

Appendix D - East Anglia Devolution survey

Question one

| Do you think East Anglia is the appropriate geography for a devolution deal? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Yes | 21.3% | 17 |
| No | 78.8% | 63 |
| Your comments | | 61 |
| <i>answered question</i> | | 80 |
| <i>skipped question</i> | | 0 |

- 1) Previous attempts at Regional devolution have either failed or not got off the ground so why try gain to create another layer of government.
- 2) We need a deal that is more Cambridge centric. Including the whole of East Anglia moves the centre too far east and excludes areas west and south of Cambridge.
- 3) As Cambridge is geared to extending its expertise worldwide: Greater transport/organisational links would be better served by reinstating the Cambridge-Oxford railway and developing it and adjacent road networks as a 'silicon and innovation corridor' which touches the northern 'curve' of London and its associated economic positives.
- 4) Greater Cambridge (which can stretch as far as Peterborough but also does take in small parts of Essex and Herts on the Southern border) is a working area that has very little connection with Norfolk and Suffolk so any attempt to bundle them will NOT have buy-in from voters.

The extra layer of expensive bureaucracy, in times of tightened belts, will produce newspaper headlines highlighting the costs, further upsetting the voter.

The cynic in me might think that this is a way for central government to pass the buck. washing the hands of their responsibilities for large parts of the infrastructure so they can say it is not their fault when there are problems. The cynic might also suggest the they don't dare re-instate the East of England grouping because someone might notice that eliminating EEDA was a waste of time after all.

Do not be bribed by the "extra funding" only if you agree to a mayor - ask the electorate what they really want. A "mayor" covering such a ridiculously large and diverse area will be about as popular with the electorate as the Police commissioner.

5) What is East Anglia ! I have never felt an infinity to East Anglia. Cambridgeshire has always a very distinct character & out of that has masses of inventions, research, start up businesses, thriving Cambridge being the jewel in the crown. However it has been held up because lack of finances in many areas e.g education for children, Cambridgeshire has one of the lowest money per pupil in the UK. Also we need more better transport, particularly in the rural area, & better train connections. I don't think we need a mayor, why would we want a CEO to tell the populace how their city & towns costing whatever !

6) I believe in and support a regional model for England. But I do not support regional government by elected mayor. Neither do I support any devolution deal which does not contain a directly elected assembly which precisely encompasses the electorate it governs. I do not support combined authorities with quango-like, indirectly elected or appointed assemblies.

I support a model based on Cambs/Norfolk/Suffolk, or a model based on Essex/Cambs/Norfolks/Suffolk. as a natural grouping counties for the East of England. It is debatable whether Herts and Beds should be included rather than making up part of a region central England.

I believe devolution in the UK must be symmetric: this must mean that all citizens are equal and this implies equal devolution for all of us whether in cities or rural areas, and whether we are Scottish or English, etc.

This therefore implies a regional system of devolution in which regional assemblies have powers similar to those of the Scottish Parliament. This has to be the long-term objective of devolution deals otherwise we in South Cambs will always remain second-class citizens in comparison to Scotland where half of the income tax revenue, and health, education, etc. are now controlled directly by the Parliament.

For the UK to be a fair country, this must be replicated across England but on a regional basis because England is too large to have a single parliament.

7) Cambridge lies on a north-south axis, a corridor of development from London, through Stansted to Peterborough. It has no natural links with Norfolk and Suffolk and is fast developing links with the south Midlands.

8) Concern that the counties are very different in their makeup. I see problems arising from say high tech in Cambs v rural and farming in Suffolk and Norfolk.

9) The current system works well. There is co-operation between the counties already, none more is needed.

10) Under this designation Essex is apparently not considered to be part of the East Anglian region, which it is, so the government is already playing games with historical reality - and one can only wonder why.

The problem with all such schemes for devolved authorities is that they are, to a great extent, artificial constructs and while the government might well be waving around promissory notes of a billion pounds as an inducement it cannot disguise the fact that significant powers in regional planning are to be vested in one 'elected' individual and a 'cabinet' whose decisions will be even further removed from electors than they currently are. Nor is there any indication of the remuneration these rather powerful individuals will receive, which always tends to be far in excess of their talents, and who pays them.

Views about devolution are not new - Joseph Chamberlain expressed enthusiasm - but in recent years they appear to have emanated from the back rooms of the Commission in Brussels and while what is currently proposed falls short of the Balkanisation of England there does appear to be a drift towards a tier of devolved regional authorities, however cobbled together, and however indifferent their performance in the period before 2010."

11) Suffolk, Norfolk, Peterborough, and Cambridgeshire is too big an area just to have one elected mayor, and all the various duties he/she, is supposed to undertake. East Anglia is a large area. A mayor is definitely needed for each of these four areas, in my opinion.

12) If its happening I would prefer only Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

13) Depends what you mean by EastAnglia? Which bits are in or out. Why Peterborough in, but north Essex out, for example

14) Cambridgeshire looks outwards towards London. It's expansion, business, economy and research and development has much more in common with London and neighbouring counties than with Suffolk and Norfolk.

15) I feel there is a massive range of places each with their own issues. I can see mayors and devolution working for the big cities but less clear how effective this would be. I guess this would be more like Scottish, Welsh or Northern Irish devolution. I guess those work ok because people in those regions have different values and priorities to Westminster. Question might be do we in the east have different idea on how this region is run, and feel strongly as a community? Being an economic immigrant to the region I'm not best placed to answer that but my feeling is no.

16) Cambridgeshire is incredibly similar to Norfolk and Suffolk - if you ignore Cambridge. The same could be said for Norwich, Ipswich etc.

17) Too varied and area for single Deal and Mayor - SCambs & Hunts needs are completely different to say Brecklands and N Norfolk

18) How can ordinary members of the public make a proper considered assessment of the proposals without full and proper information, details and costs? The Chancellor's announcement in March and the EA Devolution Agreement between the Government and two dozen local authorities consist merely of broad brush platitudinous statements which give no real insight into the practical implications of the proposal.

How much will it cost the taxpayers?

How does it meet the principle of subsidiarity? Or does it simply introduce a new tier of bureaucracy between existing central and local government?"

19) Why not? As long as the differences within this region are recognised i.e. Norfolk and Suffolk very different from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. If treated as a single area then should not be to the detriment of any area's issues i.e. "poorer" areas like Norfolk/Suffolk with different issues like employment/immigration/aging population should not take priority because more "media-friendly" and talkable stories.

