees a number of bodies which will be responsible for carrying out health scrutiny, as enabled by Section 7 of the Health and Social Care Act 2001, and scrutiny of Social Services. These bodies are:
- Four Area Health and Social Care Scrutiny Panels have been established based on Primary Care Trust boundaries. Each Panel comprises four County Councillors (except for East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, which comprises five). Cabinet members are not allowed to serve on these Panels.

- A Social Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee comprising the seven County Councillors on the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee has also been established to scrutinise Social Services matters internal to the County Council.
- Ad hoc working groups may be established to address specific issues, as appropriate.

3.4.2 The new power of health scrutiny came into effect on 1st January 2003. At this stage it is expected that:

- The Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee will meet seven times a year.
- The four Area Health Scrutiny Panels will meet four times a year.
- The Social Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee will meet seven times a year.

3.4.3 As in 3.3.6, it is difficult to predict the number of ad hoc reviews which may need to be undertaken.

### **3.5 SERVICE DEVELOPMENT GROUPS (SDGs)**

3.5.1 There are eleven permanent SDGs (non-executive advisory groups) established to provide a focus at member level for co-ordination of a range of specified services and functions of the Council. They comprise nine members and are chaired by a Cabinet Member for the relevant portfolio. They meet approximately six times a year. Any Member can attend an SDG as an observer and local members are invited when a local patch issue is to be discussed.

3.5.2 The Council for the first time in January 2003 held Budget Advisory Panels for each of the four Directorate areas. This provided an opportunity for SDG Members from the relevant service area to focus and comment on the Council's budget. These Panels now meet twice yearly in November and January and are Chaired by the Cabinet Member for the relevant portfolio. Panels vary in size with some comprising 13 members and others 21.

3.5.3 An extensive budget consultation exercise is undertaken every January. This involves two public consultation meetings held in the evening and four library "drop in" sessions held on Saturdays. These meetings are very successful with members of the public taking the opportunity to raise issues of concern with Group Leaders or their representatives. Meetings are also held with the voluntary sector, Trades Unions and Local Councils.

### **3.6 PARTNERSHIPS**

#### **Local Strategic Partnerships**

3.6.1 The Council is represented by one County Councillor Cabinet Member on each district area Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), and, in the case of the Cambridge LSP, an additional Liberal Democrat Councillor. County Councillors have also been appointed to the theme groups of Huntingdonshire LSP. It is anticipated that they are likely to be involved in the

theme groups of the other LSPs in the future. The LSPs are currently meeting on a bi-monthly basis to agree a Community Strategy for each area.

### **'In Your Patch' Meetings**

3.6.2 The role of Local Members in relation to LSPs is currently being promoted through 'In Your Patch' meetings. These meetings take place in each district four times a year and provide an opportunity for Local Members to discuss issues on a district basis.

### **Cambridge Sub Regional Implementation Stakeholder Partnership**

3.6.3 The Partnership comprises three County Councillor Cabinet Members and meets every three months. It oversees the work of the Officer Steering Group, which is responsible for providing a strategic steer for several themed task groups and ensuring effective links between the task groups and member/stakeholder processes.

### **Other Partnerships**

3.6.4 The Council is currently involved in numerous partnership arrangements throughout the County. The involvement of Councillors in these arrangements has increased over the years. Councillors have been appointed to represent the Council on 147 outside bodies. Recent appointments have included the following:

- Connexions Partnership Board
- Cambridgeshire Learning Partnership
- Learning Disabilities Partnership Board

Councillors are also likely to be invited to serve on Countryside Access Fora arising from the requirements of the Countryside Act 2000.

Service integration with partner agencies, for example Social Services and Health, is likely to involve the delivery of services on a partnership basis. This is likely to result in Councillor representation on new partnership bodies.

## **3.7 OTHER GROUPS**

### **Adult Partnership Board**

3.7.1 The Board was established in October 2001. It comprises the three Social Services Spokesmen and meets four times a year.

### **Cambridgeshire Schools Forum**

3.7.2 Regulations made under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 required Local Education Authorities to establish a Forum by 15 January 2003. The Forum must be consulted on issues relating to schools funding formula, certain contracts and a number of financial issues. It comprises four County Councillors and meets at a minimum once every half term.

### **Joint Planning Lead Member Group & Joint Transport Lead Member Group**

3.7.3 These Groups comprise one County Councillor Cabinet Member and meet approximately four times a year.

### **SMT/Labour and SMT/Lib Dem Spokes**

3.7.4 These are completely new Groups, which were set up as part of the Council's constitutional arrangements, to enable the opposition Councillors to discuss issues with Strategic Management Team (SMT). The original Constitution may have envisaged a combined /opposition spokes meeting. The Lib Democrat Group requested separate meetings. There are therefore five extra meetings a year resulting from the separate meetings.

### **Resources Spokes**

3.7.5 Resources Spokes were established as part of changes to the new IPM arrangements. Three County Councillors meet eleven times a year. There are also Spokes arrangements for Education, Libraries and Heritage, Environment and Transport, and Social Services, which have been in operation for many years.

### **Working Groups**

3.7.6 Currently these are: Children's and Adult Services Review Member Working Group; Internal Political Management Working Group; Corporate Performance Assessment Member Group; and Periodic Electoral Review Working Group. These adhoc groups are time limited and meet as required.

### **3.8 BACKBENCH MEMBERS**

- 3.8.1 The Interim Scheme of Members' Allowances report identified that an 'average' backbench member had attended Council meetings on approximately 44 days of the year in 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. Comparing the increase for an 'average' leading member, this results in a 15% increase for an 'average' backbench member equating to approximately 51 days.
- 3.8.2 The recent Corporate Assessment (CPA) reported that the new political structures, combined with the best of the pre-existing advisory forms, had contributed to developing and focusing members' decision making. However, backbench members do not challenge cabinet or officers sufficiently.
- 3.8.3 The CPA Improvement Plan has recommended further development of the member development programme, further training in the scrutiny process and expanded call-in by scrutiny committees to increase the involvement of, and internal challenge by, backbench members.
- 3.8.4 The Council has introduced a corporate seminar programme to improve and enhance information flows/levels of awareness particularly of backbench members. Seminars are held on a monthly basis. This does not preclude Directorates or SDGs from holding ad hoc seminars on key issues.

### **3.9 COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

- 3.9.1 As outlined in 3.8.2, the CPA commented positively on Cambridgeshire's new political structures.
- 3.9.2 Personal Development Plans (PDPs) were introduced for all Members to help them identify activity that they want to do in order to assist their continuous development as a successful Councillor. Approximately thirteen Councillors have PDPs. The CPA identifies that personal development planning has not been followed up vigorously enough. This situation should be rectified with the appointment of a new Organisation Development Manager.
- 3.9.3 The CPA also commented on the Council's open and collaborative approach to its community partners, including district, parish and town councils, health, police, voluntary sector and business leaders. The Council is clear that partnership working is key to making the most of scarce resources while moving services closer to users. Consequently, this has led to an increase in the number of partnerships requiring Councillor representatives (see 3.6.4).

### **3.10 REPRESENTATIONAL AND COMMUNITY ROLE OF COUNCILLORS**

- 3.10.1 Democratic Services has recently undertaken a survey of Member Training using questionnaires and 1:1 interviews. As part of this survey, it was identified that Members primarily rely on newsletters to keep in touch with their constituents. Surgeries work well when held regularly on a cross-organisation/council basis in a high profile venue. Some Members had experienced disappointing attendances at surgeries particularly those serving rural areas. Many would welcome assistance in setting them up.
- 3.10.2 There is anecdotal evidence that Councillors receive an increasing amount of e-mail from the public. The survey identified an increasing use of personal or party websites to respond to the demand for E-Government and that some Members, with appropriate assistance, would consider setting them up.
- 3.10.3 Members of the Periodic Electoral Review (PER) Working Group have also highlighted the increasing impact of district and parish council activities on their role as a County Councillor. The increase in consultation by County and District authorities has subsequently resulted in an increase in workload. Members representing rural parishes also highlighted the fact that they were expected to attend more meetings locally.
- 3.10.4 Given the increasing number of commitments for both Executive and Non-Executive Councillors, the most effective way for all Councillors to engage with their local communities is to increase the total number of Councillors in Cambridgeshire. The representational role of Councillors is key. They need to build upon this role and become more involved than previously in acting on behalf of the County Council at local level. However, the development of this role will inevitably place further demands on them if the Council is to engage with local communities. This is particularly the case for Councillors in full-time employment and who are also members of District Councils.

