Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution

APPENDIX - Stakeholder submissions

The following section contains separate submissions from stakeholder organisations in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

- Cambridge University
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS)
- Cambridgeshire Constabulary
- Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
- Confederation of Industry – East of England
- Historic England
- Unison – Eastern Region
Dear Cllr Count,

Please see below the University of Cambridge's response to the Cambridge and Peterborough East Anglia Devolution Proposal.

**The University’s views on the proposed powers and funding on offer through the devolution deal and the accompanying governance changes**

The University of Cambridge is supportive of devolution. We believe that the right transfer of powers, resources and accountability from central government to the region could be beneficial as it would allow a better, more evidence-based target of key infrastructure and funding priorities.

The University is committed to strong regional academic development and is favourable towards a devolution deal that supports wider regional collaboration. Our position remains that a bigger regional devolution footprint would better achieve this, as well as supporting local growth and driving the transformation of public services. Despite this we believe that a devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough could nonetheless help deliver some of the key challenges that the area is facing.

**Priorities** - we agree with the broad priorities set out in the current Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution proposal, in particular around delivering substantial economic growth in a knowledge-based, low-carbon economy, providing new affordable housing, matching skills to business needs, improving transport links across the area and beyond, and transforming public service delivery.

We welcome the additional funding allocation for housing needs in Cambridge. There are very specific and critical needs in this area which are affecting University staff and students and could have an impact on our competitiveness.
**Infrastructure and Transport** - we believe that priority proposals for infrastructure and transport should be decided at a wider level than the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. We welcome the proposal for the Combined Authority to “seek to develop arrangements with other Combined Authorities and other areas in order to progress strategic regional issues”. However we believe that these regional arrangements, in particular around transport, should be outlined upfront to avoid confusion and to ensure that priorities are coordinated as early as possible at regional level.

**Governance** - we have no objection in principle to an elected Mayor. We believe that he/she would need the full support and backing of local authorities to be able to exert his/her leadership effectively. Many have feared that having a Mayor would mean an added layer of governance and decision-making in an already complex landscape. This devolution process will need to prove that this new governance model would be effective and allow things to get done rather than making processes more complicated.

**Areas where the University of Cambridge thinks that the deal could and should go further / areas we should work together with other partners e.g. Norfolk and Suffolk**

Our most significant regional academic and business links extend to the east, through the powerful agri-tech sector and to the south through health and related enterprises. As a world-leading University, being embedded in a strong region would place us in the best possible position to continue our commitment to both regional and national growth. Therefore where there are opportunities to work closer with the east, they should be taken up. In particular, working with other local authorities across East Anglia on a transport strategy would help to extend the reach of the Cambridge phenomenon beyond the limits of the city and further into the region.

**Other concerns/issues that should be considered in taking this forward**

**Makeup of the Combined Authority** - we agree that it is important for the business voice to be properly represented on the Combined Authority. However, in order to ensure the new body gains the trust and support of the broader public, we believe the Combined Authority should be fully democratic. As such we would have concerns if the GCGP LEP had a voting status. Our understanding is that where other UK Combined Authorities have LEP representatives, it is in a non-constituent member capacity. We therefore suggest it would be appropriate and democratic for the GCGP LEP to have a non-constituent status. This would also allow for more equality between the voice of business and that of the NHS, Further and Higher Education Institutions and other major employers.

**Process for next steps** - there has been a strong perception that discussions to agree this devolution proposal have been held behind closed doors and that some of the area’s major employers have not properly been consulted. We would therefore seek reassurance that a larger number of stakeholders, including a wider range of businesses, NHS partners, Further and Higher Education Institutions, will be fully involved in the process of elaborating on these proposals. These stakeholders should be allowed to feed into the Strategic economic and productivity plan, the Fiscal plan, Priority proposals for infrastructure and transport and Areas of joint collaboration with Norfolk and Suffolk, as described on page 4 of the devolution proposal. We believe that the active involvement of the above-mentioned stakeholders and the sectors they represent is imperative for
this devolution deal to be successful. Similarly, the preparation of housing need assessments, housing targets and a spatial development and infrastructure framework must involve appropriate levels of engagement and consultation, and be subject to the normal processes of independent scrutiny and examination.