20) Councils have too much control now, the one thing I would not like to see is devolution so the present incumbents can empire build, I have already seen how Cambridge is being ruined

21) Geographically this is a sensible unit

22) The region is too diverse economically. Cambridgeshire is an economic powerhouse while the rest of the region needs developing. The big issue for the

Cambridge environs is affordable housing; leaving that to a region to divide up will not achieve much and the amount of money suggested £175m is pathetically low. A radical change in affordable housing provision needs to be adopted and a regional government will not be able to do that. A fundamental change in government policy is needed.

23) I don't think we have anything in common with Great Yarmouth or Lowestoft. South Cambs belongs to the "golden triangle" that lies within London, Cambridge and Oxford. This proposal will only redistribute resources from South Cambs. to the East Coast, which has a high level of need and should be receiving more support from government.

24) There seems little point in adding another layer to the already cumbersome structure of local government.

If the government has the money to give the county, it should come without having any strings such as us accepting a Mayor and their associated offices. We should also be able to spend such money the way we deem necessary - not as central politicians wish to dictate.

25) East Anglia is a vibrant and young cohort of the UK population and is every bit as capable as anywhere else of being capable of managing a devolved status.

26) I do not think this is appropriate due to the diversity of the area. There is no reason that partnerships can not be built without all the extra cost and ted tape.

27) Cambridge and Peterborough together as they are more closely related. Concerns here are not likely to be the same as the more rural areas of Norfolk and Suffolk.

28) There is too great a discrepancy between the demographics of Peterborough, Cambridge, Suffolk and Norfolk

29) The area is too diverse to be considered as one geography with the same issues across the whole

30) To take advantage of the devolution concept you need size as well as geographical and historic alignment of interests. East Anglia has lots of common issues which scale investment will help such as transport and energy. It will require genuine collaboration for common benefit.

A bit like the EU question. If one supports devolution in England i can not see why the same principle you are selling here of LOCAL SOVEREIGNTY does not apply to benefits from being part of the EU!

31) The three counties have nothing in common

32) South Cambs is hardly east Anglia nothing in common with rural Norfolk. Drain resources away from high tech area to coastal low skilled areas.

33) No. The European Union is attempting to destroy the national character of England by turning it into a collection of regions. Have you heard of divide and rule?

The other way of destroying national identity is to persue a program of mass immigration. Have you seen the latest immigration figures?"

34) Yes but! There are obvious clashes between the development of high tech industries around Cambridge and the agricultural areas elsewhere in East Anglia. This has resulted in drastically unbalanced levels of development. Similarly the commuter belly corridor serving London is dramatically different to the north coast of Norfolk. These unbalances will generate significant challenges.

35) When John Prescott was Deputy Prime Minister in the last Labour government he introduced the East of England Assembly, many of his ideas such as large housing developments in the countryside were very unpopular at the time. Most people were glad to see the back of his policies in this regard.

36) Norfolk and Suffolk are almost mainly rural areas with different needs and priorities to Cambridgeshire. I am also not convinced that we need an additional layer of bureaucracy in our Regional Government.

37) Norfolk and Suffolk have similar physical and economic configurations. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough do not. The latter two are much faster growing and have needs which are different.

38) I do not see any value in devolution process. I think it will just add further administrative costs and waste tax payers money which could be better spent on actual service delivery

39) By splitting England by devolution into such regions can only be detrimental as instead of being more efficient it will add another layer of bureaucracy instead of a reducing it. Local knowledge is often the decisive key in making final decisions on environmental issues, housing and transport. If these final decisions were to be made by a Regional Mayor and their Office then it would be very worrying.

40) While I entirely support 'localism' in political outlook and discourse, this rush for mayors-for-all isn't the way to do things. (Even the 'northern powerhouse' ideas put forward from central government are a bit wrong. Everyone is giving the wrong answers to the wrong questions.)

41) There are great differences between the areas close to Cambridge and those further east.

42) Too large an area with too many different priorities

43) The area is too different for a single unitary authority. Depending on which political party gets power will dictate which areas benefits as they will ensure money is directed at their voters rather than for the overall good

44) It represents too large an area. The counties are very different. Cambridgeshire should not be included in this as it has very different needs to the other counties.

45) I think the geography is too big. The combination of the very rural and agriculture natures of Norfolk and Suffolk and the distance between Norfolk/Suffolk coast and the borders of Cambridgeshire are too diverse and big to be managed efficiently under one organisation with the job too big for 1 mayor.

I think the principle of devolution is good but the area involved needs to be rethought.

46) I like the idea of devolution and local accountability - I'm much less sure that "East Anglia" is a region with a character and a view. I'm concerned (as in the introduction) that perhaps Cambridge and area (fast moving, university focus, entrepreneurial, young) fits with some of the outlying areas (rural, traditional (even Brexiteers), less educated). This might however be showing some of my prejudices!

47) East Anglia is a diverse area containing several industry/commerce hubs and a large area of rural countryside -- A government which tries to target both these audiences will inevitably fail to properly address the needs of either. This has historically been the case and no-one has yet explained a plan which would cause the outcome of this idea to be any different.

48) The proposed area is too big for the proposed governance arrangement

49) Norfolk and Suffolk might make sense (possibly with some North Essex) but Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have more in common with Herts and Beds- not least policing partnerships.

50) It has such a disparate economy and Geography - it would be impossible to deliberate fairly between competing demands on scant resources. (Overall there will be little real additional money from Central Government.)

51) South Cambridgeshire is going to evolve into the "super city" of London - I do not see anyway that this evolution can be avoided. It would be better to create an outer London transition zone comprising SC, Essex, Beds., Herts., etc to have some increased governance of this evolution.

52) I think the area is too large and the needs of Cambridgeshire are so different from Suffolk and Norfolk that it would not be good for any of the counties.

53) Depending on what's happening it tends to make Essex - London centric. Bedfordshire & South Cambs - Home Counties etc. Too much difference between Cambridge and Norfolk & Suffolk.

54) If we can achieve economies of scale. That means overall less bureaucracy not more pen pushers and shorter chains of command to get things happening quicker.

55) Current County is ok.

56) It will just another layer of useless and unnecessary bureaucracy.

57) It is an extremely large and diverse region whose needs vary accordingly.

58) yes i believe it is as long as there is a major overhaul of current structure to reduce excessive layers within the respective councils

59) East of the area and Cambridge have different concerns. In one area we have the major city which is built around a major university, which drives technology and biotech companies. While Norfolk has a agricultural and rural need.