### **3.11 CONCLUSION**

- 3.11.1 The Council believes, based on the information detailed above, that the average workload of each Councillor is greater than it was prior to the implementation of the Local Government Act 2000. It has been increasing steadily over the last decade or so.
- 3.11.2 The availability and use of modern technology has helped Councillors to meet the demands of an increased workload. However, it has, in some cases, resulted in a significant increase in correspondence from constituents and Council officers with unrealistic demands for an immediate response. If Councillors are to engage effectively with their local electors, parish councils and community groups, the total number of Councillors on the Council will need to increase to enable the current workload burden to be spread more evenly.
- 3.11.3 The Council therefore considers that a 15% increase in the number of Councillors is needed to meet the impact of these changes. This percentage increase, which equates to an increase to 68 Councillors from 59, has formed the basis of the Council's informal consultation on its PER.

## 4. THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S PROPOSAL

### 4.1 Proposals for future County electoral arrangements for Cambridge City

4.1.1 With a council size of 68, Cambridge City remains entitled to 14 councillors. Retaining the current division boundaries is not appropriate as the boundaries of all the underlying district wards were changed during the recent review of Cambridge City Council's electoral arrangements. The County Council therefore proposes the creation of 14 single-member divisions, each coterminous with one district ward. This leads to 100% coterminosity across the district and each division's electorate is within 10% of the county average by 2008.

4.1.2 The County Council feels that achieving this level of coterminosity in Cambridge City is important. The City is unparished and the district wards are the main way different parts of the City are defined. Implementing different division boundaries would be confusing for councillors and for the electorate, particularly because the district wards so strongly identify regions of the City.

4.1.3 The County Council consulted on this proposal and no concerns were raised.

**Table 2: Proposal for Cambridge City – see map A2.1**

<b>Electoral Division</b>	<b>Constituent District Wards</b>	<b>2003 Electorate</b>	<b>Variation from county average</b>	<b>2008 Electorate</b>	<b>Variation from county average</b>
Abbey	Abbey	6,269	-1%	6,720	0%
Arbury	Arbury	6,970	10%	6,990	4%
Castle	Castle	6,662	5%	7,050	5%
Cherry Hinton	Cherry Hinton	6,293	-1%	6,430	-5%
Coleridge	Coleridge	5,724	-10%	6,180	-8%
East Chesterton	East Chesterton	5,730	-10%	6,230	-8%
King's Hedges	King's Hedges	6,129	-3%	6,400	-5%
Market	Market	6,352	0%	6,660	-1%
Newnham	Newnham	6,506	3%	7,030	4%
Petersfield	Petersfield	5,971	-6%	6,350	-6%
Queen Edith's	Queen Edith's	6,326	-0%	6,360	-6%
Romsey	Romsey	6,288	-1%	6,330	-6%
Trumpington	Trumpington	5,535	-13%	6,470	-4%
West Chesterton	West Chesterton	6,360	0%	6,420	-5%
		<b>87,115</b>		<b>91,620</b>	

## 4.2 Proposals for future County electoral arrangements for East Cambridgeshire

4.2.1 With a council size of 68, East Cambridgeshire is entitled to 9 electoral divisions. The County Council proposes the following arrangement, illustrated on map A2.2, which leads to 100% coterminosity across the district.

Table 3: Proposal for East Cambridgeshire – see map A2.2

Division	District Wards	2003 electors	Variation from County Average	2008 electors	Variation from county average
Littleport	Littleport East	3,474		5,090	
	Littleport West	1,918		2,100	
		<b>5,392</b>	<b>-15%</b>	<b>7,190</b>	<b>7%</b>
Ely North East	Ely East	2,954		2,920	
	Ely North	3,804		4,610	
		<b>6,758</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7,530</b>	<b>12%</b>
Ely South West	Ely South	1,997		2,610	
	Ely West	3,355		3,570	
		<b>5,352</b>	<b>-16%</b>	<b>6,180</b>	<b>-8%</b>
Sutton	Downham Villages	3,216		3,140	
	Sutton	2,636		2,720	
		<b>5,852</b>	<b>-8%</b>	<b>5,860</b>	<b>-13%</b>
Haddenham	Haddenham	4,306		4,250	
	Stretham	2,792		2,750	
		<b>7,098</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>4%</b>
Burwell	Burwell	4,567		4,520	
	The Swaffhams	1,545		1,530	
		<b>6,112</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>6,050</b>	<b>-10%</b>
Woodditton	Bottisham	2,906		2,840	
	Dullingham Villages	1,553		1,530	
	Cheveley	3,068		2,980	
		<b>7,527</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7,350</b>	<b>9%</b>
Soham	Soham North	2,870		3,310	
	Soham South	4,587		4,510	
		<b>7,457</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>7,820</b>	<b>16%</b>
Fordham	Isleham	1,672		1,640	
	Fordham	2,672		2,630	
		<b>4,344</b>	<b>-32%</b>	<b>4,270</b>	<b>-37%</b>
<b>Total electorate</b>		<b>55,892</b>		<b>59,250</b>	

- 4.2.2 The proposed **Littleport** division unites the two Littleport parish wards, keeping this large village together. The electorate in Littleport is forecast to rise significantly, so that, by 2008, it would be within 10% of the county average.
- 4.2.3 Two divisions are proposed in the **City of Ely**. These divide the whole parish into two coterminous divisions. The electorates of the contiguous wards mean that Ely North East, composed of Ely East ward and Ely North ward, has an electorate of 12% above average. Ely South West, formed from Ely South ward and Ely West ward, falls at 8% below average. Ely is a significant settlement, with a more 'urban' population, and the County Council feels strongly that it should not be grouped with surrounding rural parishes. During consultation, the City of Ely Council supported these division arrangements.
- 4.2.4 The proposed **Sutton** division combines Sutton ward and Downham Villages ward. The division is coterminous, with electoral variation of 13% below the county average. The proposed **Haddenham** division groups Haddenham ward and Stretham ward. Electoral variation is 4% above the county average by 2008. Together these divisions cover the rural area to the west of the three large settlements of Littleport, Ely and Soham. The River Cam forms a natural division between this area and the rural area to the south of the district.
- 4.2.5 The proposed **Burwell** division groups the district wards of Burwell and The Swaffhams. These are closely linked by the B1102, which is the main route to this part of the district from Cambridge. By 2008 the electorate would be 10% below the county average.
- 4.2.6 The proposed **Woodditton** division groups the rural area to the south of Newmarket together, with Bottisham and Lode included to avoid breaking Bottisham ward and losing coterminosity. The electorate is 9% above the county average by 2008.
- 4.2.7 The two remaining divisions in the district are in the **Soham** area. This part of the district constitutes a clearly separate area, bordered to the west by the River Cam, to the south by New River and the Little Fen area, to the east by Newmarket and the district boundary, and to the north by Crooked Drain and the sparsely populated Middle Fen and Great Fen rural area.
- 4.2.8 During consultation, the County Council sought views on moving away from coterminosity and dividing Soham parish further. This would have led to reasonable electoral equality. Representations received from local parties demonstrated strong feelings against such a proposal. A case was made for grouping all of Soham town into one division, and also for keeping Wicken (now part of Soham South district ward) with Soham. According to Wicken Parish Council, children from Wicken attend school in Soham, and the two parishes share a Vicar and Methodist Minister. The County Council agreed that the best arrangement for Soham would be to group Soham North and Soham South district wards into one division, with electoral variation of 16% above the county average.
- 4.2.9 The County Council proposes that the remaining wards of Isleham and Fordham be grouped into one rural division. This division's electorate would be significantly below the county average, at -37%. The County Council feels that this level of inequality should be accepted in this isolated, sparsely populated area, right at the edge of the County. Creating a two-member division with the Soham wards was discussed but rejected on the grounds

that the size and local significance of Soham would eclipse the very different needs of Isleham and Fordham.

