


# East Midlands Combined Authority

**Devolution Deal Consultation  
Report  
March 2023**

Ipsos UK





# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	Context	6
1.2	Purpose of the report	6
1.3	Methodology	6
1.4	Response rates	7
1.5	Receipt and handling of responses	8
1.6	Analysis and coding of responses	8
1.7	Interpreting the findings	9
1.8	Comments about the consultation	10
1.9	Report structure	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Methodology and response rate	11
2.2	Key themes	12
2.2.1	Governance	12
	Summary of stakeholder responses	13
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	13
2.2.2	Homes	14
	Summary of stakeholder responses	14
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	14
2.2.3	Skills	15
	Summary of stakeholder responses	15
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	16
2.2.4	Transport	16
	Summary of stakeholder responses	17
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	17
2.2.5	Reducing carbon/Net Zero	18
	Summary of stakeholder responses	18
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	18
2.2.6	Public Health	19
	Summary of stakeholder responses	19
	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	20
<b>3</b>	<b>Governance</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	Background	21
3.2	Summary of closed responses	22
3.3	Summary of stakeholder responses	22
3.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses	26
<b>4</b>	<b>Homes</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	Background	29
4.2	Summary of closed responses	30

4.3	Summary of stakeholder responses .....	30
4.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses .....	32
5	Skills .....	35
5.1	Background.....	35
5.2	Summary of closed responses.....	36
5.3	Summary of stakeholder responses .....	36
5.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses .....	39
6	Transport.....	41
6.1	Background.....	41
6.2	Summary of closed responses.....	42
6.3	Summary of stakeholder responses .....	42
6.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses .....	45
7	Reducing Carbon/Net Zero .....	49
7.1	Background.....	49
7.2	Summary of closed responses.....	49
7.3	Summary of stakeholder responses .....	50
7.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses .....	52
8	Public Health .....	54
8.1	Background.....	54
8.2	Summary of closed responses.....	55
8.3	Summary of stakeholder responses .....	55
8.4	Summary of non-stakeholder responses .....	56
9	Summary of other comments .....	59
9.1	Background.....	59
9.2	Summary of responses .....	59
10	Our standards and accreditations.....	61
	Appendix A – Response form .....	62
	Appendix B – Codeframe .....	79
	Appendix C – Participant profile.....	80
	Appendix D – Local authority breakdown.....	83
	Governance .....	83
	Homes .....	84
	Skills.....	85
	Transport .....	86
	Carbon/net zero.....	87
	Public health.....	88
	Appendix E – List of stakeholders .....	89
	Appendix F – Late responses .....	92
	Appendix G - Technical note on coding.....	93

## List of figures

<b>Figure 2.1: Agreement with the proposed governance arrangements for the East Midlands CCA</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Figure 2.2: Agreement with the proposals relating to homes</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Figure 2.3: Agreement with the proposals relating to skills</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Figure 2.4: Agreement with the proposals relating to transport</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Figure 2.5: Agreement with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Figure 2.6: Agreement with the proposals relating to public health</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Figure 3.1: Agreement with the proposed governance arrangements for the East Midlands CCA</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Figure 4.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to homes</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Figure 5.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to skills</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Figure 6.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to transport</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Figure 7.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Figure 8.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to public health</b>	<b>55</b>

## List of tables

<b>Table 1.1: Breakdown of response rates</b>	<b>8</b>
---	----------

# 1 Introduction and methodology

## 1.1 Context

Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council have signed a £1.14 billion devolution deal with the Government. The deal, subject to relevant approvals, and primary and secondary legislation passing through Parliament would create the first ever Combined County Authority (CCA) and would see an extra £38 million a year coming to the proposed East Midlands CCA area from 2024. It would result in some powers and associated funding moving from a national level to a regional level, with democratic accountability created via the election of a mayor who would lead the CCA. The areas of focus for the devolution deal are about:

- Boosting productivity, pay, jobs and living standards;
- Spreading opportunities and improving public services;
- Restoring a sense of community, local pride and belonging; and
- Empowering local leaders and communities.