60) Although I've lived in the Cambridge area for over 40 years, I was brought up in, and have close connections with the Lowestoft area. And I am a geographer by training! East Anglia is now too disparate for the current devolution plan to serve any of it well. Cambridge has more connections with London, Europe and the rest of the world than it does with the impoverished (in every sense) coastal towns and the more

prosperous rural areas. We are accustomed to a cosmopolitan and outward-facing way of life. It takes 2hrs 45mins to travel from Cambridge to Lowestoft by train, and almost 2hours by car. The peripheral urban areas (Southwold and the North Norfolk coast excepted!) are hoping that some of Cambridge's gilt will rub off on them.

61) Only a Chancellor who lives in London and was educated at Eton could believe there is any commonality between Ipswich and Cambridge. An elected Mayor would weaken local democracy changing from multi party representation to single person/party control. The opportunity for corruption would be massively increased and oversight reduced. This regional Mayor would be a similar error to the Police Commissioners, changing multi representative regulation to single party control. Please do not be bribed, turn this down.

Question two

| Do you think the Deal will help meet South Cambridgeshire's transport needs? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Yes | 20.3% | 16 |
| No | 79.7% | 63 |
| Your comments | | 54 |
| <i>answered question</i> | | 79 |
| <i>skipped question</i> | | 1 |

1) Authorities are elected and in place to manage their infrastructure which should not be impossible with some co-operation with neighbouring Authorities.

2) It's impossible to say since no details are provided.

3) unlikely. It would just divert money to itself, at the expense of 'on-the-ground' resources.

4) Artificial borders don't help - they hinder. South Cambs problems start outside Cambs in the South and start West of the A1 so solutions that stop at the border will be sub-optimum. It needs National strategy and implementation.

5) Money will be spent in more Park & Rides sites with people who live outside Cambridge will be locked out of driving in the town. Many people commute to Cambridge from the countryside ,we need speedy transport from the villages with innovate ideas not failed buses.

6) No, our needs will only be met by having a powerful local government which has tax-raising powers like the Scottish Parliament so that we in the East of England can invest in projects under our own steam and without interference or hindrance from Government. Tax-raising powers must of course be accompanied by a directly elected authority.

7) Significant upgrades required to local public transport and also the road network (in particular the A10) would be needed.

8) No. The Greater Cambridge area has its own particular transport problems which are not shared with the rest of the region. The railways do not serve the proposed East Anglian region as a whole. The road system serves the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor and is not properly linked to Norfolk and Suffolk, except for the A14 to Felixstowe. Would the devolved authority have the power to divert funds earmarked for road building to improvements in public transport? Where does the Highways Authority fit in?

9) Possibly. Cambridgeshire needs investment in rail as well as roads eg remove Ely bottleneck, improve Cambridge to London line with better links to Stansted Airport. Improved cross country rail would benefit Cambridge, Bury St Ed, Ipswich etc.

10) There will be no more money despite the hype

11) Unlikely. Many of the transport needs of this area involve East/West travel - so involve planning with authorities outside the area covered by the 'Deal'.

12) Congestion is already occurring at certain times of the day. It is bound to worsen when Northstowe, Waterbeach Barracks and development is finalised on the old NIAB land. This deal, to improve the infrastructure, and to elect a mayor for the whole of the areas will not help.

13) Maybe, who knows really!

14) I think Greater Cambridge area needs one voice to fight for its own solutions. Not sure why people in Sheringham should be involved in road and rail plans for Shelford.

15) Subject to the reservations mentioned below.

16) Until the Council learns its lessons about traffic management and stops deliberately making things worse, no amount of money etc will make any difference.

17) Cambridge needs a better transport system that doesn't involve the existing roads. We should rely more on train like modes of transport and links to these stations should be improved. Many communities don't have a station nearby. I also think Cambridge needs a fast link to Oxford and Birmingham. Links out to the east would be nice too but linking up to those places so that you don't have to go via London would be far better and more important.

roads are a bit of a nightmare because too many people want to drive on them! New houses need to have the roads / transport sorted out first. A505 and a14 are particularly annoying to me. Having said that dualing a11 has been excellent."

18) There is not nearly enough money in the deal to upgrade the A10, particularly if the new town at Waterbeach gets off the ground.

19) It's extra money, and a decision making process/body that is likely to take decisions rather than argue about it for years

20) Existing strategic authorities have consistently failed to take proper account of local transport needs;

examples include:

- the failure of the A14 upgrade scheme to provide for an all ways interchange at Girton.

- the same scheme introduces an all ways junction at Cambridge Services which will radically affect the traffic on surrounding rural roads.
- the A428 dualling has created horrendous traffic problems at Caxton Gibbet and Madingley Hill"

21) Cannot say unless we know what was in the pipeline anyway - how much is genuinely new in this deal? What is the regions actual requirements.

22) All the council are interested in is penalising car drivers, if we have devolution it would get worse

23) Obviously the extra money promised would help !

24) It has already taken decided for the improvements to the A14 to be agreed I do not see how any major transport links can be better improved. We need a truly integrated transport system which must include BR. will they be part of the new model?

25) Emphasis will be given to regenerate the areas in greatest need and South Cambs. doesn't fall within this category. We should concentrate on the improvements contained within City Deal and not get involved with this rather silly devolution proposal.

26) The County transport needs have been woefully misunderstood by central Government up till now.

South Cambridgeshire is more than capable of managing its own transport needs and arguably more so than any other organisation."

27) This will end up in a massive fight for funds with the county the Mayor comes from always winning. Again no reason that this can not be done locally and in partnerships

28) The Deal would have to be more diluted to cover needs for Norfolk and Suffolk.

29) This just sound like an extra layer of government with no demonstrable benefit other than additional costs

30) Only if you have a sound local plan with clear outcomes and delivery dates.

31) Stop mass immigration and the traffic problem goes away.

32) Yes but! Current planning and political will has managed to totally mess up the region. Why did Felixstow double its container capacity but no change has occurred to supporting road and rail links? Why should we have any faith that devolution will change the situation? When will politicians be held countable for the totally messed up planning in the area?

33) How can more housing ease the burden of traffic congestion in this area. I assumed that this government had already agreed to the A14 upgrade anyway. Surely they will not teenage on this deal.

34) If the commensurate level of funding was given direct to Cambs County Council, it could address the main transport issues of South Cambs

35) It's clear that more money will help. But mixing that up with the rural transport needs of scattered populations in Norfolk diverts from our pretty clear requirements.

36) See no benefit for South Cambs

37) South Cambridgeshire's transport problems are to do with lacking of funding at a Government level so Devolution will not effect this. The East of England has historically lost out over decades of years particularly in the East / West transport provision so joining it up with other counties and inheriting their local issues will not help South Cambridgeshire in any way.

38) While I'm not one of the hardcore cycle-lanes everywhere, cars nowhere brigade, the Deal outlined plans are the most no one gets what they want ideas they could possibly muster.