### 4.3 Proposals for future County electoral arrangements for Fenland

4.3.1 With a council size of 68, Fenland is entitled to 11 electoral divisions. The County Council proposes the following arrangement, illustrated on map A2.3, which leads to 82% coterminosity across the district.

Table 4: Proposal for Fenland – see map A2.3

Division	Constituent Wards	2003 Electorate	Variation from county average	2008 Electorate	Variation from county average
Roman Bank & Peckover	Roman Bank	4,747		5,090	
	Peckover	1,698		1,750	
		<b>6,445</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6,840</b>	<b>2%</b>
Wisbech North	Waterlees	3,683		3,970	
	Clarkson	1,560		1,780	
	Kirkgate	1,710		1,710	
		<b>6,953</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>7,460</b>	<b>11%</b>
Wisbech South	Staithe	1,837		1,810	
	Hill	3,519		3,680	
	Medworth	1,845		1,860	
		<b>7,201</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7,350</b>	<b>9%</b>
Waldersey	Parson Drove				
	& Wisbech St Mary	3,351		3,620	
	Elm & Christchurch	3,385		3,830	
		<b>6,736</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7,450</b>	<b>11%</b>
March North	March North	<b>4,907</b>	<b>-23%</b>	<b>5,330</b>	<b>-21%</b>
March East	March East	<b>5,362</b>	<b>-16%</b>	<b>5,910</b>	<b>-12%</b>
March West	March West	<b>5,127</b>	<b>-19%</b>	<b>5,260</b>	<b>-22%</b>
Whittlesey North	St Andrews	1,997		2,030	
	Bassenhally*	1,317		1,300	
	Delph	1,457		2,190	
	Kingsmoor*	1,216		2,100	
		<b>5,987</b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>7,620</b>	<b>13%</b>
Whittlesey South	St Mary's	2,001		2,000	
	Lattersey*	1,931		1,920	
	Coates & Eastrea	2,480		2,580	
		<b>6,412</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>6,500</b>	<b>-4%</b>

Forty Foot	<i>Benwick parish</i>	676		830	
	Doddington	1,640		1,650	
	Wimblington	1,394		1,690	
	Manea	1,303		1,650	
		<b>5,013</b>		<b>5,820</b>	<b>-14%</b>
Chatteris	Birch	1,682		2,090	
	Slade Lode	1,647		1,760	
	The Mills	1,971		1,970	
	Wenneye	1,725		1,930	
		<b>7,025</b>		<b>7,750</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Total electorate</b>		<b>67,168</b>		<b>73,290</b>	

\*See Appendix 3: Corrections

### The market towns

- 4.3.2 The County Council proposes that six of the seven district wards in **Wisbech** be combined into two electoral divisions. Waterlees, Clarkson and Kirkgate would group to form Wisbech North, with electoral variation of 11% above the county average by 2008. Staithe, Hill and Medworth would form Wisbech South, with variation of 9% above the county average. The remaining, more rural ward of Peckover is grouped with Roman Bank, as outlined below.
- 4.3.3 The County Council considered a number of possible division arrangements for **March**. Consultation was carried out on a proposal to divide March West ward into two parts, along the River Nene. The area to the north of the river would remain in a March division with March North, the area to the south of the river would have joined rural parishes to the south of March. This would have led to a good level of electoral equality, but coterminosity would have been lost. On reflection, the County Council agreed that it was desirable to avoid dividing the parish further.
- 4.3.4 The County Council therefore proposes that the three district wards in March form three electoral divisions, each with fully coterminous boundaries. The largest of these, March East, would have an electorate 12% below the county average by 2008. The other divisions, March North and March West, would have variation of -21% and -22% respectively. The County Council acknowledges that this level of variation is outside that generally considered acceptable, but considers the coterminosity gain to be considerable. The town of March is located towards the centre of this geographically large parish. Grouping any part of March with another area would mean joining a section of this clearly defined rural centre with a rural settlement some distance away.
- 4.3.5 The County Council proposes creating two electoral divisions in **Whittlesey** parish. The first, Whittlesey North, would be formed from St Andrews, Delph, Bassenhally and Kingsmoor wards, and have electoral variation 13% above the county average. The second, Whittlesey South, would be composed of St Mary's ward, Lattersey ward and Whittlesey parish part of Benwick, Coates & Eastrea ward. The parish of Benwick is the only part of the district that would not be coterminous with the district ward boundaries. The Whittlesey South division would have variation of 4% below the county average by 2008.

4.3.6 The proposed **Chatteris** division is formed by combining all four of the district wards in the parish into a single division with variation of 15% above the county average by 2008. This division reflects the strong feeling expressed by Chatteris Town Council during consultation that no part of Chatteris should be split and combined with the surrounding rural parishes. The County Council agreed that the moderate level of electoral inequality was outweighed by the advantages of keeping the whole parish and market town within a single division.

#### The rural parishes

4.3.7 The proposed **Roman Bank & Peckover** division combines the predominately rural Roman Bank ward, at the northern tip of the County, with the Peckover ward of Wisbech. Although the Peckover ward does contain part of the town area of Wisbech, it also has a large rural part that links well with the parishes that make up the Roman Bank ward. This division's electorate is 2% above the county average.

4.3.8 The proposed **Waldersey** division groups the rural wards of Parson Drove and Elm & Christchurch. Electoral variation is 11% above the county average and coterminosity is maintained.

4.3.9 The proposed **Forty Foot** division is formed from the three rural wards of Doddington, Manea and Wimblington, which sit between the market towns of March and Chatteris. The parish of Benwick would be combined with these, which brings the electorate up to 14% below the county average by 2008. The settlements in the parishes concerned are well connected by the B1093 and are similarly defined by their very separate parish and village identities, and by their shared proximity to March and Chatteris.

#### 4.4 Proposals for future County electoral arrangements for Huntingdonshire

##### The County Council's preferred option – map A2.4

4.4.1 This option leads to coterminosity of 28% (5 of 18 divisions).

Table 5: Proposal for Huntingdonshire – illustrated on map A2.4

Division	Constituent wards or parishes	2003 electorate	Variation from county average	2008 electorate	Variation from county average
Ramsey	Ramsey	6,147	-3%	6,280	-7%
Warboys	Upwood and The Raveleys	2,365		2,330	
	Warboys and Bury	4,650		4,680	
	<i>Broughton parish</i>	195		200	
	<i>Old Hurst parish</i>	220		220	
	<i>Woodhurst parish</i>	266		270	
	<i>Pidley-cum-Fenton parish</i>	294		300	
			<b>7,990</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>8,000</b>
Somersham	<i>Somersham parish</i>	2,865		2,790	
	<i>Colne parish</i>	619		640	
	Earith	4,732		4,610	
		<b>8,216</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>8,040</b>	<b>19%</b>
St Ives East	St Ives East	5,163		5,010	
	<i>St Ives South part</i>	841		810	
		<b>6,004</b>	<b>-5%</b>	<b>5,820</b>	<b>-14%</b>
St Ives South	<i>St Ives South remainder</i>	4,023		4,180	
	St Ives West	2,268		2,360	
		<b>6,291</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>6,540</b>	<b>-3%</b>
Fenstanton & The Hemingfords	Fenstanton	2,241		2,350	
	The Hemingfords	4,691		4,740	
		<b>6,932</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>7,090</b>	<b>5%</b>
Huntingdon North	<i>Huntingdon North</i>	6,120	-4%	6,250	-7%
Huntingdon East	<i>Huntingdon East</i>	6,729	6%	6,570	-2%
Huntingdon Town & Godmanchester	<i>Huntingdon Town</i>	1,962		2,410	
	Godmanchester	4,545		4,920	
		<b>6,507</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7,330</b>	<b>9%</b>
St Neots Rural	Gransden & The Offords	3,526		5,270	
	Little Paxton	2,421		2,600	
		<b>5,947</b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>7,870</b>	<b>17%</b>
St Neots Eynesbury	St Neots Eynesbury	6,694	5%	7,940	18%