The creation of an East Midlands County Combined Authority (EMCCA) would work to improve economic growth, productivity, and personal wellbeing for the 2.2 million people who live and work in the proposed EMCCA area.

A number of documents were prepared and presented to the public and wider stakeholders as part of the consultation<sup>1</sup>. These include the full proposal document in detail<sup>2</sup>, an abridged summary of the proposal<sup>3</sup> and a FAQ document<sup>4</sup> which sought to respond to common questions. An open consultation ran from 14 November 2022 to 9 January 2023.

## 1.2 Purpose of the report

This report summarises the key findings from the open consultation, which ran from 14 November 2022 to 9 January 2023. It will inform any submission to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and summarise the consultation responses. The report covers the responses to any closed questions (i.e. those with an answer scale), split out by members of the public and stakeholder individuals/organisations. It also includes an analysis of the most common themes mentioned in response to the open questions, based on thematic coding undertaken by Ipsos UK (an explanation of which can be found in Appendix E).

## 1.3 Methodology

An online consultation portal was established by Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council<sup>5</sup>. It included a summary of the deal, a

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/have-your-say/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Proposal-For-Consultation-East-Midlands-Combined-County-Authority.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Devolution-proposal-summary.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/East-Midlands-Devolution-Frequently-Asked-Questions.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/>

copy of the proposal, what it would mean if the proposal were adopted, the likely benefits and an explanation about how the proposed deal built on the pre-existing strengths of the proposed EMCCA area. The website included a number of other pages, including associated background information and a detailed FAQ section.

It also included an online response form for people to respond to the devolution proposals. There were a number of formal channels through which individuals and stakeholder organisations could give their views on the proposals:

- Online response platform, which could be accessed through the website;
- Hard copy response form, which was available to print out from the website and on request;
- A written letter, sent via the Freepost address listed on the paper response form; and/or
- By email, via a dedicated consultation email address.

Hard copies of the response forms were also made available at various locations across the proposed EMCCA area and the councils ran a communications campaign prior to and during the consultation period. This activity took place independently of Ipsos UK and the details of the activity are available separately from this report.

#### 1.4 Response rates

Overall, there were 4,869 participants in the consultation. The majority (4,751) participated online via the official response form. There were also 98 postal response forms and 20 responses via email to the dedicated consultation email address<sup>6</sup>.

The table overleaf shows how the response rates are broken down by public and stakeholder audiences – stakeholders are those who self-identified as responding on behalf of a business or organisation.

---

<sup>6</sup> NB – this response channel did not use the structure of the consultation response form

**Table 1.1: Breakdown of response rates**

	Non-stakeholder responses (e.g. public/organisations)	Stakeholder responses <sup>7</sup>	TOTAL
Online response forms	4,633	118	4,751
Paper response forms	94	4	98
Email	7	13	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,734</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>4,869</b>

## 1.5 Receipt and handling of responses

Online consultation responses were received by Ipsos UK. All original electronic responses were securely filed, catalogued and given a serial number for future reference, in line with requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018, and General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).

E-mail responses were also received directly by Ipsos UK, whilst other responses (for example to the individual councils) were also passed on if they represented a bona fide response to the consultation. The handling of consultation responses was subject to a rigorous process of checking, logging and confirmation to ensure a full audit trail.

## 1.6 Analysis and coding of responses

For those who provided comments via email (and not as per the questionnaire format), each of their comments were attributed to the relevant questions in the response form. This means that, for example, if a member of the public submitted a response via email and made comments about the governance arrangements for the proposed CCA (relating to Q1 of the response form) such comments were analysed alongside responses submitted to Q1 of the official response form. This approach ensures that responses via all channels were analysed using the same framework.

The purpose of having closed questions was to enable measurement of support/agreement for the devolution of powers relating to a particular policy area within the proposal, whilst the open ended follow up question then allowed participants to further expand upon their opinion or provide reasoning.

