

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743



28 June 2016

To: Chairman – Councillor Sue Ellington
Vice-Chairman – Councillor David McCraith
All Members of the Council

Quorum: 15

Dear Councillor

This is a supplement to the previously-published agenda for the meeting of **COUNCIL** on **TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2016**, containing those reports which had not been received by the original publication deadline.

Yours faithfully
JEAN HUNTER
Chief Executive

AGENDA

3. THE EAST ANGLIA DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL

PAGES
1 - 8

As set out in paragraph 26 of the report originally published with the agenda pack for this meeting, the attached document sets out responses submitted to an online survey which closed at 12 noon on 28 June 2016.

This page is left blank intentionally.

Agenda Item 3

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Proposals

Please tell us what you think about the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution proposals:

1. We already have 3 layers of local government, all working competently. We don't need another one, with additional costs and potentially at odds with the others.
2. We should reject this, and push for local democracy to be better supported by the government.
3. Cambridgeshire should NOT be linked with Norfolk and Suffolk.
4. I am strongly against any devolution. Cambridge and Peterborough are fundamentally very different cities and should not be artificially linked together. Also, this proposal adds a further costly layer of administration that is not needed and not wanted.
5. I do not think it is appropriate to join with Norfolk and Suffolk.
6. I strongly support the proposal for a separate Mayor/ devolution status for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and AGAINST merged arrangement originally proposed to include them with Norfolk and Suffolk. The official referendum stats emphasise the polarisation and differences between the rural coastal areas of Norfolk and Suffolk and the strongly 'Remain' results of Cambridge City and especially South Cambs: Over 81% of eligible South Cambridgeshire voters took part in the EU Referendum, with over 60% voting for the UK to Remain a member of the EU - highest turnout in Cambs., 2nd highest in East of England and 17th highest overall. It would be abhorrent to ignore this and tie any benefits of devolution to the Norfolk/Suffolk opinion holders.
7. Totally oppose it - mainly about vanity projects.
8. Dreadful. A mayor is a terrible idea. This is not devolving power to local people but simply adding another layer of government, which will not be popular. The new body will not represent the devolved area population if members are put forward from each of the council areas, as massively skewed towards conservatives. I would reject this, and any other similar proposal requiring a mayor and un-proportional representation. SCDC should reject this proposal as the financial offering for housing is nothing more than a bribe.
9. This is hardly a deal for the whole of Cambridgeshire. It does nothing for the people of South Cambs. Transport improvements do not benefit the people who live in this part of Cambridgeshire or who use St Neots station. The deal is vague and open to interpretation in places and given recent events with claim and counter claim I am not inclined to expect anything to benefit my community unless it is specifically defined. Lastly it is quite poor that you have given residents so little time to respond to this survey. Is this real engagement or going through the motions?
10. Cambridge has very little in common with Peterborough, March and Wisbech etc. I used to teach in March and was horrified at the racist attitudes of the

children there, very few of them had actually been to Cambridge or travelled more than 30 miles away from their home town. For devolution to work the people need to be able to trust and understand each other. The proposals just won't work. Better to give money to improve the education, expectations and quality of life to all in the north of Cambridgeshire.

11. The referendum has shown the HUGE differences in the two halves of Cambridgeshire and the differences in both thinking and attitudes which will set the two sides apart. Cambridge has been given oodles of money via the City Deal to increase housing and jobs, why not use the money to improve housing and job prospects of those in Cambridgeshire instead and when the two parts become more equal they may be ready to join together.
12. Devolution should not happen yet if at all until there is some trust by the people. The people should be allowed to say not the monied class who just want to make more money.
13. Disgraceful bribe to move power further away from members of the public to an unaccountable body. The money for housing is a welcome start but we should not be held to ransom in this way.
14. If it can deliver the proposed housing and related infrastructure then it is worth pursuing. Having two centres (Cambridge and Peterborough) may make it hard to focus. Who is going to be Mayor?
15. I would support the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution proposal, in principle. I would not support the idea of creating devolved government covering all three East Anglian counties.
16. I don't agree with devolution for cambridgeshire and peterborough, I don't believe transferring powers like this will be beneficial to this area, I have, like many others, seen cambridgeshire change too much too fast and not for the better either, there is a continuous war on drivers, if residents object to houses being built they are ignored, this I know for a fact as its happened in our village, give some one power and they will always abuse it, I don't believe residents are listened to as it is and I think it would be worse with devolution.
17. I'm broadly in favour but really wonder if it will proceed in the form outlined after the disastrous referendum result.
18. I think that in terms of the area covered this is a more manageable and more coherent solution but I am still concerned by the extent of the powers invested in the chief executive or mayor and the questions of accountability that arise from this.
19. Given the result of the recent EU Referendum, the political landscape of the UK is likely to change dramatically in the coming months.
20. We shouldn't rush into anything like this until the political landscape and future of the UKs position in the world are clear.
21. We should not join up with these Brexit areas, South Cambs and City should go it alone.

