

# 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 |
| <br>  |    |
| 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:

| <b>Stage starts</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|---------------------|---|
| 21 October 2014     | Decision on council size  |
| 28 October 2014     | Division pattern consultation   |
| 12 May 2015         | Draft recommendations consultation  |
| 7 July 2015         | Analysis of submissions received 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.

|   | 2014    | 2020    |
|---|---------|---------|
| 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 62 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  |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|---|
| Arbury           | 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.  |
| Barnwell         | 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. |
| Castle & Newnham | 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  |

|               |   |    |  |   |
|---------------|---|----|--|---|
|               |   |    |  | 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.  |
| Cherry Hinton | 1 | 3% | This division lies in the east of the city and comprises the Cherry Hinton community.  | <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> |
| Chesterton    | 1 | 5% | 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. | 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 & Newnham division. In the north of the division, we propose that a section of Milton   |

|                      |   |     |   |   |
|----------------------|---|-----|---|---|
|                      |   |     |   | 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   |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>division is currently undergoing large-scale housing development along its southern fringe.</p> | <p>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.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

## 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%                    |