### Coding of open question and free text responses

The process of analysing the content of each response to the open ended follow up questions was based on a system where unique summary 'codes' are applied to specific words or phrases contained in the text of the response. These codes include a sentiment, in this case whether a comment was positive/supportive or negative/unsupportive. A number of responses also made suggestions, and these

<sup>7</sup> Stakeholders are defined as non-public organisations which have responded in an official capacity to the consultation. Such organisations include local authorities and councillors, non-departmental governing bodies (such as the Environment Agency) and other public sector representative bodies (e.g. trade unions, economic growth organisations etc.)

are prefixed as such in the codeframe. The application of these summary codes and sub-codes to the content of the responses allows systematic analysis of the data.

Ipsos UK developed an initial coding framework (i.e. a list of codes to be applied) based on the text of the first responses received. This initial set of codes was created by drawing out the common themes and points raised. The initial coding framework was then updated throughout the analysis process to ensure that any newly-emerging themes were captured. Developing the coding framework in this way ensured that it would provide an accurate representation of what participants said.

Ipsos UK used a web-based system called Ascribe to manage the coding of all the text in the responses. Ascribe is a system which has been used on numerous large-scale consultation projects. Responses were uploaded into the Ascribe system, where members of the Ipsos UK coding team then worked systematically through the comments and applied a code to each relevant part(s) of them.

The Ascribe system allowed for detailed monitoring of coding progress and the organic development of the coding framework (i.e. the addition of new codes to new comments). A team of coders worked to review all of the responses as they were uploaded to the Ascribe system. All coders received a thorough briefing about the objectives of the consultation before they could undertake analysis of responses. It was also necessary for coders to have read the consultation document before undertaking their analysis of responses.

To ensure that no detail was lost, coders were briefed to raise codes that reflected what was being said in responses. These were then collapsed into a smaller number of key themes at the analysis stage to help with reporting. During the initial stages of the coding process, weekly meetings were held with the coding team to ensure a consistent approach in raising new codes and to ensure that all additional codes were appropriately and consistently assigned.

## 1.7 Interpreting the findings

While a consultation exercise is a valuable way to gather opinions about a wide-ranging topic, there are some key points which should be kept in mind when interpreting the responses.

Firstly, while the consultation was open to everyone, the participants were self-selecting. In consultations there can be a tendency for responses to come from those more likely to consider themselves affected, and therefore more motivated, to express their views. In previous consultations we have also found that responses tend to be polarised between those who think the proposals will benefit them or their area, and conversely those who think they will have a negative effect. Consultations do not tend to fully capture the views of the 'silent majority', who may be less opinionated about the proposals under consideration.

It must therefore be understood that the consultation findings, as reflected through this report, can only be used to record the various opinions of the members of the stakeholder and non-stakeholder participants who have chosen to respond to the proposals. Due to the self-selecting nature of the method, findings should not be aggregated up to be representative of the population of the East Midlands.

## 1.8 Comments about the consultation

In addition to responses submitted in answer to the questions themselves, some responses were received commenting on the process of the consultation, including the supporting documents and supplementary information.

In total, 199 participants submitted comments regarding the consultation itself. Key comments made included:

- The questionnaire was too lengthy and complex;
- Some of the questions on the individual deal proposals were closed and/or leading in nature;
- The consultation was biased in favour of the proposed deal and lacked a counter argument;
- There was a lack of publicity of the process and consultation;
- The lack of belief that the consultation will change anything, with some believing it is already a 'done deal'.

## 1.9 Report structure

This report has been divided into nine chapters:

- This first chapter covers the background and objectives of the consultation, including how the consultation was carried out, the number of participants who responded via available channels and how the responses were analysed and reported on;
- Chapters three to nine include a summary of comments received on the devolution of powers across policy areas: Governance, Homes, Skills, Transport, Reducing Carbon/Net Zero, Public Health, and other responses received from the consultation. Each of these chapters follows the same structure:
  - Firstly, it summarises responses to the closed question with a graph to illustrate the balance of opinion across all responses, followed by a summary of responses from non-stakeholder participants and stakeholder participants;
  - This is followed by thematic analysis of open-ended responses from stakeholder participants;
  - Non-stakeholder responses, which includes members of the public and organisations; and
  - An Executive Summary makes up chapter two and is a high level summary of the more detailed chapters.