22. We have nothing in common with Hunts, Fenland and Peterborough. It's unnecessary bureaucracy. Cambridge, S Cambs E Cambs yes, the rest no.
23. A terrible idea. One more layer of government to pay for that we don't need. County and District councils are fine as they are.
24. As a resident south of Cambridge, didn't look like there was much in it to interest / affect me.
25. Ridiculous - yet another layer of Government and local Councillors, which is totally unnecessary and will prove far too expensive for the already challenged local authority budgets.
26. The revised proposals are an improvement on the previous debacle - however, they still represent an additional layer of government that will have little if any legitimacy in the eyes of voters. This will be the case if and when the devolved administration is seen to be (physically and socio-politically) remote from those it is supposedly meant to serve.
27. To put this in context, the current planning system has failed the residents of South Cambs. Instead of planned new (housing) development with appropriate infrastructure (transport, healthcare, educational provision) occurring in centres such as Bourne and Cambourne, all South Cambs villages with their unique character are being permanently damaged by opportunistic unplanned, incremental development proposals that are unsustainable. The A10 corridor simply cannot cope. The rail service to London from Cambridge is at breaking point for commuters. The healthcare service is overstressed. Educational provision is a major headache for all parents in the area.
28. The documents provided give only a partial (one might say lambent and one-sided) analysis of the options available with a clear bias towards Option 4, but without a proper assessment of Option 3 in particular. The table in para 90 of the Governance Review is highly misleading - Option 3 is dismissed and yet the rationale states that Option 3 "Supports a coherent approach to strategic planning and infrastructure and able to take devolved powers from Government". Remember that an additional layer of planning - under the auspices of a remote "Mayoral Combined Authority" (Option 4) will not be able to address the above failures quickly, and inevitably it will be viewed as remote, expensive and unaccountable. (And before it is suggested - sweetening the pill with a new cycle route from Cambridge to Peterborough is not what is needed). Cost-cutting in the guise of devolution by central government is one thing, establishing an additional remote and costly layer of government is quite another proposition. The South Cambs / A10 corridor issues require urgent attention and should be a specific requirement within the proposals if they are to be supported at all. To conclude, Option 3 - establish a Combined Authority requires much more careful appraisal than it has been accorded in the documentation and if there is to be a change from the status quo - then Option 3 Form A Combined Authority is likely to have greater legitimacy, more transparent governance, and be more meaningful and accessible than a "Mayoral" solution. Re-consider Option 3."
29. I think this is just another sop for local people to believe they have a voice, when of course they haven't. The previous devolution proposal by John Prescott was not received well and added another layer of administration and

cost. It is now difficult to see how much more development this area can take with the existing infrastructure, in and around Cambridge. Traffic and parking will be a major headache - even outside peak hrs. There will be increased pressure to build on green belt land. Thankfully we will be moving away from the SE in the foreseeable future. With the changes in planning law that this government has introduced over the last few years it is easy to see where their priorities lie and it's not with the environment!

30. The UK is generally over-centralised in financial matters so this degree of devolution makes sense. Whether the proposed benefits can be realised depends to a great degree upon whether the country is so stupid as to leave the EU today
31. I think it is a very poor deal for South Cambs. There is no new money in reality and there will be no new houses one and above those already identified. An elected mayor represents the opposite of what devolution should do by creating a further level of unaccountable democracy rather than devolving powers down. Please reject this.
32. Considerably better than going in with Suffolk and Norfolk but why is yet another level of government needed.
33. Would broadly support the proposal, the decentralisation of Whitehall responsibilities gets a tick along with increased investment in housing, transport and the economy.
34. I am not keen on the idea of one mayor; Cambridge is very different in arrangements and needs from the rest of the area.
35. I would like to see a summary comparing the proposal and the alternatives, with the pros and cons of each, so I can make a considered choice.
36. If, essentially, we're talking about bringing Peterborough unitary authority back into Cambridgeshire then I can't see anything massively wrong with it. But I am really wary that this sort of project can end up creating yet another layer of expensive bureaucracy without actually solving any of the region's problems
37. Do we have the expertise?
38. Revised MCA proposal should be beneficial to area. Urgent need to overcome the infrastructure problems in Cambs. Remove Ely rail bottleneck, create rail links to north of county (eg Wisbech) to facilitate commuting and goods movement, new cross counties service (Cambridge to Oxford), improve services to London. This will create new employment prospects. However, costs must be strictly controlled. No vast salaries, expensive offices and perks to be paid for by residents! New Mayor's office with minimum staff to be paid for by reducing costs elsewhere ie not replacing retiring staff. These changes must not be reason for creating another layer of local government. Local taxes must not rise as result of new structure. Save on Police & Crime Commissioner, merge functions. Make savings on district back office functions. Continue with revision to fire and ambulance services - merge many functions as is done in France and is cost saving especially in rural areas. Bus links from villages have been cut so forcing people to use