St Neots North	<i>St Neots North (Priory Park + part Eaton Ford)</i>	<b>7,303</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7,160</b>	<b>6%</b>
St Neots Eaton	<i>St Neots Eaton (part Eaton Ford + Eaton Socon)</i>	<b>7,005</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>6,830</b>	<b>1%</b>
Buckden	Buckden	2,505		2,440	
	Kimbolton & Staughton	2,444		2,400	
	<i>Grafham and Perry parishes</i>	1,007		1,000	
		<b>5,956</b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>5,840</b>	<b>-13%</b>
Sawtry	Ellington	2,218		2,280	
	Sawtry	5,047		4,960	
		<b>7,265</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>7,240</b>	<b>7%</b>
Brampton	<i>Brampton parish</i>	3,643		3,580	
	Alconbury & The Stukeleys	2,506		3,750	
		<b>6,149</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>7,330</b>	<b>9%</b>
Norman Cross	Stilton	2,348		2,350	
	Elton & Folksworth	2,147		2,130	
	<i>Farcet parish</i>	1,372		1,360	
		<b>5,867</b>	<b>-8%</b>	<b>5,840</b>	<b>-13%</b>
Yaxley	<i>Yaxley parish</i>	<b>5,896</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>6,690</b>	<b>-1%</b>
<b>Total electorate</b>		<b>119,018</b>		<b>124,680</b>	

### The market towns

- 4.4.2 In **St Ives**, the County Council proposes creating two non-coterminous divisions, St Ives East and St Ives South West, with electoral variation of –14% and –3% respectively. St Ives East comprises the whole of St Ives East ward, with the addition of a small section from St Ives South ward, as shown in map A2.4a. The non-coterminous boundary runs along the A1123, the main route through the town, and up Ramsey Road to join the existing district ward boundary. Although coterminosity is lost, the proposed boundary is easily identifiable and it divides the town logically, leading to an acceptable level of electoral equality.
- 4.4.3 In **St Neots**, the County Council proposes creating three electoral divisions: one fully coterminous with the St Neots Eynesbury district ward, and two non-coterminous divisions from the Priory Park, Eaton Ford and Eaton Socon district wards. The Eynesbury division is projected to grow to 18% above the county average by 2008. The County Council considered this level of inequality to be justifiable given the maintenance of coterminosity. The Council proposes that the Eaton Ford district ward be split along Duloe Road / Mill Hill Road (as shown in map A2.4b). The area of Eaton Ford to the north should be combined with Priory Park ward to form St Neots North. The area to the south should be combined with Eaton Socon district ward, to form St Neots Eaton. Electoral variation for these

divisions is 6% above and 1% above the county average respectively. Although coterminosity is lost, the proposed new boundary is easily identifiable and leads to a good level of electoral equality.

- 4.4.4 The County Council notes the proposal from Huntingdonshire District Council to combine Eynesbury and Eaton Socon into one two-member division. Although this leads to a good level of equality in that division, the grouping is problematic as the River Ouse and extensive riverside area divide the two wards. The main crossing point between the two sections of the division would be St Neots Bridge, which means leaving the division and entering Eaton Ford before returning to the division in question.
- 4.4.5 In **Huntingdon**, the County Council proposes three non-coterminous divisions (as shown in map A2.4c): Huntingdon Town & Godmanchester (6% by 2008), Huntingdon East (-5% by 2008) and Huntingdon North (-10% by 2008). The Huntingdon Town & Godmanchester division groups the parish of Godmanchester with the historic town centre area of Huntingdon. These adjoining settlements are closely linked by the B1044. To reach Huntingdon from the south, drivers must leave the A14 and approach through Godmanchester. The division also includes the Hinchingsbrooke Park area. Although somewhat separated from the rest of Huntingdon by the A14, the area is linked to the town centre by the B1514. The proposed boundary follows the natural boundaries of the A14 and railway line, before heading east to join the existing district ward boundary.
- 4.4.6 The proposed Huntingdon North division combines the remaining Huntingdon West area (mainly the Stukeley Meadows estate) with the Oxmoor estate. The County Council feels it is important that the Oxmoor area is not split between divisions – the area has SRB funding and local regeneration initiatives focus on fostering a cohesive community identity. The industrial land towards the centre of the division is a key growth area for the district.
- 4.4.7 The proposed Huntingdon East division is composed of the rest of Huntingdon East ward. The majority of the division is coterminous with the district ward boundary, with the exception of a small area near the A14.
- 4.4.8 Despite the loss of coterminosity, the County Council feels these proposals best reflect the different community areas of Huntingdon and would therefore facilitate good representation.

#### Ramsey, Upwood, Warboys and Somersham

- 4.4.9 The north-east part of Huntingdonshire forms a natural section of the district, bordered to the south by the market towns of St Ives and Huntingdon, and to the west by the large rural area west of Ramsey and Woodwalton. Although not coterminous with the district ward boundary, the A1(M) forms a significant boundary between the north-east and north-west areas of the district.
- 4.4.10 The County Council proposes creating three divisions from the parishes in this area. The first is coterminous with the **Ramsey** parish and district ward boundary, with an electorate 7% below the county average by 2008. The second and third divisions both have an electorate 19% above the county average by 2008. The proposed **Warboys** division is

composed of Upwood & The Raveleys district ward, Warboys district ward, and the parishes of Broughton, Old Hurst, Woodhurst and Pidley-cum-Fenton from Somersham ward. The proposed **Somersham** division constitutes the remaining parishes of Somersham and Colne from Somersham ward, and Earith ward. Importantly, these groupings keep the rural villages separate from St Ives, a sentiment expressed strongly by Holywell-cum-Needlingworth Parish Council. Although the high electoral variation in these two divisions is undesirable, and the divisions are geographically larger than would be ideal, Councillors felt they reflect the natural settlement groupings well.

#### North-west Huntingdonshire

- 4.4.11 The County Council proposes creating one division from the parish of **Yaxley**, which would have an electorate of 1% below the county average by 2008. Keeping the district ward of Yaxley and Farcet together would result in an electorate 20% above the county average, which in this case was felt to be undesirable.
- 4.4.12 The proposed **Norman Cross** division combines the wards of Elton & Folksworth and Stilton with Farcet parish, to form a division 13% below the county average by 2008. This division groups parishes located close to, and heavily influenced by, Peterborough.
- 4.4.13 Along the western edge of the County, the Council proposes grouping the district wards of Sawtry and Ellington to form **Sawtry** division. Electoral variation is 7% above the county average by 2008 and the division is coterminous.
- 4.4.14 In the centre of the district, the Council proposes **Brampton** division, combining Alconbury & The Stukeleys district ward with the parish of Brampton, to give a division with 9% more electors than the county average. The parishes concerned share a close relationship with Huntingdon and all have a significant armed forces presence.

#### South Huntingdonshire

- 4.4.15 In the south of the district, three rural divisions are proposed. The **Kimbolton** division is formed from Kimbolton & Staughton district ward, the parishes of Grafham and Perry, and Buckden district ward. The electorate is 13% below the county average by 2008. The **St Neots Rural** division groups the wards of Little Paxton and Gransden & The Offords. These wards share a close relationship with St Neots. Part of the division, by 2008, will contain new development on the St Neots fringe.
- 4.4.16 The County Council notes the strong opinion received from representatives for Little Paxton that the village be included in a St Neots division. The Council were unable to integrate this wish with the proposal for the rest of the district, and also felt a number of other parishes could claim a similarly close relationship with St Neots.
- 4.4.17 The remaining **Fenstanton & The Hemingfords** division is composed from the wards of The Hemingfords and Fenstanton, with an electorate 5% above the county average.