The appendices include a copy of the response form, technical details on the coding process and the Ipsos Standards and Accreditations.

## 2 Executive Summary

Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council have signed a £1.14 billion devolution deal with the Government. The deal, subject to relevant approvals, and primary and secondary legislation passing through Parliament, would create the first ever Combined County Authority (CCA) and would see an extra £38 million a year coming to the East Midlands from 2024. It would create the East Midlands County Combined Authority (EMCCA).

A number of documents were prepared and presented to the public and wider stakeholders about the devolution proposals<sup>8</sup>. An open public consultation on the proposals ran from 14 November 2022 until 9 January 2023.

### 2.1 Methodology and response rate

An online consultation portal was established by Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and Nottingham City Council<sup>9</sup>. It also included an online response form for people to respond to the devolution proposals. There were a number of formal channels through which individuals and stakeholder organisations could give their views on the proposals:

- Online response platform, which could be accessed through the website;
- Hard copy response form, which was available to print out from the website and on request;
- A written letter, sent via the Freepost address listed on the paper response form; and/or
- By email, via a dedicated consultation email address.

Hard copies of the response forms were also made available at various locations across the proposed EMCCA area and the councils ran a communications campaign prior to and during the consultation period.

Overall, there were 4,869 participants in the consultation. The majority (4,751) participated online via the official response form. There were also 98 postal response forms and 20 responses via email to the dedicated consultation email address<sup>10</sup>.

The table overleaf shows how the response rates are broken down by public and stakeholder audiences – stakeholders are those who self-identified as responding on behalf of a business or organisation.

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/have-your-say/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk/>

<sup>10</sup> NB – this response channel did not use the structure of the consultation response form

	Non-stakeholder responses (e.g. public/organisations)	Stakeholder responses <sup>11</sup>	TOTAL
Online response forms	4,633	118	4,751
Paper response forms	94	4	98
Email	7	13	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,734</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>4,869</b>


## 2.2 Key themes

### 2.2.1 Governance

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposed governance arrangements for the East Midlands CCA.

**Figure 2.1: Agreement with the proposed governance arrangements for the East Midlands CCA**

Q1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed Governance arrangements for the East Midlands County Combined Authority?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 1,949 agreed with proposed revised governance arrangements with 609 saying they strongly agreed and 1,340 saying they agreed. The greatest level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 572 disagreed whilst 1,613 strongly disagreed. There were 513 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

<sup>11</sup> Stakeholders are defined as non-public organisations which have responded in an official capacity to the consultation. Such organisations include local authorities and councillors, non-departmental governing bodies (such as the Environment Agency) and other public sector representative bodies (e.g. trade unions, economic growth organisations etc.)

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the proposed governance arrangements than non-stakeholders. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 83 agreed (31 strongly) with the proposed arrangements whilst only 21 disagreed (14 strongly).

### Summary of stakeholder responses

**Of the 16 stakeholders who made comments in support of the proposed governance arrangements**, five made comments in support of a mayor, who they felt would provide a much needed voice and raise the profile of the proposed EMCCA area. Further comments relating to the proposed mayor's role included their role in stimulating productivity and therefore economic growth (2) and establishing an integrated CCA (2).

**Of the 10 stakeholder organisations which made comments in opposition to the proposed governance arrangements**, the majority of these (6) disagreed with the election of a mayor, which they felt was unnecessary. There was also concern that too much power would sit with a single person (4). Further concerns were raised that EMCCA members would not be representative of the local area and therefore care about local issues (2) whilst there was also demand for the public to be able to vote in EMCCA members (2).

### Summary of non-stakeholder responses

**Of the 24 participants who provided a response in support of the governance arrangements for the proposed CCA**, around half (13) agreed with the need for a mayor. Another six agreed that the mayor's role would raise the profile of the East Midlands and give them a voice to lobby for their needs.