39) There are no Details in the Plan about what transport changes are planned or what is considered necessary.

40) The has too many conflicting requirements and political expediency will dictate what happens rather than what is the best overall solution as there always be people who are negatively impacted and they often over ride the greater good

41) Because this would need considerably more investment than would be likely to come our way if the devolution was to include such a large number of counties. South Cambs transportation is dire for those living in rural villages. It is desperately in need of funding to provide more public transport buy this would not be the solution. South Cambs is basically a special case that has very different needs in terms of sorting out the housing costs and transport and that should involve a huge re think of where industries and businesses are to be. It was the best area to live in by far but is in danger of becoming a total nightmare if this cannot be addressed.

42) S Cambs transport needs are more linked to Essex, Herts, Beds and to the west of the country

43) Hopefully

44) I don't have enough data to really comment. I don't believe that "the Deal" would provide enough money to do what is necessary (we are still threatened, for example, by the Bourn Airfield Development - yes transport has been mentioned, but by all accounts it would be well behind any housing development!). However, at least some form of local accountability is probably better than direction from London?

45) No. Because South Cambridgeshire's transport needs are that people can get to services and workplaces which are currently in Cambridge. Cambridge, on the other hand, is dedicated to preventing them getting to those services and workplaces in order to control congestion and pollution within the city. S.Cambs council has failed to move services out of Cambridge to where their citizens can access them. I do not see how another layer of government will have any more success in moving workplaces and services to where their citizens can reach them unimpeded.

46) This is tied into the City Deal

47) Although, at the fringes, it might have had an impact when considering e.g. routes to Haverhill.

But the core problems are A14, A14-A11-M11, ""ring road"", Congestion in and out of Cambridge City, Growing congestion around

a) Addenbrookes

b) Babraham Institute, Granta Park, Genome Campus, former Spicers site

- which will exacerbate A505 gridlock, A1301 gridlock

48) Maybe the A14 upgrade but even that seems unlikely given the money offered and the cost of the A14 improvement.

49) Need to re-open old railways. Tired of the A14 debate. Waste of money.

50) It's all in the implementation and the competence of the managers.

51) Another layer of politicians is unlike to have help, but more likely to hinder

52) only if needs are identified in a much more speedier fashion that is the current case and not years of debate

53) I should prefer to see a large unitary authority based on Cambridge with a modern integrated public transport system run in the manner of Transport for London.

54) No because the needs of Suffolk and Norfolk are vastly different to South Cambridgeshire

Question three

| Do you think the Deal will help meet South Cambridgeshire's housing needs? | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Yes | 24.7% | 19 |
| No | 75.3% | 58 |
| Your comments | | 55 |
| <i>answered question</i> | | 77 |
| <i>skipped question</i> | | 3 |

1) Don't know

2) It might help a little but I fail to see how it will speed-up housing delivery which seems to be the main problem. Although thousands of houses are talked about very few are being built.

3) It risks becoming subject to inappropriate national government objectives.

Instead more localised housing management issues should be to the fore for South Cambs. Such as: providing assisted accommodation/'council-housing' for the lower paid workers essential for maintaining the city and surrounding areas infrastructure, etc.; the maintenance of greenbelt space; effective management of pollution levels in and around the city; flood management/defence problems already acerbated under-funded water-shed management in South Cambs across all agencies.

Situations/needs that will be ill-served by diverting more money away from S.Cambs priorities to a further layer of government.

4) It is not "the Deal" that would help - it is the cash. Say no to the Deal but make a good case for the funding.

5) There will never have the housing we need. Many people from outside UK buy up flats as quickly as they can be built in Cambridge & this is pushing up the prices & are not available to buy.

6) No, our needs will only be met by having a powerful local government which has tax-raising powers like the Scottish Parliament so that we in the East of England can invest in projects under our own steam and without interference or hindrance from Government.

Tax-raising powers must of course be accompanied by a directly elected authority.

7) No. The promised funds are likely to be spent over the proposed East Anglian region and would be diluted as a result.

8) Possibly. But we are already being swamped by new build in Cambridgeshire. Until infrastructure problems are resolved, more house building will only cause road delays, pollution and overloading of utilities/hospitals, schools, etc. Must get projects in right order! Essential to preserve green belt, countryside and farmland. Land is a finite commodity.

9) Where will the money come from?? The Government wants to shed the burden of having to say there is not more money. The Government could have relaxed rules about councils building. There is a lot more that needs to be done by legislature

10) I fail to see how an elected Mayor for 'East Anglia' [minus Essex] can have much influence on the increasing number of people working in Cambridge and the surrounding area, or commuting to London, who require housing, which can only be provided by despoiling more of the Green Belt and agricultural land and ultimately destroying the many small villages that give this part of Cambridgeshire its unique ambience.

11) How can it?

12) Hopefully

13) Again, there is no common interest between the authorities in the proposed area. Peterborough and Great Yarmouth do not face the same problems

14) Provided that the rural character of South Cambridgeshire is not adversely affected. The housing shortage, being national problem, needs to be solved nationally, in conjunction with a strategy stimulating employment and industry outside the South-East.

15) People need to live in Cambridgeshire and not commute from outlying counties.

16) I don't like the focus on shared ownership. It seems bonkers to ask the poorest people to pay for mortgage and rent, meaning they must pay more than people with a standard mortgage and a little bit of capital.

New build houses are ridiculously expensive in Cambridge (take the ones in Trumpington for £500K). These aren't going to make things easier for people. We also seem to encourage London commuters to come and live here. I love being able to get to London easily but that isn't helping prices in an already expensive area. Maybe if other regions had better London connections this would help but I'd expect most links would go via Cambridge and so things would be just as bad.

Joint transport ticket / smartcard: we now have wireless payment on bank cards, phones and watches. Please don't waste money on a new card that has to be used. Just allow people to use contactless if they have it!"

17) We need more affordable (in the proper sense of the word, not the current government definition) properties that don't require people to have significant capital available.

Again, the critical question is about decision making, and whether the body doing that has the clout to get on with making things happen ..."

18) It's impossible to answer the question without further details, but South Cambridgeshire's own draft Local Plan puts Cambridge City's interests above those of District communities so it seems unlikely that an East Anglia-wide authority will be more beneficial.

19) Same comment as before.

20) The flats and houses being built today are ugly and do not enhance the area at all, at the rate we are going we won't have a green field left, enough is enough

21) Obviously the extra money promised would help !

22) In south Cambs we need more affordable rented housing not just affordable properties to purchase. It is now impossible for a young person on a good salary to purchase a home on one income.