Purpose of devolution - we note that the proposal very much focuses on the area’s growth and wealth creation and how devolution can enhance that. Given the result of the recent EU referendum and the wide socio-economic inequalities that can be observed even within the city of Cambridge, we believe that the devolution proposal should allow more thought and planning to achieve inclusive growth. Every effort should be made to ensure that the benefits of devolution reach the most deprived areas.

Yours sincerely

Professor Nigel K. H. Slater
Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Enterprise and Regional Affairs
Dear Sir/Madam

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Consultation

I am writing to give Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group’s (CCG) comments on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Consultation.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group has supported the work that our local authorities have been doing to secure a Devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough deal is coterminous with the work that the health and social care sector are delivering through the Sustainability and Transformation Programme (STP) and so we welcome the footprint that has now been agreed.

The CCG supports the devolution programme’s proposals to invest in transport infrastructure, jobs and housing and believes that this work will help deliver good quality local services for our residents. We welcome the opportunity to work more closely as a health system with our local authority partners through the devolution work and we are already delivering results together through the Better Care Fund. The public sector is facing an increasing financial challenge and only through working more closely together can we continue to deliver the services that our communities need. The CCG is committed to partnership working and will continue to work together on the implementation of this important programme of work.

Yours faithfully

Tracy Dowling
Chief Officer
Dear Steve,

I am writing to you regarding the proposals for devolution in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

In my role as Chief Constable of Cambridgeshire Constabulary I have been in favour of opening the discussion around the opportunities that devolution could present. As such I was a signatory on the initial letter to Government.

I am writing to express my continued support to the principle of devolution. The public sector continues to face significant challenges which require us as local leaders to look for new, innovative and collaborative approaches to support our communities to thrive. An area of particular interest to me is the opportunity presented by drawing down additional powers to support a more cohesive approach to community safety.

I feel the principles of devolution present a really exciting opportunity for all in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

I am copying this letter to Martin Whiteley and Kevin Hoctor.

Yours sincerely,

Alec Wood
Chief Constable
Cllr Steve Count
Chair of Public Services Board
Cambridgeshire County Council
Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

CM/450820/RH/SPB

24 August 2016

Dear Steve,

I am writing in my capacity as Fire Authority Chairman with regards to the proposals for devolution in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough that would see powers and funding devolved from central government to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area.

Whilst from the Fire Authority’s perspective many of the opportunities that devolution will bring are not directly linked to our ability to deliver our Services, I recognise that greater local decision making and powers will enable the opportunities of wider public sector reform to be more easily achieved. For this reason I and the Fire Authority are fully supportive of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Deal.

Should the proposals move forward as planned, I look forward to working with the new mayor and combined authority.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

SIR PETER BROWN
FIRE AUTHORITY CHAIRMAN

cc: Kevin Hoctor & Martin Whiteley
Cllr Steve Count  
Leader, Cambridgeshire County Council  
Shire Hall  
Castle Hill  
Cambridge  
CB3 0AP

By email: steve.count@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

08 August 2016

Dear Steve,

I am writing on proposals for devolution in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough that would see powers and funding devolved from central government to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area.

As you know, in my former role as Executive Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council, I was a signatory to the initial letter to Government to open discussions on possible devolution.

In my current role as Police and Crime Commissioner I continue to support the principle of devolution. Public sector organisations face significant challenges in the next few years. The ability to access devolved funding and to be able to make decisions more locally provides real opportunities to develop new solution for public sector reform. This includes the opportunity to continue the dialogue with Government to draw down additional powers to support more integrated approaches to community safety.

Assuming the proposals move forward as proposed, I look forward to working the new mayor and combined authority.