cars to commute. Also hampers young people getting jobs and going to colleges. Done well this plan can greatly benefit the area.

39. They are an improvement on the original East Anglia devolution proposals but I am concerned about an additional layer of bureaucracy and the costs and potential conflicts that will bring.
40. It must be demonstrated that devolution will provide (and has provided in due course) a net benefit to the area.
41. Cambs and P'boro is a better fit than Cambs with Norfolk, Suffolk.
42. It will defeat the purpose if it introduces another layer of local government bureaucracy.
43. Whilst the whole idea is daft, if there is a chance of attracting more Government investment in this region it merits some consideration.
44. The Cambridgeshire/Peterborough bloc has a lot less against it than the original wider East Anglian scheme - what benefits Norfolk and Suffolk is in most cases irrelevant to Cambridge & Peterborough, and trying to impose overall arrangements across the entire original area is unlikely to benefit everyone except possibly for transport and water management. So while I am strongly against the original combined proposal, I can see some limited benefits in the revised scheme.
45. I've spent 45mins on the site and can't find the details! The main document appears solely to be about the process; the responses to the previous survey are reported but not analysed or synthesized. With no clarity on what is proposed, how can I say what I think? This is hardly consultation :-)
46. Having devolved Peterborough from County control to give it Unitary Authority status there seems little point in now merging its activities with a County. If such plans are considered beneficial then why not just absorb it back into one of the Counties rather than creating an additional layer of government (Mayor & staff) with all the attendant additional costs - especially in these times of austerity when public costs are supposedly being cut.
 - A) How does the promised funding compare with the funds which would have come the way of the constituent local authorities without devolution?
 - B) Will the funding dilute the funds urgently required for infrastructure in and around Cambridge?
 - C) Should not the £70m fund for affordable housing be allocated to Cambridge City and South Cambs?
47. The title of "mayor" is absurd. "Chief Executive" would be more appropriate.
48. More infrastructure income required to reduce congestion around Girton/Histon/ Cottenham as Northstowe becomes residential. Dual carriageway required on A10 from Amey Cespa roundabout to A14 roundabout, Milton. The devolution proposals need to be reviewed after 23rd June, depending on the outcome eg. housing, buy to let and Green Belt reduction as is already occurring around Cambridge.

49. Peterborough. Investors will have difficulty to set up businesses due to sustainability and accomodation problems for various nationalities and religious matters as you are already aware. However, I agree the proposals for Cambs. & Peterborough are reasonable, but to have one Mayor which includes Norfolk & Suffolk, needs Government officials to understand, because of the differences in East Anglian's history and culture, together with educational requirements is not really feasible in my view. Devolution is better than centralisation, providing more legislation and regulations do not stop Councils from carrying out "Common sense" reforms in their areas and the finance is available.
50. Why another level of bureaucracy and 6 figure salaries with minimal control by the public? Virtually all decisions will be based on either Peterborough or Cambridge City, the villages will not get a look in, just built over.
51. I read the current inability to decide a way ahead as purely political. Cambridge city is red/orange, everywhere else in East Anglia's blue. Further reason NOT to join with Peterborough.
52. Why a Peterborough University? Just more watering down of the degree system and wasting more money on "media studies" so called degree courses.
53. Sorry proposals are pure politics and seem to offer nothing to anyone who lives outside the two cities.
54. I would support this deal provided great care is taken that the provision for affordable housing (all types) is carried out in such a way that the money is used effectively to benefit the residents. We see in current building schemes a reluctance from the companies involved to bring houses onto the market at pace because of the negative effect this would have on prices (and thus their profits). A large amount of housing is required in this area, and this needs to be supplied quickly to alleviate the inflated costs the current population is struggling with.
55. I don't see why it's necessary, it's another layer of bureaucracy that has to be paid for somehow and money will be cut from other areas to pay for the mayor and her staff.
56. It sounds ok but my main concern is housing and if this deal will enable homes to be built speedily to deal with chronic shortage and build small scale site on edge of villages and market towns not everyone want to live in Cambourne or northstowe if that ever gets going.
57. This is sounds like a much better step than the East Anglia plan. Be good to see more details on how this will work - and I am not quite sure why it doesn't also include some links with London.
58. Will support most of it, provided that the proposal to have an elected Mayor with virtually unlimited powers is scrapped.
59. I agree in principle, but do not think the funds suggested for infrastructure and housing will be sufficient to meet the needs of the proposed development of this area.