## The County Council's reserve option – map A2.4d

4.4.18 The County Council feels that the 'preferred option', outlined above, best reflects local needs and would give the best local representation. The Council does, however, also realise that the low level of coterminosity is undesirable. Councillors remain opposed to the introduction of multi-member wards but, in Huntingdonshire, can see they could lead to higher levels of coterminosity, particularly in the market towns. The County Council therefore asks that the Boundary Committee give consideration also to this alternative option. This includes four two-member divisions.

4.4.19 The reserve option leads to 66% coterminosity across the district. The electoral information for the altered divisions is given below; the remaining divisions are as proposed in the 'preferred option'.

**Table 6: Alternative division arrangements for Huntingdonshire – map A2.4d**

Division	Constituent wards or parishes	2003 electorate	Variation		
			from county average	Variation	
		2003 electorate	2008 electorate	from county average	Variation from county average
St Ives (2 member)	St Ives East	5,163		5,010	
	St Ives South	4,864		5,000	
	St Ives West	2,268		2,360	
		<b>12,295</b>		<b>12,370</b>	
		<b>6,148</b>		<b>6,185</b>	<b>-8%</b>
			<b>-3%</b>		
Huntingdon East & Godmanchester (2 member)	Godmanchester	4,545		4,920	
	Huntingdon East	6,737		6,580	
	Huntingdon North	3,740		3,920	
		<b>15,022</b>		<b>15,420</b>	
		<b>7,511</b>		<b>7,710</b>	<b>14%</b>
			<b>18%</b>		
Huntingdon West & Brampton (2 member)	Huntingdon West	4,334		4,740	
	<i>Brampton parish</i>	3,643		3,580	
	Alconbury & The Stukeleys	2,506		3,750	
		<b>10,483</b>		<b>12,070</b>	
		<b>5,242</b>		<b>6,035</b>	<b>-10%</b>
			<b>-17%</b>		
Norman Cross (2 member)	Stilton	2,348		2,350	
	Elton & Folksworth	2,147		2,130	
	Yaxley & Farcet	7,268		8,050	
		<b>11,763</b>		<b>12,530</b>	
		<b>5,882</b>		<b>6,265</b>	<b>-7%</b>
			<b>-7%</b>		

4.4.20 The main differences in the reserve option are in the market towns of St Ives and Huntingdon. The proposal would retain the original arrangement for St Neots, which involves splitting a parished area. The proposed new boundary is clear and sensible and would lead to good overall representation in St Neots. Creating a two-member division from the Priory Park, Eaton Ford and Eaton Socon wards would lead to an overly large and unwieldy division, especially in comparison to the remaining Eynesbury division.

- 4.4.21 In **St Ives**, the three district wards could be combined into a single two-member division, with electoral equality 8% below the county average. This arrangement is coterminous and leads to a good level of electoral equality, while also keeping the whole of the market town together and separate from the surrounding rural parishes.
- 4.4.22 In the **Huntingdon** area, two two-member divisions could be created. The Huntingdon East and Godmanchester division groups Huntingdon East, Huntingdon West and Godmanchester into one two-member division, with an electorate 14% above the county average by 2008. Huntingdon North and Brampton groups Huntingdon North with Alconbury & The Stukeleys ward and the parish of Brampton. This division's electorate would be 10% below the county average by 2008. Although the divisions do combine parts of Huntingdon with surrounding more rural areas, the parishes concerned do have close connections with Huntingdon and each other, and in some cases there is little clear separation between different settlements.
- 4.4.23 One further two-member division could be created, called **Yaxley**, in the north of the district. This would combine the wards of Yaxley and Norman Cross, and would have an electorate of 7% below the county average by 2008. This division avoids splitting the villages of Yaxley and Farcet, which Farcet Parish Council would prefer.

## 4.5 Proposals for future County electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire

4.5.1 With a council size of 68, South Cambridgeshire is entitled to 16 electoral divisions. The County Council proposes the following arrangement, as illustrated on map A2.5, which leads to 100% coterminosity across the district.

Table 7: Proposal for South Cambridgeshire – see map A2.5

Division	Constituent Wards	2003 Electorate	Variation from county average	2008 Electorate	Variation from county average
Linton	Balsham	3,536		3,440	
	Linton	3,632		3,600	
		<b>7,168</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7,040</b>	<b>5%</b>
Fulbourn	Fulbourn	3,675		3,570	
	Teversham	1,949		1,930	
	The Wilbrahams	1,986		1,970	
	<b>7,610</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>7,470</b>	<b>11%</b>	
Waterbeach	Milton	3,224		3,150	
	Waterbeach	3,884		3,920	
	<b>7,108</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7,070</b>	<b>5%</b>	
Histon & Impington	Histon & Impington	6,424	<b>1%</b>	7,930	<b>18%</b>
Cottenham	Cottenham	5,931	<b>-7%</b>	5,920	<b>-12%</b>
Willingham	Willingham & Over	4,876		4,920	
	Longstanton	1,509		2,380	
	<b>6,385</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>7,300</b>	<b>8%</b>	
Papworth & Swavesey	Swavesey	1,922		1,870	
	Papworth & Elsworth	3,178		3,860	
	<b>5,100</b>	<b>-20%</b>	<b>5,730</b>	<b>-15%</b>	
Bar Hill	Bar Hill	4,012		3,890	
	Girton	2,986		3,160	
	<b>6,998</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>7,050</b>	<b>5%</b>	
Hardwick	Barton	1,894		1,840	
	Comberton	1,723		1,710	
	Hardwick	1,905		1,860	
	Caldecote	1,536		1,750	
	<b>7,058</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>7,160</b>	<b>6%</b>	
Bourn	Bourn	2,768	<b>-56%</b>	7,100	<b>5%</b>
Gamlingay	Gamlingay	3,789		3,770	
	Orwell & Barrington	1,813		1,780	
	Haslingfield & The Eversdens	2,065		2,020	
	<b>7,667</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7,570</b>	<b>12%</b>	

Bassingbourn	The Mordens	1,801		1,850	
	Bassingbourn	3,611		3,560	
	Meldreth	1,861		1,880	
		<b>7,273</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7,290</b>	<b>8%</b>
Melbourn	Fowlmere & Foxton	1,881		1,880	
	Melbourn	4,206		4,120	
		<b>6,087</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>-11%</b>
Duxford	Whittlesford	1,908		2,010	
	Duxford	1,994		2,020	
	The Abingtons	1,757		1,710	
		<b>5,659</b>	<b>-11%</b>	<b>5,740</b>	<b>-15%</b>
Sawston	Sawston	5,542	<b>-13%</b>	5,430	<b>-19%</b>
Shelford	Harston & Hauxton	1,898		1,850	
	The Shelfords & Stapleford	5,647		5,610	
		<b>7,545</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7,460</b>	<b>11%</b>
<b>Total electorate</b>		<b>102,323</b>		<b>109,260</b>	

- 4.5.2 The proposed **Linton** division combines the district wards of Linton and Balsham. This is the same as the current Linton division. By 2008 the electorate will be 5% above the County average.
- 4.5.3 The proposed **Fulbourn** division joins the wards of Fulbourn, Teversham and The Wilbrahams. By 2008 the electorate is 11% above the county average. The division joins the geographically compact area between the eastern edge of Cambridge City and the eastern edge of South Cambridgeshire. The River Cam separates the northern border of The Wilbrahams ward from the wards to the north. Horningsea Parish Council considers this “a good scheme”.
- 4.5.4 The proposed **Waterbeach** division combines Milton ward and Waterbeach ward. These wards share a close relationship with Cambridge and are well connected by the A10, which runs north from Cambridge towards King’s Lynn. By 2008 the electorate is forecast to be 5% above the county average. Waterbeach Parish Council “endorse the proposals for Waterbeach and Landbeach... [and] consider that the two villages have strong pastoral and historic links”.
- 4.5.5 The proposed **Histon & Impington** division is formed from the Histon & Impington ward. By 2008 the division is projected to have grown considerably, to 18% above the county average, as it contains the 900 dwelling Cambridge Northern Fringe development. The County Council considered splitting the division to achieve a better level of electoral equality but felt it was illogical to split what is really a single settlement spread over two parishes, and that the coterminosity gain was considerable.