23) Of course not. Our local economy is really centred around the Cambridge Travel to Work area and doesn't have much to do with East Anglia. Our housing market has more in common with Bedfordshire and Essex than Suffolk and Norfolk.

24) The housing needs of South Cambridgeshire are being dictated by central government - this "Deal" will only reinforce their wishes/demands, rather than what South Cambridgeshire wants.

25) Housing needs in Cambridgeshire are intimately linked to transport needs and job opportunities; the people of Cambridgeshire are more than capable of understanding this complex issue and delivering appropriate solutions.

26) They will try and build in the more rural areas of East Anglia then there will be increased needs for transport costs and congestion

27) Norfolk and Suffolk are too far away for workers in Cambridge to commute from.

28) Again, the needs of the areas differ too much.

29) Again the housing pressures are too different and my view is the government should be working to regenerate the north than over developing the south including east Anglia

30) Ditto above you needs a proper housing plan which is based on a local vision for the next 50 years.

31) If you import 300,000 people a year net and they do not bring their houses with them, it is hardly surprising there is a housing shortage. Just consider if you do not import 630,000 people gross, then there could even have been a surplus of houses this year, bearing in mind that 300,000 British people have joined the brain drain to get out of overcrowded England.

32) Reason for saying no is that the basic requirements questions have not been answered, or at least no one has made public where the numbers banded around come from. Current policy does not seem to put housing and industry together - eg why build Addenbrookes site up but build the new housing at Northstowe?

33) I thought that we had given enough assurances that a given number of houses would be built anyway. I believed the SCDC old Local Plan was not to join up villages but to keep space between them. We have lived in the area now for 13 years and the traffic congestion has got worse and worse especially around the new housing developments, e.g. Trumpington Meadows - a classic example. More housing? I hope not!

34) Again, if the funds were given direct to S Cambs and CCC they could use them better than a new E Anglian authority

35) I expect my elected representative to tell me that. Presumably the Local Plan addresses that issue. What can the Deal do to improve matters? The government seems to be intent on queering the pitch for a sensible housing policy involving local government financed housing.

36) No benefit over current proposed Local Plan benefits

37) Every area has local needs and needs to be assessed as such. The M25 corridor is spreading more to the North so is now having an impact on housing in South Cambridgeshire as is the natural expansion of Cambridge. However the infrastructure is not in place to accommodate major clusters of housing around the villages. This is really being ignored in the schools and medical service provision.

38) Well. Do we need more houses? Sure. (Although it isn't as if there aren't lots around Cambridge. The Addenbrooke's site has what looks like hundreds of flats there. And 'affordable'? I am not sure what that word even means. Same as 'fair'.

39) Cambridgeshire housing is dictated by building companies slowly adding new expensive houses to the market. There is no indication of how this will change in the plans

40) I see nothing in this that will be of any practical help. There is too much money invested in the status quo for any real change to happen

41) There is far too much emphasis at the moment in putting houses in areas that are not near the jobs. These areas are bearing the brunt of the massive development which is spoiling South Cambridgeshire around the A428 and causing dreadful

transport problems. There should be more emphasis on locating jobs in areas that have the capacity and which would spread the development density. Developers are being totally unscrupulous at the moment with the LDF not complete and basically South Cambs has enough housing for its area with the proposals for Northstowe, Cambridge West, Waterbeach etc etc that are already in the pipeline. Move the businesses to other areas of E Anglia that need to be developed before South Cambs comes to an absolute total standstill and just full of foreign investors who can afford the properties. Building "starter/housing association houses" that even then the average jo blogs can't afford is only going to cause more problems.

42) Possibly, but not sure

43) Not while house prices still rise!

44) Not really sure why I am more positive here - I think perhaps that having a regional perspective rather than more local might be useful. Though, given my comments above about BAD, I would probably not be happy about what any regional perspective might take!

45) S.Cambs housing needs are well understood -- way too many people want to live in Cambridge, it's unaffordable and people can't get from where they can afford to live to where they can afford to work. If S.Cambs councils can't fix that problem, I can't see how a council which is also worrying about Norwich will be able to.

46) We need much more social housing

47) The SCDC area needs to choose between being a distinctive area or face being swallowed into a Cambridge Suburb.

48) We have a hiatus on significant housing development due to the Review of the Local Plan by the Planning Inspectorate.

Instead of addressing this chronic long term problem then, it has been delayed and worsened.

This got a huge lot worse with the Government's requirement to sell off Housing Association and the most valuable Council properties.

It's a complete and Conservative mess.

49) It is irrelevant to SC's housing which is now dominated by the housing needs of "South East England" - under the previous Government's construct. What happened to that?

50) Maybe.

51) Again it's all in the implementation and the competence of the managers.

52) Housing policy is already out of control and unplanned - more politicians isn't going to help

53) I certainly hope so as long as planning committees are removed and a more qualified body can unbiasedly identify need and get on a build much need homes across the entire area

54) We require more social housing for rent to assist the geographical flexibility of the workforce. Ownership, even part-ownership, makes taking up or changing jobs ponderous.

55) Until the government lifts the ban on Council House building there will not be a solution. The market only solution has never worked for the UK housing demanding. A mixed economy of state and private provision was the only model that has ever delivered for the lower 30%.

Question four

| The Deal would see an elected Mayor for East Anglia who would have transport powers and budget handed down from Government. What are your views on this? | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Answer Options | Response Count |
| | 78 |
| <i>answered question</i> | 78 |
| <i>skipped question</i> | 2 |

- 1) Totally against
- 2) Sounds like an additional tier of bureaucracy
- 3) Given the rural constituencies, the 'elected mayor' would no doubt be a Conservative, selected so as to cooperative with the Government, and given the powers to override any local councils (and city councils embedded within the area) so as to push through unpopular planning decisions and override local democracy. A bad idea.
- 4) Pressure from National government priorities would take precedence over local priorities if this were to happen. Diminishing local democracy.
- 5) See above comments on passing the buck and National Strategy. NOT the best way to get things done
- 6) No
- 7) Elected Mayors are an unnecessary and unpopular tier of government. I believe in plurastic democracy, and that requires directly elected assemblies with a cabinet government system. I reject directly elected mayors most forthrightly.
- 8) Needs to be local with a real understanding of all local needs - specifically transport for drivers as well as cyclists
- 9) One supremo type mayor for a large geographical area is not appropriate.
- 10) Not interested in an extra layer of bureaucracy.

11) The proposed devolved governance appears to be undemocratic and unaccountable. It is bizarre to describe the chief executive of the devolved authority as a "Mayor"

12) My main concern. Another layer of expensive bureaucracy in local government! More meetings, committees and wrangling over the money. Aim should be to reduce costs to tax payers and simplify organisation of government at all levels.