I am copying this letter to Martin Whiteley and Kevin Hoctor.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Ablewhite  
Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner
CBI Response: Consultation on the Proposal for Devolution to a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

1. The CBI welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership’s consultation on the proposed deal to devolve powers to a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. As the UK’s leading business organisation, the CBI speaks for some 190,000 businesses that together employ around a third of the private sector workforce, including a significant number across the proposed combined authority region.

2. Devolution presents a significant opportunity for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region to deliver on its economic growth potential. Productivity in the region is strong compared to many parts of the UK, but we have the opportunity to do even better, maximising the potential of the world-class assets and vibrant businesses that already exist.

3. In this submission we argue that:
   - The proposed devolution agreement is rightly focused on economic growth
   - Our analysis identifies improvements to local education, in-work training and business practices as keys to the region’s success
   - Devolution to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority will only succeed with deep and effective business engagement

The proposed devolution agreement is rightly focused on economic growth

4. Our members are clear that the government’s devolution agenda can deliver real benefits for business, the economy and society if implemented effectively, with a long term focus on economic growth. Evidence from around the world shows that where regions are given the power to take a vision for prosperity, based on robust economic evidence, a well-defined geography, and reflecting local assets and opportunities, the impact can be substantial.¹

5. Much work has been done by the CBI and others on the potential of devolution alongside the risks. Devolution succeeds where there is strong, trusted leadership at all levels. The clear terms of the proposal are therefore welcomed, but it will be important to sustain visible, accessible leadership over the long term, executing the plan as outlined. Businesses will also look to the Combined Authority to bring forward more ambitious proposals as the authority establishes its credibility and ability to deliver.

Our analysis identifies improvements to local education, in-work training and business practices as keys to the region’s success²

6. The East of England is the UK’s third most productive region in terms of Gross Value Added per head, and the most productive outside London and the South East. This productivity is underpinned by a number of factors. The Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough LEP area has relatively high levels of employment and participation in the labour market compared

¹ Source: Devolution and Economic Growth, Centre for Cities

² Source: Devolution: The Evidence, Centre for Cities
to the national average. Businesses in the region are also amongst the UK’s most dynamic, with a higher presence of fast-growing firms than 95% of other regions and a very high propensity for exporting (although this varies substantially within the LEP area itself).

7. All of this combines to put the region in a strong position to take advantage of the opportunities presented by devolution. Forthcoming analysis from the CBI points to a variety of factors that affect regional productivity and growth potential. For Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the focus should be on local education outcomes, in-work training and business practices.

8. While there is significant variation within the LEP area, local education outcomes are a key concern, with our analysis placing school performance in the bottom third of the nation as a whole. This is crucial because local education and skills stands out above all else as the most fundamental driver of local economic growth. The commitment in the devolution proposal to support the work of the Regional Schools Commissioner with an education committee is welcome. It will be crucial however that the education committee reflects the priorities and requirements of the region’s economy to give young people the best possible opportunity to progress into fulfilling careers upon leaving school.

9. Delivering improvements to in-work training is the second key to achieving prosperity through devolution in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Our analysis shows that while again there is significant variation in performance across the LEP area, the quality and outcomes of in-work training is in the bottom fifth overall. Businesses in the region will welcome proposals to enable the Combined Authority to vary block grant allocations to adult training providers according to performance. It will be important, however, to ensure that funding decisions are based on outcomes for learners and the impact on employability, rather than simple completion measures. Alongside control over adult training budgets, new responsibilities for the Apprenticeship Grant for Employers can be used to more effectively target funding towards priority areas for the region. With the forthcoming apprenticeship levy creating uncertainty for employers, it will be important that any changes made by the Combined Authority do not add complexity to the system, particularly for employers who take on apprentices across a number of regions.