- 4.5.6 The proposed **Cottenham** division is composed from the Cottenham district ward. By 2008 the electorate is 12% below the county average. There are no neighbouring wards or small parishes that could be added to improve electoral equality.
- 4.5.7 The proposed **Willingham & Over** division joins the wards of Willingham & Over and Longstanton, to form a division 8% above the county average.
- 4.5.8 The **Papworth & Swavesey** division groups the district wards of Papworth & Elsworth and Swavesey. By 2008 the electorate is 15% below the county average. This grouping is somewhat unsatisfactory as Swavesey is separated from the rest of the division by the A14. During consultation, the Parish Council expressed their strong desire to remain grouped with Over and Willingham, with whom they share local meetings. The County Council were unable to see an alternative arrangement in the area, as the Papworth & Elsworth ward is on the edge of the district and there are no alternative neighbouring parishes it could be combined with that would lead to both a reasonable level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- 4.5.9 The proposed **Bar Hill** division joins the wards of Bar Hill and Girton. The parishes concerned are bordered to the east by the A14, and are all approached directly from the A14. By 2008 the electorate is forecast to be 5% above the county average.
- 4.5.10 The suggested **Hardwick** division is made up of the district wards of Caldecote, Hardwick, Comberton and Madingley. By 2008, electoral variation will be 6% above the county average. Childerley Parish Council comments that, "as it stands, the proposal is exactly right".
- 4.5.11 The proposed **Bourn** division is coterminous with Bourn district ward. The current electorate of the division is 56% below the county average, but the parishes of Bourn and Caxton contain the fast growing new settlement of Cambourne. This means that by 2008 the electorate is projected to have risen to 5% above the county average.
- 4.5.12 During consultation, villages in the southwest corner of South Cambridgeshire expressed a strong preference for the current Gamlingay and Bassingbourn divisions to be kept the same, pointing out that the electoral figures would be approximately correct. The County Council, however, feels that because the underlying district wards have changed, it follows that the divisions must change too. The Council therefore proposes the new **Gamlingay** division should be composed of Gamlingay ward, Orwell & Barrington ward and Haslingfield & The Eversdens ward. This division's electorate is projected to be 12% above the county average by 2008.
- 4.5.13 The proposed **Bassingbourn** division contains the district wards of The Mordens, Bassingbourn and Meldreth, leading to electoral variation 8% above the county average by 2008. This division groups as many of the feeder villages for Bassingbourn Village College as possible, and reflects representations made to the County during the consultation process. The County Council feels that the proposed Gamlingay and Bassingbourn divisions are the best solution to the issues raised during consultation, within the remit to achieve coterminosity wherever possible.

- 4.5.14 The proposed **Melbourn** division groups the district wards of Melbourn and Fowlmere & Foxton. By 2008 the electorate will be 11% below the county average.
- 4.5.15 The proposed **Shelfords** division groups the wards of Harston & Hauxton and The Shelfords & Stapleford. By 2008 the electorate will be 11% above the county average. The division groups a cluster of closely linked villages influenced by their proximity to Cambridge.
- 4.5.16 For the remaining four district wards in the south of the district, the County Council proposes the following arrangement. The larger village of **Sawston** should form one division, with a projected electorate in 2008 of 19% below the county average. Although the electorate is low, coterminosity is maintained, and the village's size lends it a clearly separate status from the surrounding, more rural, villages.
- 4.5.17 The remaining district wards of Whittlesford, Duxford and The Abingtons group to form a **Duxford** division, with an electorate of 15% below the county average by 2008.

## APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING CONSULTATION

This appendix summarises the feedback received during consultation on the County Council's draft electoral review proposal. Contributions are grouped by district and the name of the main party concerned is given. Text shown in quotation marks ("for example") has been taken directly from the information received; remaining text is an interpretation or summary of the contribution. Where appropriate, notes have been added in italics to clarify methodological issues arising from the comments or to highlight potential consequences of the suggestions. The full feedback forms and correspondence are available on request.

### Cambridge City

- **Cambridge City Council** – “wishes to express its wholehearted support for the County’s proposals as they affect the City of Cambridge. 100% coterminosity with the City’s new ward boundaries will be very convenient, in administrative and political terms, and will further good and cost-effective governance.”
- **Cambridge City Conservative Association** – “would like to indicate support for the proposals with regard to Cambridge City, in view of the importance I would attach to coterminosity.”

### East Cambridgeshire

- **East Cambridgeshire District Council** – “recommend Option 2 of the County Council’s draft proposals...”
- **South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association** – “...option 2 represents the best way forward. This is based on the historic link between the parishes of Wicken and Soham.”
- **City of Ely Council** – “supported proposals relating to the Parish of Ely.”
- **Haddenham Parish Council** – “accepts the proposals as presented.”
- **Isleham Parish Council** – “option 2 is the better option. Council’s personal views are that Soham should be on its own and Wicken, Isleham, Fordham, Chippenham, Snailwell and Kennett should be together.”
- **Soham Town Council** – “... the proposals were viewed with horror and disbelief. ...It appeared to Councillors that no cognisance had been taken of historic or local community factors, and that the exercise seemed to be “numbers-crunching” led, particularly as no regard had been given to the principal of coterminosity. It was resolved that Soham Town Council do not consider that Soham should be split, unanimously rejects the totally unacceptable proposals to divide Soham ... and consider that any boundary alterations must at least coincide with the recently determined District Electoral Review Boundaries.”

- **Westley Waterless Parish Council** – is concerned about the parish boundary between Waterless Parish and Burrough Green Parish as the village of Westley Waterless is divided between the two parishes. “If this is not relevant to this boundary consultation perhaps it could be passed on to the correct people.”

*The County Council notes that there is no scope to alter parish boundaries under this review. The comments could, however, be taken to suggest that any proposal to split the parishes of Westley Waterless and Burrough Green into different divisions would be viewed negatively.*

- **Wicken Parish Council** – “... is concerned about the options suggested for Soham/Wicken... both options end up dividing Soham along an artificial and illogical boundary and putting together parishes which have little in common. The proposed solutions are not coterminous with the District Council boundaries, and this would lead to confusion. ... the only sensible option is to retain the status quo with Soham North and Soham South (including Wicken) forming a single ward... the problem would obviously be the remaining ward of Isleham, Fordham and the small villages. The combination is sensible and logical, since Isleham has quite strong links with Fordham, but would lead to a low 2008 electorate. However, we feel that this is inevitable in these scattered, rural constituencies and presents far less of a problem than splitting towns along artificial and illogical boundaries and lumping together parishes that have no links. ...We therefore recommend that neither of the options are chosen and that we retain the status quo and accept the discrepancy in numbers.”

## **Fenland**

- **Chatteris Town Council** – “is firmly against the proposal that one county councillor should cover the Slade Lode, The Mills, and the Wenneye wards of Chatteris and another councillor should cover the Birch ward, Wimblington ward, Manea ward and Christchurch parish. ...The people of Chatteris have no affinity with Wimblington and Christchurch and only limited affinity with Manea.”
- **Cllr M Curtis, District Councillor Kingsmoor ward, Whittlesey** – “I support these proposals. The suggestion for Whittlesey is far better than the current situation and the overall proposal meets the needs for coterminosity.”
- **Mr B Howlett, March East ward** – no comment
- **North East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association** – “...despite the fact that we don't entirely agree with [the proposals], we have been unable to devise an alternative. If the commission had seen fit to accept the Fenland District Council proposals for March ... we are sure that a far better result would now be possible. However, under the circumstances, we have no alternative other than to support your proposals.”
- **March divisions** – an alternative proposal was submitted by Cllr F. Yeulett (District and County Councillor), Cllr S Keane (March West Town Councillor and March East resident), Cllr B. Keane (Mayor of March Town Council and Fenland District Councillor), Cllr K. Owen

(Fenland District Councillor March West ward), Cllr M. Ogden (County Councillor March West), Cllr J. West (Fenland District Councillor March North) and Mr L. Nyde (resident).

