

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Warding patterns	5
Draft recommendations	6
North	7
East	9
West	10
South	13
Conclusions	16
3 Have your say	17

Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District Council	19
B Submissions received	22
C Glossary and abbreviations	23

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 South Cambridgeshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of South Cambridgeshire District 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 district council elections varies depending on where you live in South Cambridgeshire. Overall, 18% of wards currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the city, and one ward (Histon & Impington) has a variance of more than 30% from the average.

Our proposals for South Cambridgeshire

South Cambridgeshire District Council currently has 57 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a reduction of 12, to 45 councillors, will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

As South Cambridgeshire District Council elects by whole-council elections, the Commission can produce a pattern of mixed-member wards. Our draft recommendations therefore propose that South Cambridgeshire District Council's 45 councillors should represent 25 wards, made up of 10 single-member wards, 10 two-member wards and five three-member wards. Two of our proposed 25 wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for South Cambridgeshire by 2021; our proposed Cambourne ward would have a variance of -11%, and our proposed Cottenham ward would have a variance of -12%.

You have until 25 July 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 17 for how to have your say.

1 Introduction

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

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ 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

Consultation

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

Stage starts	Description
November 2015	Council size decision
24 November 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
1 February 2016	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
10 May 2016	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
25 July 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
18 October 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your ward 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.

¹ 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:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ 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 wards 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.

	2015	2021
Electorate of South Cambridgeshire	117,115	130,255
Number of councillors	45	45
Average number of electors per councillor	2,603	2,895

10 Under our draft recommendations, two of our proposed wards (Cambourne and Cottenham) will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for South 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. In the case of South Cambridgeshire we are not proposing new electoral arrangements for any of its constituent parish and town councils.

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

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of South Cambridgeshire of approximately 11% to 2021. The district is forecast to experience significant growth in Cambourne, as well as in the new town of Northstowe.

15 Having considered the 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

16 Prior to consultation, South Cambridgeshire District Council submitted a proposal to us to reduce the current council size of 57 members to 45 members, a reduction of 12. We considered that the Council's submission was supported by evidence to justify reducing the current council size. We are content that the Council has sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under this council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We therefore invited proposals for warding arrangements based on a council size of 45.

17 We received three submissions mentioning council size in response to our consultation on warding patterns for South Cambridgeshire District Council. Two were positive, and one negative. However, no evidence was received to justify an amendment of the Commission's initial decision, and we have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 45 elected members.

Warding patterns

18 During consultation on warding patterns, we received 32 submissions, including one district-wide proposal. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district, and one political group put forward a slightly amended version of the Council's scheme.

19 The district-wide scheme received from South Cambridgeshire District Council provided a warding arrangement of 29 wards, made up of 16 single-member, 10 two-member and three three-member wards for the district. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that this proposed pattern of wards resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the district and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. However, there are areas in which we have recommended changes to improve electoral equality and thus better reflect the statutory criteria.

20 Our draft recommendations are for 25 wards, made up of 10 single-member wards, 10 two-member wards and five three-member wards. 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.

21 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 19–21) and on the large map accompanying this report.

22 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also particularly welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations, as no ward names were proposed by the Council as part of their submission.

Draft recommendations

23 The tables on pages 7–15 detail our draft recommendations for each area of South Cambridgeshire. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

North

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Bar Hill	1	9%	This ward comprises the parish of Bar Hill.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Bar Hill provide for good reflection of the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Cottenham	2	-12%	This ward includes the parishes of Cottenham and Rampton.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. The creation of this ward results in a relatively high electoral variance of -12%. However, we consider that this warding pattern is the most appropriate as it avoids the creation of unviable parish wards with too few electors, and also avoids splitting communities. We are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Girton	2	-6%	This ward includes the parishes of Dry Drayton, Girton and Madingley.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Girton provide for good adherence to the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Histon & Impington	3	9%	This ward comprises the parishes of Histon, Impington and Orchard Park.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Histon & Impington reflect our statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Longstanton	2	4%	This ward comprises the parishes of Longstanton and Oakington & Westwick.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Longstanton reflect communities, especially given the significant projected