13) I think that devolution leads to low level and high level corruption. There will be local cronyism and so many avenues for corruption.

14) I wonder who would actually vote for a Mayor of East Anglia 'Lite' in sufficient numbers to give him the authority he needs?

15) The counties above are different in their needs.

Individual budgets are required in my judgement.

16) The idea sounds really good, but as always having people elected requires that the people voting is REALLY informed and there is always the problem of corruption!

17) A recipe for political in-fighting, with one person running an area that has never before had a sense of unity, and doesn't need one now

18) There may be associated advantages provided there is suitable democratic control and no dilution of powers currently residing with District, County and City Councils.

19) Awful idea. Cambridge has a Mayor and the system works very well

20) Initial thought is who is paying for this and how much money will it take away from projects in the region? We already have elected folks in all regions who are working for us.

21) As long as it is someone local who understands local needs.

22) Fine - there's a real feel of turkeys refusing to vote for Christmas ...

23) Unnecessary additional layer of Government

24) Devolution from Westminster to some remote mayoralty does not truly amount to 'subsidiarity'. An elected South Cambridgeshire District Council should govern South Cambridgeshire District!

25) Total overkill and not necessary if the right representation is being made by local Councils. Just another layer of bureaucracy and management expense. Spend the money on the services not on layers of management and committees.

26) Just another layer of bureaucracy we can well do without

27) The area is far too large and diverse to be effectively represented by a single elected person. An elected Mayor would be simply a token figure head and as such a waste of money and add further unnecessary complexity to local democratic arrangements.

28) It will end up as a political appointment and be given to a "time server" and not someone with an entrepreneurial view point

29) Already enough problems with too many layers of Local Govmt. Another layer will only make this worse

30) Having an elected mayor for the region only takes democratic decision making further from the people they are supposed to serve. I cannot see how the needs of such a diverse region can be satisfied

31) It is just a remote layer of bureaucracy to try and isolate the district local authorities, creating super regional unitary government by the back door. Let's keep our district council and localism as strong as it can be. Let's join-up with Cambridge and set the world alight! Why should a few rural MPs who happen to be members of the Cabinet get their own way.

32) We do not need an elected Mayor for East Anglia. South Cambridgeshire should not have a gun put to its head to only get the deal central government wants us to have, rather than the deal South Cambridgeshire requires (and is quite capable of working out all by itself).

33) Elected Mayors are definitely the favoured and most efficient option for the future of Cambridgeshire.

The mere suggestion that Cambridgeshire is incapable of delivering a suitable candidate and managing its own infrastructure development is ridiculous."

34) The Mayor will always fight for their local area and just another burden of expenditure. Local people will lose their powers of appeal and be over ridden all the time

35) The 'Mayor' would be unlikely to be able to cover the needs of three vastly differing geographical areas.

36) I don't see that we need a central leading figure such as a mayor.

37) Can't understand the benefit, the current councils are already aware of the issues and should be able to work together to resolve.

38) Someone has to be accountable and in charge. Make sure is a suitably talented person and not a politician who has never managed a real job or people in a business environment.

39) Totally against

40) Another layer of government adding cost remote from South Cambs.

41) Another layer of bureaucracy increasing costs unless you get rid of parliament.

42) If the mayor is actually accountable to the public, maybe this could work, but why have faith in another politician when we have not been well served to date. Especially with disparity between Cambridge city and the rest of the area.

43) This would involve more bureaucrats and more money wasted on spurious transport schemes.

44) The needs and priorities of Norfolk/Suffolk and Cambs are too disparate for a single person to balance effectively

45) Another unwanted level of bureaucracy.

46) A waste of public money funding this office

47) See comments above. Just another tier of Administration!

48) This is a silly idea. Token 'democracy' where it is really pointless bureaucracy.

49) I am not convinced that a single mayor should take individual control over transport. They are likely to prioritise projects in swing vote areas to ensure they are reelected. Instead of focusing on the most effective use of the money for the population.

50) Risky but should result in some action

51) It would not be a workable arrangement.

52) Good idea

53) Don't trust the Government to provide sufficient funding.

Always turns out to be less attractive

54) They are limited and political expediency will stop any real progress

55) Ridiculous. What a dreadful idea! This is far too big an area to have just one person representing. Far too diverse interests in the different counties and far too much power in the hands of one person. It's impossible for one person to be totally au fait with the diverse needs of the counties. Just absolutely lends itself to corruption and intense lobbying by those with money.

56) Acceptable

57) Too big an area with too diverse needs

58) He or she can't be any worse than central government!

59) More unnecessary tiers of government. Increasing costs, and of no benefit to any county.

60) Not sure how much the powers are really devolved - and to be honest, it then depends on finding a good candidate!

61) Currently we have parish councils, district councils, county councils, a national government and an EU government. I fail to see how ANOTHER layer of government will solve any problems that the existing layers shouldn't already have done.

Although it'll cost extra money the chances of it reducing the taxes from any of the other layers is remote.

62) A scheme dreamed up by bright people who do not have a clue. This is a fatuous response to Scottish devolution which in the proposed case neither fully empowers nor fully devolves

63) The region has no obvious identity so what's the point? Makes sense in metropolitan areas but not in rural ones.

64) Waste of Space

(Why would say, Andrew Lansley think he'd have more influence as ""Mayor"" than he had in Cabinet at mate David Cameron's right hand?"

65) I am not in favour of the concept of a Mayor of a wide region. I am okay with cities electing a Mayor but I do not see how a Mayor of EA would be a step forward.

66) we do not need a mayor, monemt paying for the mayor and his staff would be far better spent on the region, We already have elected representatives, why do we need another one? A mayor may be useful in urban areas but not in the huge country area that is propped.

67) Wouldn't trust a local person to make the decisions.

68) The person needs to be a technical rather than a political appointment then it could work. French Mayors seem to get it right.

69) More layers of bureaucracy to slow things down and cost money.

70) Total waste of time and money that will not benefit the people that live in the area

71) Good idea if we can find a competent and trustworthy Mayor.

72) An additional layer of elected bureaucracy, the principles of which have previously been decisively rejected by voters in mayoral and regional assembly referenda.

73) Dreadful idea.

74) this is good idea if suitable strong person can be found not andrew lansley however

75) Worthless - Devolution should be clearer

76) More burocracy. More money spent somewhere else. There shouldn't be a mayor. There should be something else more like a working group between the counties. Supporting each other.

77) I am utterly opposed to this. It would almost certainly be a political role and therefore inevitably Conservative or even UKIP given the overwhelming rural electorate.