The alternative proposal contends that the County Council's proposals "do not take into account the historic and natural divisions of the town." The alternative involves the transfer of:

- approximately 1,270 electors from March North to March West division (the area between the River Nene and Wisbech Road/Dartford Southern side);
- approximately 1,220 electors from March East to March North division (the area contained by Station Road to the River Nene and the railway line);
- approximately 1,355 electors from March West to March East division (the Stow Fen area, between B1101 and existing March East district ward boundary).

The proposal utilises the "natural and traditional boundaries" of the river and B1101. "In the recent District Council elections, confusion was caused by officials failing to adhere to the new boundaries, thus placing a number of electors in the wrong wards. ...the boundary to the east of Wimblington Road would cause immense confusion."

*The County Council notes that the alternative proposal loses coterminosity between the March East district ward and the March East electoral division.*

## Huntingdonshire

### Ramsey/Warboys/Somersham area – Option 1 versus Option 2

- **Abbots Ripton Parish Council** – "We had initially preferred Option 2... however on discussion we would prefer Option 1. The reason for this is that we believe this to be the first opportunity we have had to have the whole school catchment area under the same county council seat."
- **Bury Parish Council** – "It was decided, unanimously, that Option 2... represented the best alternative for the village."
- **Colne Parish Council** – "...does not agree to the re-organisation whereby it severs its close links with Earith and Bluntisham Parish Councils... Colne PC reluctantly accepts Option 2..."

*The County Council notes that both options would in fact bring together Colne, Earith and Bluntisham, which were divided by the recent district ward review.*

- **Cllr Victor Lucas** – submitted proposed amendment to Option 1. Wishes to see two divisions created as follows:
  - Earith ward plus part of Somersham ward (Colne, Pidley and Somersham parishes)
  - Warboys and Bury ward plus part of Upwood and The Raveleys ward (Abbots Ripton, Kings Ripton and Wood Walton parishes and Wyton Airfield parish ward) and remainder of Somersham ward (Broughton, Oldhurst and Woodhurst parishes).

Wood Walton would remain with Ramsey parish. Cllr Lucas also proposes that St Ives is combined into two divisions, without including Holywell-cum-Needingworth.

- **Ramsey Town Council** – “...either of the two options in the consultation document is acceptable. The County Council might also consider a third option, which puts the Ramsey ward and Bury parish in electoral division no. 16 and puts Woodwalton parish and Upwood and The Raveleys parish in electoral division no. 17.”

*The County Council notes that placing Bury parish with Ramsey would lose coterminosity*

- **Warboys Parish Council** – “...the Parish Council have decided to support Option 2... Although there are community interests between Warboys and the surrounding parishes of Broughton, Woodhurst, Old Hurst and Pidley-cum-Fenton, the Council decided that these were outweighed by the advantages of coterminosity with the boundaries of District wards.”
- **Wistow Parish Council** – “is very concerned at the proposed linking of Wistow with Warboys and Bury. Wistow has a great deal in common with many neighbouring small villages (eg Broughton, Raveleys, Upwood etc) and very little in common with larger villages like Warboys. ... there are compelling reasons for the Boundary Committee to be flexible and to find a group of smaller villages the would include Wistow and for Wistow not to be included with Warboys.”

*The County Council notes that Option 2 would combine Wistow with Upwood and The Raveleys. Removing Wistow from Warboys would mean losing coterminosity.*

- **Woodwalton Parish Council** – “The parish Council has no preference...Option 2 which has the 2 District Council wards might be better.”

#### Other comments received

- **Buckden Parish Council** – “Has no objection to the proposed electoral division.”
- **Great Gransden Parish Council** – Have no specific objection to the proposed divisions, but do not feel the new houses to be built on the St Neots fringe (which fall within St Neots rural parish and therefore the proposed Gransden & The Offords division) should be included in the area as they are an urban rather than rural environment.
- **Hilton Parish Council** – “...endorses the proposal that Hilton becomes part of the Hemingfords ward... requests that the name be changed to The Hemingfords and Hilton.”
- **Holywell-cum-Needingworth** – “...is totally opposed to the changes... The rural interests of Holywell-cum-Needingworth and the urban interests of St Ives East are not compatible. It would be impossible for councillors to take an independent view when the two areas could be in total opposition... The village status would be jeopardised... would be better served being in a ward with Somersham, Bluntisham, Earith, Colne, Old Hurst, Pidley and Fenton. The Parish Council would prefer to be part of a large rural ward served by two councillors than merged with St Ives East.”
- **Huntingdonshire District Council** – “...appreciate the problem in producing proposals that meet all of the criteria laid down by the Electoral Commission. However, there are certain aspects of what [the County Council is] suggesting that the panel had difficulty in reconciling

with the guidance and where there seemed to be insufficient justification to substantiate the proposals that you have consulted upon.”

Concerns relate to:

- Number of electors per member
- Council size
- Coterminosity
- Community interests (specifically Buckden, St Neots and Little Paxton)
- Splitting of parish wards (specifically in Huntingdon and St Neots)

The District Council propose that 19 Councillors in Hunts would place the district on a much more comparable basis with the other Districts within the County. Their proposal leads to 100% coterminosity with the district wards and includes four two-member divisions.

*The County Council notes the proposal includes a division composed of Godmanchester and Buckden. These district wards are not contiguous and therefore this combination does not meet the Boundary Committee’s requirements.*

- **Little Paxton Parish Council** – “...has always seen Little Paxton’s inclusion in the St Neots Priory Park division as most appropriate arrangement as we look to St Neots for most of our public transport links, secondary educational resources, local employment, police and fire cover, shopping and recreation. Your proposals do not reflect the realities of our ties with the local community at all and the Parish Council is strongly opposed to them as a consequence.” The Parish Council propose that Little Paxton be joined with St Neots and the boundaries within St Neots be adjusted.
- **North West Cambridgeshire Conservative Association** – propose same solution as put forward by Huntingdonshire District Council.

*The County Council notes the proposal includes a division composed of Godmanchester and Buckden. These district wards are not contiguous and therefore this combination does not meet the Boundary Committee’s requirements.*

- **St Ives Town Council** – “...St Ives should be divided into two wards but they be formed as follows: 1) St Ives South and half of St Ives West, and 2) St Ives East and the other half of St Ives West. ... It is felt that Holywell-cum-Needlingworth should remain with its District Council sub-division and the wards adjusted to suit. The reason for these recommendations is to maintain community identity, otherwise the population will feel discouraged from voting.”
- **Sawtry Parish Council** – wrote directly to Boundary Committee. “Wish it to be noted that they are strongly of the opinion that the local electoral division remain based from Sawtry.”
- **Upton and Coppingford Parish Council** – “...do not agree with the parish being included in the Sawtry ward... The parish’s common interest is with the villages of Alconbury and Alconbury Weston. They are closest and most villagers will pass through them on the way to our major town of Huntingdon, our medical, social and post office facilities are within the villages and many of the parish’s children attend their school.”

- **Woodhurst Parish Council** – “strongly object to the proposal that the village should now be included in the Somersham area... The village has few, if any, ties with Somersham. Warboys is the village that Woodhurst has close ties with. We use the post office, the doctor and the shops in Warboys... Warboys Community Primary School in the designated school for Woodhurst. Historically the village has always had close ties with Warboys and virtually none with Somersham.”