				increase in the electorate in this area, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Milton & Waterbeach	3	-8%	This ward comprises the parishes of Landbeach, Milton (including the detached southern area of the parish) and Waterbeach.	In addition to the district-wide scheme, we received one submission regarding this proposed ward from a parish council. It suggested that the projected housing in the Waterbeach area should be taken into account, and that Waterbeach should remain as it is currently. The submission did also note, however, that if a change had to take place, then Waterbeach could join Milton in a ward. The electorate figures provided by the Council take into account all projected increases in the electorate until 2021 and in order to meet the statutory criteria, we propose to use the Council's scheme in this area. We consider that the ward proposed by the Council reflects our statutory criteria, and are therefore confirming it as part of our draft recommendations.
Over & Willingham	2	-3%	This ward comprises the parishes of Over and Willingham.	In addition to the district-wide scheme, we received one submission relating to this proposed ward. The proposal, from a parish council, suggested that Over and Willingham parishes should be combined with Fen Drayton and Swavesey parishes in a large three-member ward. However, this ward would be geographically large, and we did not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify moving away from the Council's proposed scheme in this area.
Swavesey	1	-3%	This ward comprises the parishes of Fen Drayton, Lolworth and Swavesey.	In addition to the district-wide scheme, we received one submission relating to this proposed ward. The proposal, from a parish council, suggested that Over and Willingham parishes should be combined with Fen Drayton and Swavesey parishes in a large three-member ward. However, this ward would be geographically large, and we did not consider that sufficient evidence was provided to justify

				moving away from the Council's proposed scheme in this area. We consider that the Council's proposal adequately reflects community identities and will ensure effective and convenient local government. We are therefore adopting it as part of our draft recommendations.
--	--	--	--	---

East

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Balsham	1	1%	This ward comprises the parishes of Balsham, Carlton, Horseheath, West Wickham, West Wratting and Weston Colville.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Balsham reflect the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Fen Ditton & Fulbourn	3	7%	This ward comprises the parishes of Fen Ditton, Fulbourn, Great Wilbraham, Horningsea, Little Wilbraham, Stow cum Quy and Teversham.	<p>In addition to the Council's proposal, we received two submissions relating to this area, one from a parish council and one from a political group. The Council's proposal for this area was for two wards: a two-member Fulbourn & Teversham ward, with a variance of +12%, and a single-member Fen Ditton ward, with a variance of -5%.</p> <p>The submission made by the political group arranged the parishes in this area differently, and put forward a single-member Fen Ditton & Teversham ward, with a variance of 0%, and a two-member Fulbourn ward, with a variance of 10%. However, this proposal would split the Teversham Foxgloves and Teversham Village areas into different wards. This was opposed by the parish council, which argued that the Teversham areas should remain together. In order to provide the best balance of our statutory criteria in this area, and to avoid splitting communities, we propose a three-</p>

				member ward combining the Council's proposed wards as part of our draft recommendations. This will ensure that electoral variances are kept to a minimum here.
Linton	2	0%	This ward includes the parishes of Bartlow, Castle Camps, Great Abington, Hildersham, Linton, Little Abington and Shudy Camps.	In addition to the district-wide scheme in this area, we received one submission relating to this proposed ward. The submission, from a parish council, requested that villages with shared interests be grouped together. We consider that the Council's scheme reflects this in this area, and are therefore confirming this ward as part of our draft recommendations.

West

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Barrington	1	5%	This ward comprises the parishes of Barrington, Great Eversden, Little Eversden, Orwell and Wimpole.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Barrington provide for good adherence to the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Bassingbourn	1	8%	This ward comprises the parishes of Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth and Litlington.	In addition to the district-wide scheme received from the Council, we received four submissions relating to the proposed Bassingbourn ward. Two of these submissions, which came from a district councillor and jointly from two parish councils, supported the Council's proposal for Bassingbourn and Litlington to be joined to form a single-member ward. The other two submissions, which both came from the same parish council, requested that Whaddon should be joined with the proposed Bassingbourn ward. However, this would

				result in an unacceptably high variance of 21%, and any attempt to move very small numbers of electors would create unviable parish wards. For these reasons, Whaddon is not included in the Bassingbourn ward. We consider that sufficient supporting evidence has been provided to adopt the Council's proposed ward in this area as part of our draft recommendations.
Caldecote	1	-8%	This ward comprises the parishes of Bourn, Caldecote, Childerley, Kingston, Little Gransden and Longstowe.	In addition to the district-wide scheme, we received one submission relating to this ward. The submission, from a parish council, referred specifically to the parish of Longstowe and requested that it be included in a ward with Gamlingay. However, this would necessitate the parish of Little Gransden being moved into a Gamlingay ward as well, resulting in a very high variance of -17% for Caldecote. We are not persuaded that we have received sufficient evidence to justify this variance are therefore confirming the Council's proposed Caldecote ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Cambourne	3	-11%	This ward comprises the parish of Cambourne.	In addition to the Council's proposed scheme, we received two submissions relating to the proposed Cambourne ward, both of which referred to parish warding arrangements. The submissions requested that the parish be split into three parish wards. However, we only put forward new parish warding arrangements as a direct consequence of our recommendations for the district. As we are proposing to include the whole parish in one ward, we are not in a position to propose any alterations to parish warding in this area. The creation of this Cambourne ward results in an electoral variance of -11%. However, we consider that this warding pattern is the most appropriate as it avoids splitting any