78) This is a terrible idea. I want multi party considered regulation. I do not want single person and party dominance that is aimed at populist decision making

Question five

Devolution - your views

Do you think the Council should sign up to the East Anglian Devolution Deal in its current form?

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 14.1% | 11 |
| No | 85.9% | 67 |
| Your comments | 50 | |
| answered question | 78 | |
| skipped question | 2 | |

1) Too much is being devolved from Westminster which then means the Government of the day has no power to control but the number of MP's and running costs will doubtless be the same but with additional costs at Regional level - more for the taxpayer to find.

2) There is insufficient benefit to make this worthwhile. We should try to negotiate a better deal for Cambridge and the surrounding area.

3) Behind all the flim-flam about "scale and opportunity to exploit local Global Leadership in addressing the grand challenges...." and "A step change infrastructure delivery with an integrated approach...", I suspect that this has just the same purpose as all this Government's other 'localism' initiatives: to remove power from elected local Councils, and remove protection against unwanted new projects. In this case, I expect the 'elected mayor' would be a tool of the Government and big business, to push through undesirable new developments and override local democracy. No doubt the mayor's office would cost a great deal of money, which would be removed from local councils, thus further weakening local services. The only power that this government ever truly devolves is the power to decide where the cuts will fall, and I expect this proposal is another along the same lines.

4) Adding another layer of expensive bureaucracy will remove revenue from local government diverting it towards an organisation of untested quality and vague aims. And ultimately divert effective use of local resources to too wide an area. Also it would give central government too much influence and tempt future chancellors in London to exert undue pressures (by way of direct funding) to further the interests of national government objectives above local needs.

5) Walk away. Let them know how much extra Greater Cambridge will contribute to the economy if the right transport and housing projects are funded WITHOUT the overheads and unpopularity of this fake Mayor. Make central government do its job.

6) I believe it shouldn't sign up because it does not represent real devolution. It does not provide a form of elected government that the people will be able to identify with, and the people will not like the idea of an elected mayor accompanied by a quango-like chamber.

The Council should reject the deal unless it also contains powers to control taxation locally and deliver real power.

However, the Council, should also reject any alternative model such as a devolution deal for only Cambridgeshire & Peterborough. This is not an adequately-sized region to deliver useful power.

I believe wholeheartedly in the principle of East Anglia as a devolved region, but definitely not on the basis of what is on offer.

7) Despite the promised funding it is unlikely that H.M.Treasury would relinquish its control over expenditure.

On the financial side it is not possible to compare the amounts promised to a devolved East Anglia with what would be available from central government if no devolution takes place.

No mention of the NHS. Would the proposed authority be empowered to divert some NHS funding to support social care?

Would funding for Cambridge be diluted?

8) Needs much more clarification and thought before any commitment. How will Mayor be appointed? Elected/accountable/non-political? Cost of offices, staff, etc?

9) Budgets for these major powers need to remain at Government level where there is accountability and no local interests wanting a slice without scrutiny.

Devolution of budgets to academies has led to corruption. Some cases appear in the press which one suspects is only the tip of the iceberg.

Devolution is not a good thing. Look at Scotland now wanting to leave the UK. We are still the 'United' Kingdom, devolution is not unity.

10) Without Essex, you cannot call this an 'East Anglian' anything. It is another artificial tier of local government, drawing power away from local authorities that are already too far removed and unrepresentative of their electors. It has more to do with the convenience of Whitehall (ministers will in future only have to deal directly with a handful of mayors scattered around England) than it has with encouraging local democracy or more intelligent planning decisions.

11) More discussion required.

12) Please try to limit the area to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. I guess it really depends of how much of our money we want to share with the other places!

13) East Anglia co-operation is good where needed, but not necessary to have such a powerful centralising voice for a region that has no centre at present. Please concentrate on Cambridgeshire solutions for our own problems.

14) I do not yet have enough information to comment on this point.

15) The current system is far from perfect but it is a great deal better than having a Mayor for East Anglia. Cambridge cannot risk investment being channelled to other East Anglian counties however much they need it. It is a vital part of the UK's economy and should be allowed to continue to develop as it is.

16) As a layman I Don't see what the advantages are. Cambridge already does pretty well but it does need to have growth managed better. Better links to cities other than London would also help.

17) I think more money needs to be negotiated and that local people should have a greater say in how things are managed. Why not have a greater say in education policy and funding, for example?

18) Something is better than nothing ...

19) Perhaps, ... **(wording removed due to use of inappropriate language)** ... But before doing so, the Council must subject the Deal to the most rigorous scrutiny and should insist on an 'opt out' in respect of any aspects which it considers contrary to the interests of South Cambridgeshire District

20) Should remove requirement to have Mayor and team supporting the mayor. The current structures are more than enough.

You need to ask this question setting out what is NEW about the deal versus what was already going to happen previously."

21) The council should be scaled down, not increased

22) Already enough problems with too many layers of Local Govmt. Another layer will only make this worse

23) What would be the roles of existing LAs? Even London still has all its LAs and they deal with major issues. I would need much more information on how the proposal would work in order to agree with the moves.

24) It's preposterous. We should be looking South rather than to the East to continue our strong economic performance. This deal will only drain South Cambridgeshire of its vitality and resources. I can understand why Norfolk and Suffolk would want us in - but from our perspective the whole arrangement doesn't fit, we are struggling with our success, which is far preferable to trying to bring people up to where they should be.

No to ""sign-up"" for me.

25) This is a ridiculous bribery offer. We are managing our area very successfully. Provide the extra money without strings attached and let us do the best we can without central government imposing its will by the back door.

26) Such Devolution deals as these are never 'set in stone' anyway....so just lets get on with it!

Nationally such deals should be encouraged and they will help to reform National Government such that the role of central Government can be thought through from first principles and refreshed for the benefit of the whole Country."

27) We should develop local partnership and no not need another layer of expense and committee decisions.

They say there will be additional money but if their is cash available then this sounds like blackmail to agree. If the money is available then why is not available now "

28) As above.

29) The information given is too sparse. We are not even told which counties are to be involved.

It is not clear how a single central authority can stand for Cambridge and rural Norfolk.

30) I have not seen sufficient evidence that this structure will be able to deliver the benefits that have been claimed. Also it is clear that there will be additional costs

31) Take advantage of the offer as it might not come again and do not assume you can say no now and then hope for a better deal later - like Boris Johnston and the EU. Make it work by owning the concept and the need to work together to solve common problems, not internal Cambridgeshire can do better on it's own. IT has done brilliantly for somethings but not others and working together will share the good and help resolve the other infrastructure issues, trains,planes housing etc.