## South Cambridgeshire

### General comments for the district

- **South Cambridgeshire Conservative Association** – feel the South West area of the district should be looked at in greater depth. Submit proposal with 11 divisions identical to the County’s proposal, and five altered divisions. These are:
  - Bassingbourn (The Mordens ward, Bassingbourn ward and Meldreth ward)
  - Gamlingay (Gamlingay ward, Orwell and Barrington ward, Haslingfield and The Eversdens)
  - Melbourn (Melbourn ward, Fowlemere and Foxtan ward)
  - Duxford (Duxford ward, Whittlesford ward, Newton parish and Harston parish)
  - Shelfords (The Shelfords and Stapleford ward, minus Newton parish and plus Hauxton parish).
- **South East Cambridgeshire Conservative Association** – support the proposal given by South Cambridgeshire Conservative Association.
- **Impington Parish Council** – suggest that potential major adjustment to the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire boundary could change the basic assumptions in this area.

*The County Council notes that there is no scope within this review to comment on district boundaries.*

- **Cllr John Reynolds** – proposed revisions to Bassingbourn and Melbourn area, as detailed above by South Cambridgeshire Conservative Association.

### Comments for specific parishes

- **Arrington Parish Council** – “...feels that things work well as they are at present. ...Changing the boundaries would have a detrimental effect especially on the educational and policing requirements of the area.”
- **Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council** – “...strongly agree that Bassingbourn ward should be left as it is. At present primary schools within the ward feed into Bassingbourn Village College... The proposal would mean that there was no common link! The proposed ward would also be separated by a major road... If it works why change it!”
- **Cllr Gravatt, District Councillor for Bassingbourn and Litlington** – “would like to express my great concern at the proposal ... to include Bassingbourn with Melbourn, Great and Little

Chishill and Heydon...This makes no sense at all in the geographical disposition of the area, the communities involved and, most importantly, in the catchment areas of the schools. ... I suggest the most sensible change to the Division, if any is needed, would be to take out Arrington and Croydon and include Whaddon and Barrington.”

- **Mr A. H. Shepherd, Bottisham** – supports proposal detailed above, submitted by South Cambridgeshire Conservative Association and Cllr Reynolds.
- **Childerley Parish Council** – “You have done exactly as proposed and asked. On the face of it, Childerley sticks out on its own; but all Childerley contacts are with Bourn rather than Dry Drayton so that as it stands the proposal is exactly right, thank you.”
- **Croydon Parish Council** – “is astounded at the suggestion that Croydon (and Arrington) should be moved into Gamlingay division... There is already an excellent working relationship between the District and County Councillors and the school heads – why change this?”
- **Eltisley Parish Council** – “It does not appear that Cambourne has been included in this document can you please explain the proposals for Cambourne.”

*The County Council notes that Cambourne is included in the proposals, falling under the parish and district ward of Bourn.*

- **Fen Drayton Parish Council** – “...has no specific comments to make at this time.”
- **Fowlmere Parish Council** – “...welcome the changes for Fowlmere. It is more sensible that Fowlmere and Foxton are a new district ward.”
- **Fulbourn Parish Council** – “There appears to be no change to the Fulbourn ward, and this we find acceptable.”
- **Dr and Mrs M. A. Heazen, Haslingfield** – suggest that division 13 (Meldreth, Orwell & Barrington and Haslingfield & The Eversdens wards) seems to be composed of ‘leftovers’, since the villages “have nothing in common”. Secondary age children in the proposed division would go to three different village colleges, primary children from The Eversdens would not be educated within the ward – few parents would know school governors.
- **Hinxton Parish Council** – “...still vehemently opposes the proposal to group Hinxton with The Abingtons.” Feels the district ward makes no sense, want to be grouped with Duxford and Ickleton. (Similar comments were also received from Dr Trudgill and Ms Roberts).
- **Horningsea Parish Council** – “These latest proposals... is well thought through and appropriate. This is a good scheme.”
- **Litlington Parish Council** – “...Bassingbourn should retain its link with Litlington and the Mordens. ... The present arrangement works very well – there is no need to change!”
- **Longstanton Parish Council** – “...feels very strongly that with the expected increase in population in the parish and locality owing to the planned development of the land surrounding

and including Longstanton the division boundaries should reflect this proposed increase in population.”

- **Melbourn Parish Council** – “...query the fact that it is understood that while the Cambridgeshire area has been marked for expansion the figures for the Melbourn ward show a decrease in the electorate by 2008.”

*The County Council notes a decrease in electorate would be expected in areas without significant development as overall household size is projected to fall by 2008 and because changes to the age structure have a commensurate effect on household size. In particular, as populations age, there is a general trend towards more single-person households, which lead to a fewer electors per dwelling.*

- **Meldreth Parish Council** – “...Map 5a is missing from the booklet!”

*The County Council notes there is no reference to a Map 5a and that there is not intended to be a Map 5a.*

- **Mrs C. A. Murfitt, District Councillor for the Mordens** – “I write to protest at the proposed division of villages into the new electoral areas in the Bassingbourn and Gamlingay areas. To split up the feeder villages of Bassingbourn Village College into two electoral areas seems not only illogical but unworkable.”
- **Orwell Parish Council** – does not wish feeder villages for Bassingbourn Village College to be disrupted.
- **Rampton Parish Council** – “feels very strongly that the current warding arrangements... should continue.”
- **Swavesey Parish Council** – “wishes to object to the changes proposed” – reasons given are:
  - Long and historical links with Over and Longstanton.
  - “The A14 is soon to be upgraded and will create an even bigger division between villages on either side.”
  - “In relation to highways and countryside issues, Swavesey Parish Council often liaises with Over and Longstanton Parishes. Very rarely in the past has Swavesey Parish had joint meetings with the villages in the proposed new ward.”
- **Waterbeach Parish Council** – “endorse the proposals for Waterbeach and Landbeach to remain united under the electoral review. The Parish Council consider that the two villages have strong historic and pastoral links.”

## **Countywide comments**

- **Cambridgeshire County Labour Party** – strongly object to proposed increase in Council size on the grounds that it was not properly consulted on. “...in the absence of a closely argued case for 68 councillors, it must be assumed this is a strategy to ensure that the wards and

electoral divisions in Cambridge are coterminous. ...we will be sending a copy of this letter to the Boundary Committee, requesting that they require you to consult properly with the public. It follows from the above that we reject your proposed electoral divisions and will in due course submit a set of proposals for 59 seats to the Boundary Committee.”

- **North West Cambridgeshire Constituency Labour Party** – as submitted by Cambridgeshire County Labour Party.
- **Sibson-cum-Stibbington Parish Council** – are against the proposed increase in Council Size, feel that larger divisions would have “increased the flexibility on individual parcels.

## APPENDIX 2: MAPS

A2.1 – Cambridge City

A2.2 – East Cambridgeshire

A2.3 – Fenland

A2.4 – Huntingdonshire

A2.4a – St Ives detail

A2.4b – St Neots detail

A2.4c – Huntingdon detail

A2.4d – Huntingdonshire alternative

A2.5 – South Cambridgeshire

### ***Interpreting the maps***

*On each district map, each coloured block represents one county electoral division. The new district ward boundaries are shown in blue. Parish boundaries are shown, where appropriate, in fine black.*

*On the detailed market town maps, a red line shows the proposed division boundary.*



### **APPENDIX 3: CORRECTIONS**

During the consultation process, two errors were noted in the allocation of development sites to new wards in Whittlesey. The sites concerned are:

- 125 dwellings on land to east of 175-230 Drybread Road, Whittlesey – this site was mistakenly allocated to Bassenhally ward, but should be in Kingsmoor ward.
- 400 dwellings on land north of 184 Eastrea Road, Whittlesey – this site was allocated to Lattersey ward but should be in Kingsmoor ward.

The revised allocation of new dwellings to wards leads to the following revised electoral forecasts, which differ to the original forecasts submitted to the Boundary Committee and made available to interested parties.

- Bassenhally ward  
Current electorate: 1,317  
Forecast electorate: 1,300 (changed from 1,510)
- Kingsmoor ward  
Current electorate: 1,216  
Forecast electorate: 2,110 (changed from 1,200)
- Lattersey ward  
Current electorate: 1,931  
Forecast electorate: 1,920 (changed from 2,610)

These revised forecasts have been used in the County Council's submission.