				communities. We are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Caxton & Papworth	2	5%	This ward comprises the parishes of Boxworth, Caxton, Conington, Croxton, Elsworth, Eltisley, Graveley, Knapwell, Papworth Everard and Papworth St Agnes.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Caxton & Papworth reflect the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Gamlingay & The Mordens	2	3%	This ward comprises the parishes of Abington Pigotts, Arrington, Croydon, Gamlingay, Guilden Morden, Hatley, Shingay cum Wendy, Steeple Morden and Tadlow.	<p>In addition to the Council's proposed scheme, we received 11 submissions relating to this area. The Council's proposal was for Gamlingay to form a single-member ward with a variance of 10%, and for The Mordens to form another single-member ward, with a variance of -5%. However, we received compelling evidence from a number of local residents and parish councils regarding the close links between East Hatley and Gamlingay. To include the East Hatley area in the Council's proposed Gamlingay ward would lead to an unacceptably high variance of 17%; to address this, we are proposing to combine the Council's proposed Gamlingay and The Mordens wards. This would also serve to include the parish of Croydon with Gamlingay, something put forward convincingly in a parish council's submission.</p> <p>We received one submission expressing concern that the Council's proposed ward for The Mordens extended too far north and that different communities should not be put together. However, we are of the view that combining different communities in one ward is preferable to splitting a community between wards. As such, we are proposing this ward as part of our draft recommendations.</p>

Hardwick	1	-6%	This ward comprises the parishes of Hardwick and Toft.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward, although we did receive a submission from a parish council concerned by the general reduction in the number of wards. This reduction is necessary due to the reduction in councillors, and in order to achieve good electoral equality. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Hardwick reflect the statutory criteria, and we are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Harston & Comberton	3	2%	This ward comprises the parishes of Barton, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Harlton, Harston, Haslingfield and Hauxton.	Apart from the Council's proposals, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. As part of their submission, the Council initially proposed three wards in this area. However, two of these wards had variances outside of 10%, and the Council proposed that the parishes of Barton, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Harlton, Harston, Haslingfield and Hauxton, could be combined to form a three-member ward. We are persuaded that this proposal will ensure good electoral equality while reflecting community identities. We therefore propose to include this three-member ward as part of our draft recommendations.

South

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Duxford	1	-3%	This ward comprises the parishes of Babraham, Duxford, Hinxtton, Ickleton and Pampisford.	Apart from the Council's proposal, we did not receive any submissions directly regarding this ward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council for Duxford provide for good adherence to the statutory criteria, and are therefore including this ward as part of our draft recommendations.

Foxton	1	-6%	This ward comprises the parishes of Foxton, Fowlmere, Great & Little Chishill and Heydon.	We received one submission relating to this area, which favoured the parish of Shepreth being linked with Foxton and Fowlmere. We do not consider that persuasive evidence has been received to adopt this warding pattern. We have therefore included the Council's proposed Foxton ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Melbourn	2	9%	This ward comprises the parishes of Melbourn, Meldreth, Shepreth and Whaddon.	In addition to the submission referred to above, regarding Shepreth, we also received a submission from a parish council which requested that Shepreth remain in a ward with Melbourn and Meldreth; this was proposed by the Council and provides for good of electoral equality. We received two submissions requesting that Whaddon parish should be joined with the proposed Bassingbourn ward. However, this would result in an unacceptably high variance of 21% in Bassingbourn, and any attempt to move very small numbers of electors would create parish wards that are too small and which would not provide for effective and convenient local government. For these reasons, Whaddon is not included in Bassingbourn ward. We consider that sufficient supporting evidence has been provided to adopt the Council's proposed ward of Melbourn as part of our draft recommendations.
Sawston	2	8%	This ward comprises the parish of Sawston.	In addition to the Council's proposals, we received one submission that mentioned Sawston. However, no specific proposals for warding were put forward. We consider that the proposals made by the Council provide an effective balance between the statutory criteria, and are therefore including the proposed Sawston ward as part of our draft recommendations.
Shelford	2	-1%	This ward comprises the parishes of Great Shelford, Little Shelford and Stapleford.	Alongside the Council's proposals, we received two submissions relating to the proposed Shelford ward, both of which referred specifically to Stapleford. Both submissions supported the warding pattern proposed by the Council in