60. It's a lot better than the greater East Anglian deal with more money directly targeted at our immediate area. I would take the deal.
61. I am fully in favour in principle; Cambridge and Peterborough are clearly well able to cope with devolved powers and finances, while the UK needs to decentralise as a matter of principle.
62. Linking Peterborough and Cambridge makes eminent sense and will enhance the existing parallel structures for Police and Fire Services and the Criminal Justice system. Most importantly there will be adequate career growth opportunities that will reduce the pressure upon Cambridge-London commuting.
63. Far too many houses.
64. By far the better option. The other option is too big and distant
65. Seem to be mostly focused on Peterborough social projects. Not enough about business for Cambridgeshire or transport plans/infrastructure to support for both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough e.g. train transport improvements at existing stations like Huntingdon plus new station at Cambridge Science Park - should be bringing this latter item forward as a priority ditto A14 improvements
66. I think this is a much more realistic plan than the previous offering.
67. I still have concerns that this process will result in centralisation in the cities at a time while Cambridge is actively trying to discourage Cambridgeshire from being able to access services there.
68. I welcome improvements in the Ely-London rail corridor -- but I believe the Ely north improvements must be prioritised as highly as possible as it is a necessary precursor for longer trains/more frequent services.
69. Improvements within Cambridge are *vital* and must not be overlooked. Congestion in Cambridge will not be solved without investing money -- a few more busses and some cycleways will not suffice; tramways and light rail should be looked at.
70. Overall I support this plan -- but I would like to see more accountability; individual projects put to regional referenda instead of a single large plan whose public answerability will be limited.
71. Much more sensible and logical than the initial proposal but nevertheless represents an additional tier of regional government by another name. How about a referendum???
72. What, no detailed questions on specific aspects? What sort of survey is this?
73. The devolution deal is absurd. It creates a tier of government which is barely 20% bigger in population than Cambs County Council's remit. Why should we have a redundant and arbitrary imposition of an elected mayor when the funds and extra powers could simply be delivered to the existing elected authorities of Cambs County Council and Peterborough City without stupid strings attached?

74. What is worse is that the Combined Authority is wholly undemocratic. It will have representation from the seven Council Leaders all but one of whom are Conservative. This means that the largest opposition party in *all* seven councils will have no representation on the Combined Authority at all. This becomes a virtual one-party state because it is highly likely that the elected Mayor will be from the same party that also controls the majority of the constituent authorities within the Combined Authority. This devolution deal eliminates any form of elected opposition from the exercise of power and will disengage the voters even more. It is an unnecessary tier of government and we would be better off with real and substantial power being devolved from Westminster, not having to accept strings attached to sums of money which are handed out only by the grace of the government.
75. There's a lot that's very positive here - and in principle I'm behind it.
76. I have some questions:
77. the mayoral role will be challenging - it will be political, but need to work across political boundaries and deliver a clear consensus decision that is right for everyone, and influencing a wide range of authorities and their working methods and staff - is it defined correctly?
78. how will that role engage with the public?
79. how will that role engage with Parish Councils, particularly as we see Parishes rise to the challenge of working with principal authorities to deliver better services locally at better value
80. there's significant extra money coming forward, where communities are making that difference (eg by increasing volunteering, delivering affordable/extra housing etc) they will need a slice of that - that needs to be factored into the thinking
81. Seems good in principle though there's quite a distance (in many ways) between Cambridge and Peterborough.
82. We must not forget that the Biotech campuses are in the extreme South-East of this 'area' and dependent on labour from neighbouring areas, notably Suffolk and Essex. Transport proposals must obviously consider this! The roads around the periphery of Cambridge stretch into neighbouring counties.
83. We also need to ensure that this is not just another layer of local government - and a source of inefficiency. The general public does not really understand the current split between county and district!
84. Will it make it quicker to get agreement on Local Plans? The current timescale for the Cambridge/South Cambs one seems ridiculous.
85. I think the area is still too big. I think a Greater Cambridge is needed. There is little in common between Cambridge and its hinterland, and say Wisbech, and in particular the political make up of the disparate areas.