32) No "don't know" option here. Deal conditions are not clear on what it actually means for joe public, other than another 6 figure salary for some original lackey and his/her clingons.

33) I would vote against any increased bureaucracy or devolution for the region.

34) I like the Norfolk/Suffolk and Cambs/Huntingdon/Peterborough suggestion better

35) For reasons above

36) If there were to be any consolidation of regions then it should be with Peterborough and Huntingdon. I thank Heidi Allen, our South Cambridgeshire MP, for bringing this to the Government's attention. The Government rushed this Devolution idea through far too quickly thinking people would not notice or care. Well we do notice and care.

37) There are waaaay more important things the Council should be doing.

38)The local council simply does not inspire enough confidence to entrust them with any more powers

39) South Cambs should push for more autonomy and more funding yes, but not with this sort of arrangement.

40) As mentioned in 1

41) I'm deliberately not voting on this one - I don't have enough knowledge to say whether we might get a different or better deal by voting no. I do feel (by the way) that this survey is somewhat biased :-(

42) I think adding another layer of government will merely increase the opportunities for things falling through the gaps while also increasing the cost base...

43) Extra layer of Government, unnecessary in function and in cost. The local Council leaders have admitted it is a bribe - they are only considering because an outside party (Central Government) is offering them money to do something they wouldn't otherwise do..."

44) It is worth pursuing but the final commitment should depend on how the negotiations unfold and what wrinkles emerge.

45) The existing Councils can work together when it is appropriate and get on with things on themselves when it isn't.

They make it sound like handing power down when in fact there is power handed up, in effect. Decision making becomes more expensive with less to spend on the real needs.

46) We just don't need more politicians and bureaucracy

47) Attempting to force an elected mayor on such a diverse region is indicative of dogmatic, top-down government imposition. It's too high a price to pay even for the funding and devolved powers promised.

48) I see the current push for East Anglian devolution as yet another attempt by the present government to distance itself from unpopular decisions affecting people's daily lives. The power is not devolved to people at all, but to one person. Unpopular infrastructure and planning decisions will continue to be taken by central government with no regard for localism.

I particularly dislike the notion of decisions being taken by LEAs. The business element in these bodies is not in anyway democratic, and is inevitably self-serving."

49) The worst part of this idea is the Mayor for East Anglia. It is a step backwards for democracy.

Question six

Do you have any other comments?

| Answer Options | Response Count |
|----------------|----------------|
| 41 | |

| | |
|-------------------|----|
| answered question | 41 |
| skipped question | 39 |

1) Stop spending all this taxpayers money on consultations/consultants/'re-branding' and put it where it is needed now.

2) An East-Anglian mayoral retinue will hinder local authorities ability to deliver effective local government and be yet another burden on the tax payer.

3) Wrong solution to the wrong perceived problems. We can do better and keep the electorate on side

4) I think I've said more than enough. We need real power delivered to the regions of England and we need some form of Federal United Kingdom settlement to remove the grotesque asymmetries between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

5) This is a waste of tax payers money.

- 6) It would be more sensible to create a Greater Cambridge authority, centred on Cambridge city and South Cambs.
- 7) Do not get pushed into an agreement by promises of cash which may not materialise.
- 8) I shall be very surprised if the deal is not ratified at the earliest opportunity!
- 9) Please ensure our government is given a clear idea of these area's INDIVIDUAL requirements!!.
- 10) no
- 11) No-one I know has the slightest knowledge of this proposal. It has no democratic legitimacy. And I doubt that the promise of "new money" will be delivered by govt.
- 12) There are too many unanswered questions - what is in this for the public? Will the Mayor be any better at listening to public/parish councils than what we have at the moment Indeed, will Parish Councils have a role at all??
- 13) Councillors: be "bloody, bold and resolute". Do not 'sleepwalk' into a deal which you - and more importantly, those you represent - will live to regret.
- 14) Let's make sure elected Councillors have the necessary authority and not layers of higher management (Mayoral).
- 15) Who's idea is devolution, is it our government or is this another diktat from the eu, either way we dont need it
- 16) Waste of time and effort
- 17) The offer of extra money looks like a bribe to accept another layer of Government. Why not give the money directly to County and District councils?!
- 18) The amounts of money promised sound very large but they will not be sufficient to cope with the expected growth.
- 19) I hope we can see sense and keep clear of this. South Cambridgeshire is a fantastic palce - why put this at risk?
- 20) Devolution initiatives like this, when extended nationally will be exactly the stimulus to National Government to focus its priorities and activities upon National issues exclusively. The calibre of MPs will need to be significantly improved as a result, and a whole new calibre of PPC's will be developed and much to the benefit of the Country nationally.
- 21) Please lets not be blackmailed into this, and lets us develop partnerships.
- 22) No
- 23) No
- 24) Not a coherent area the concept if flawed for such a wide and mixed area. May be appropriate for a large conurbation but not East Anglia. South cambs is not East Anglia!!!

25) Whatever the people say, their views will be ignored but you can then say the the process of consultation has been carried out.

26) Little confidence in yet another level of bureaucracy, when current system has failed totally to deliver the key infrastructure needs of the area. The people in the job will almost certainly come from the same stock.

27) When will SCDC's Local Plan be ready? I feel that this is something to get sorted before much else is put on the table.

28) No

29) South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City already work quite well together in some areas. It would help if they merged. And got more money to help with transport and housing needs.

30) Think the whole devolution process should be scrapped

31) People in this region love where they live and are not afraid of change when it is moderate. However they do not like to be deceived by any Council or Government and so I think we are becoming more aware these days.

32) no

33) How can such a very large area being represented by one man/woman with so much potential power and influence possibly be deemed "devolution"? More like dictatorship.

34) No

35) Not really - thanks for asking!

36) I would be more than happy to take all the county councils including Essex and Herts and make the into an East Anglian Regional Assembly. Get rid of the county councils. Reorganise the district councils with half the current number and some of the existing counties' powers. Fully fund the process.

37) If we really want devolved government, let's go for

a) Unitary Authority

b) Greater Cambridge & Peterborough devolved area"

38) I am all for local autonomy as in principal local people should be better placed to determine priorities. IF we get the right people in place.

39) currently sth cambs is not working we have massive shortage of houses 1st class growth in our area will die if housing and transport is not addressed quickly. We can wait for years debating what if anymore. 10 years for Northstoww to get of the stocks is terrible

40) Cambridgeshire and Peterbrough sound like a more plausible agreement.

41) Health and Social Care should, of course be integrated, but that would be better approached by providing it via the NHS. Health and Social Care should not be a postcode lottery.