				this area. We consider that the proposed ward reflects communities in this area and have therefore decided to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations.
Whittlesford	1	-8%	This ward comprises the parishes of Newton, Thriplow and Whittlesford.	In addition to the Council's proposals, we received one submission relating to Whittlesford. The submission did not put forward evidence to suggest an alternative warding pattern for the area, and as such we are including the Council's proposed Whittlesford ward as part of our draft recommendations.

Conclusions

24 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	45	45
Number of electoral wards	25	25
Average number of electors per councillor	2,603	2,895
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	2	0

Draft recommendation
 South Cambridgeshire District Council should comprise 45 councillors serving 25 wards representing 10 single-member wards, 10 two-member wards and five three-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

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

3 Have your say

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

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

27 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

28 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

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

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

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

A good pattern of wards should:

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

Electoral equality:

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

Community identity:

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

Effective local government:

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

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

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

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

32 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for South Cambridgeshire District Council in 2018.

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Balsham	1	2,930	2,930	13%	2,930	2,930	1%
2	Bar Hill	1	3,144	3,144	21%	3,144	3,144	9%
3	Barrington	1	2,621	2,621	1%	3,050	3,050	5%
4	Bassingbourn	1	3,089	3,089	19%	3,125	3,125	8%
5	Caldecote	1	2,669	2,669	3%	2,669	2,669	-8%
6	Cambourne	3	6,520	2,173	-16%	7,760	2,587	-11%
7	Caxton & Papworth	2	4,691	2,346	-10%	6,104	3,052	5%
8	Cottenham	2	5,031	2,516	-3%	5,114	2,557	-12%
9	Duxford	1	2,806	2,806	8%	2,806	2,806	-3%
10	Fen Ditton & Fulbourn	3	8,067	2,689	3%	9,273	3,091	7%
11	Foxton	1	2,670	2,670	3%	2,729	2,729	-6%
12	Gamlingay & The Mordens	2	5,626	2,813	8%	5,951	2,976	3%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for South Cambridgeshire District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13	Girton	2	4,200	2,100	-19%	5,439	2,720	-6%
14	Hardwick	1	2,540	2,540	-2%	2,723	2,723	-6%
15	Harston & Comberton	3	7,225	2,408	-7%	8,816	2,939	2%
16	Histon & Impington	3	8,341	2,780	7%	9,450	3,150	9%
17	Linton	2	5,642	2,821	8%	5,774	2,887	0%
18	Longstanton	2	3,652	1,826	-30%	6,049	3,024	4%
19	Melbourn	2	6,182	3,091	19%	6,315	3,157	9%
20	Milton & Waterbeach	3	7,472	2,491	-4%	8,004	2,668	-8%
21	Over & Willingham	2	5,476	2,738	5%	5,617	2,809	-3%
22	Sawston	2	5,547	2,774	7%	6,228	3,114	8%
23	Shelford	2	5,612	2,806	8%	5,736	2,868	-1%
24	Swavesey	1	2,741	2,741	5%	2,799	2,799	-3%
25	Whittlesford	1	2,621	2,621	1%	2,651	2,651	-8%

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Totals	45	117,115	-	-	130,255	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,603	-	-	2,895	-

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

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/south-cambridgeshire>

Local authority

- South Cambridgeshire District Council

Councillors

- Councillor N. Cathcart

Political groups

- South Cambridgeshire District Council Liberal Democrat Group

Local groups

- The Whittlesford Society

Parish and town councils

- Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council (joint submission with Litlington Parish Council)
- Croydon Parish Council
- Hatley Parish Council (two submissions)
- Little Abington Parish Council
- Longstowe Parish Council
- Shepreth Parish Council
- Stapleford Parish Council
- Steeple Morden Parish Council
- Swavesey Parish Council
- Teversham Parish Council
- Toft Parish Council
- Waterbeach Parish Council
- Whaddon Parish Council (two submissions)

Residents

- 13 local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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

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