10. CBI analysis of regional productivity highlights the importance of business practices, and particularly management practices. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have a disproportionately high number of firms well-organised for growth and productivity, both in terms of business structures and the use of employee incentive programmes. This can be enhanced through the Combined Authority, by signposting available support as described in the devolution proposal, simplifying services and offers to business where possible, and encouraging businesses in the region to take advantage of tools like the Mayfield Review's https://howgoodisyourbusinessreally.co.uk/

Devolution to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority will only succeed with deep and effective business engagement

11. The development of a strategic economic and productivity plan, as outlined in the devolution proposal, is encouraging. For the plan to be effective, however, it will be crucial that it is informed by the views and priorities of the business community as a whole. The CBI and its members would welcome the opportunity to contribute to this process.

12. There are a number of principles that underpin successful business engagement at the regional level that we would like to see followed by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. The Combined Authority should operate a partnership model, being open and collaborative based on shared and mutually developed aims and objectives. Engagement will be most fruitful where businesses feel their participation is meaningful and impactful, and where their experience is brought to bear across the regional policy agenda. Businesses should be able
to contribute where their individual expertise is most valuable. Where businesses are represented in specific roles or positions, the representative should have a clear mandate and be available to the wider community.

13. Unlocking regional growth is at the forefront of the CBI’s agenda as the key to delivering long-term prosperity across the UK. In the coming months we will be making a number of contributions that will add to the evidence base on which your decisions can be taken. This will include detailed datasets on the economic strengths and weaknesses of the region, including its component parts, and a publications outlining the business community’s infrastructure priorities.

Richard Tunnicliffe
Regional Director, CBI East of England
Richard.Tunnicliffe@cbi.org.uk

---

i See for instance the transformation of Pittsburgh as described by KPMG in their work on “magnet cities” - [http://kpmg.co.uk/creategraphics/07_2014/Magnet_cities/files/assets/common/downloads/CRT0000209A_magnet%20cities_web.pdf](http://kpmg.co.uk/creategraphics/07_2014/Magnet_cities/files/assets/common/downloads/CRT0000209A_magnet%20cities_web.pdf)

ii This work contains statistical data from ONS which is Crown Copyright. The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the statistical data. This work uses research datasets which may not exactly reproduce National Statistics aggregates
Dear Sir / Madam

Ref: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Deal Proposal

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the proposed Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment, we look forward to continuing to work constructively with the partner authorities. Owing to our statutory role we already are engaged with providing advice on a number of projects identified in the devolution deal, such as East-West Rail, and with local plans.

We would wish to highlight the county’s rich historic environment which significantly contributes to its attractiveness as a place where people wish to study, work, live and enjoy. This link between environment and economy was emphasised in the Government’s Culture White Paper this year which announced Historic England’s Heritage Action Zones a programme of projects delivered in partnership between local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships, Historic England and other partners to deliver economic regeneration through harnessing the historic environment. The Heritage Action Zones include grant funding from Historic England and have the potential to link in to devolution objectives. More information on them can be found here: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/heritage-action-zones

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss any aspect of Historic England’s work as it relates to a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Deal, so please do not hesitate to contact us if there is anything you would wish to explore further.
Yours sincerely

Dr Natalie Gates
Principal, Historic Places Team
e-mail: natalie.gates@HistoricEngland.org.uk
This document provides the consultation with the formal UNISON Eastern regional response to the devolution proposals for a Mayoral Combined Authority in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The overarching aims of devolution to a combined authority are, in principle, positives for UNISON members and the region. Faced with the financial obstacle of the austerity agenda, UNISON recognises that local authorities face a significant challenge in building economic and social prosperity. While UNISON will continue to lobby for fundamental changes to the future of local government funding, the union will support reforms which look to develop and reinforce public services in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

UNISON does hold concerns over various parts of the proposals and asks that these issues are explored and explained in further detail before a decision is made.

**Initial Development**

The Devolution Proposal document indicates that the bulk of the planning for the Mayoral Combined Authority will take place once the resources and powers have been transferred from Central Government. UNISON is concerned that there is repeated emphasis on “collaborative opportunities” with other public service providers with no explanation as to what this could mean for residents in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The development of a fiscal plan “new models of public/private infrastructure funding to provide a firm basis for delivery of major and priority schemes.” UNISON is opposed to privatisation and is concerned that this statement is a clear indication that future procurement will not consider profit over the public interest test. It is for this reason that UNISON is seeking a procurement agreement at an early stage, to ensure that future public services in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough are considered thoroughly and with the areas’ issues at their core rather than efficiency savings or business profit.

The suggestion is made that a second Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough will be proposed. UNISON requests confirmation that any future proposals will also be subject to public consultation before decisions.

**Finance**

The headline figure for the Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA) is control over an additional £20m a year of funding but this is a deal covering 30 years with a review every five years which has to be successful in order to unlock the next five years’ funding. Although this leaves local authorities with more certainty over budgets there
are still risks in undertaking high value capital projects extending further than a five year period.

The cost of a MCA will be borne by the Local Authorities’ existing budgets. Where is this money coming from? There have been significant cuts to local government budgets which have forced major reductions in services across the two counties to date. There is also continuing pressure on local authorities through the uncertainty of the delivery model of Business Rates from 2020. UNISON asks where is the evidence from the individual local authorities that they have made adjustments to their Medium Term Financial Plans to accommodate this additional expenditure.

If the money cannot be found or more money is required, the Combined Authority will become a precepting authority for the purposes of section 39 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. This means that Council Tax payers could face an additional charge from the inception of the Combined Authority. This factor has been hidden within the consultation document and not clearly highlighted to residents. UNISON is seeking reassurance that the option of this levy will not be considered within the first five years of the proposal, in order for the MCA to prove the claim that it is financially sustainable from existing resources.

The legislative changes also mean that an additional levy can be placed on local businesses. UNISON believes that the MCA will not hold any credibility with residents if it were to use any levying options in order to finance this secondary tier of local government.

Structure

The purpose of devolution is “the transfer of resources, powers and accountability from central Government to local partners.”¹ The Governance Review regularly points to proposals which require collaboration with Central Government suggesting that the practical powers of the Mayoral Combined Authority will be limited. For example, design of the new National Work and Health Programme is in partnership with the Department of Works and Pensions which will control all aspects of funding and negotiations on data sharing within the project. The MCA will serve to inform the programme but with no outlay for the time and resources which it will invest: devolving cost from the DWP onto LAs.

The MCA will not be a democratic institution with the inclusion of a representative from the LEP. To allow an unelected representative from businesses into a new tier of local democracy with equal voting rights to local authority representatives is not a featured outcome of the Governance Review and UNISON is against the inclusion of this board member.
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The Governance Review fails to identify in detail additional benefits of a “mayoral combined authority” over a “combined authority” apart from the opportunity to levy as a precepting authority.

**Implications for staff**

Local government employees work extremely hard in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough delivering high quality services in spite of enormous pressures. The creation of the Combined Authority assumes that staff will be able to incorporate new work within their existing roles with no regard for implications on staff welfare.

Conversely, a joined up approach to the delivery of public services has the significant potential to result in employment transfers and/or redundancies. Employees will be the key to the successful delivery of the Combined Authority’s future projects and it is vital that a commitment is made from the outset to ensure high level engagement with trade unions.

It is on this basis that UNISON is seeking an agreement with the Combined Authority to close working relationships on matters concerning employees through a joint protocol agreement and the creation of a Workforce Engagement Board. This is in line with arrangements that have been successfully implemented in the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

These agreements will ensure that there is maximum engagement with staff on any proposals which will impact on them and facilitate consensual change in workforce matters, maximising the success of the new structure if implemented.

Darren Barber – Convenor
Becky Tye – Deputy Convenor
Glyn Hawker – Regional Secretary

On behalf of UNISON Eastern Region
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