**There were a relatively large number of comments in opposition to the proposed governance arrangements**. The overriding reason for this was opposition towards the role of the mayor (199), with participants not believing that it is necessary. A further 127 participants went on to argue that a mayor would be a waste of money and an additional tier of local government which would be expensive (some specifically referenced their likely salary in making this point concerning expense). There was also concern that a single post would have disproportionately too much power – 107 participants felt that power would be too concentrated on one individual.


The other main concern was around the perceived extra tiers of bureaucracy which the proposed EMCCA itself would bring about. Issues concerned the potentially excessive cost (68), the lack of representativeness and therefore lack of concern about localised issues (56) and the qualifications and experience of the individuals (42). Some felt that there would be a lack of democratic representation (26) and the potential conflict of interests of individuals was also mentioned – be that political party affiliation (20) or outside business interests (13).

### 2.2.2 Homes

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to homes. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,239) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,913). Of those who disagreed with the proposed governance arrangement, the majority (1,273) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 2.2: Agreement with the proposals relating to homes**

Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to homes?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question 2,156 agreed with homes proposals with 704 saying they strongly agreed and 1,452 saying they agreed. Of those who disagreed with the proposals, more strongly disagreed (1,268) than disagreed (628).

Proportionately there was a greater level of agreement from stakeholders to the proposals – only 16 disagreed with the majority (83) in agreement.

#### Summary of stakeholder responses

**In terms of supportive comments**, stakeholders supported protection of greenbelt land (3), the provision of better housing (1), the allowance for effective planning for housing developments (2), the extra funding to construct new homes (2) and the Mayoral Development Corporations (2).

**A few stakeholders made negative comments in response to the proposals.** These included the negative impact the proposals for more homes would have on the greenbelt and open spaces (1), disagreement with Mayoral Development Areas and the power to acquire and dispose of land (2), the unsustainability of the proposals without complementary infrastructure (1), the potential lack of, or mismanagement of, funding (2).

#### Summary of non-stakeholder responses

**Amongst non-stakeholders there was general support** expressed for the principle of constructing additional homes in the proposed EMCCA area (12). Some support was also conditional – people supported the proposals on the basis that additional and supportive infrastructure would be delivered and the greenbelt would be protected (26). Other supportive comments focussed on how homes would be built on existing brownfield sites, thereby protect pre-existing greenbelt land (8) whilst others

mentioned the likely improvement in the quality of housing stock (2) and the provision of more affordable housing which is so needed in the region (2).

**There were three main themes which underpinned non-stakeholder opposition to the proposals:**

(1) The potential negative impact on greenbelt and wider open spaces (37); (2) The potential for some areas to become overcrowded and overdeveloped (32); and general disagreement with the principle of the proposed EMCCA area needing additional homes (without necessarily stipulating why) (29).


Other comments were made in disagreement with the Mayoral Development Areas (20) and, similarly to stakeholders, a need to ensure that proposals are supported by wider improvements to complementary infrastructure (15).

**2.2.3 Skills**

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to skills. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,504) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,534). Of those who disagreed with the proposals, the majority (1,060) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 2.3: Agreement with the proposals relating to skills**

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to skills?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,414 agreed with the skills proposals with 859 saying they strongly agreed and 1,555 saying they agreed. Proportionately there was a greater level of agreement from stakeholders to the proposals – only 10 disagreed with the majority (90) in agreement.

**Summary of stakeholder responses**

**Those stakeholders making supportive comments** stated their overall support for the proposals (10) along with their belief that the proposals would ultimately stimulate productivity, benefit the regional economy and lead to job creation (4). Some gave specific support for the Adult Education Budget (3) whilst there was also support for the Freeport (2) along with the proposals relating to green growth (1). There was also some support for the D2N2 LEP (2) and the Local Skills Improvement Plan (1).

**There was minimal opposition to the proposals relating to skills amongst stakeholders.** One stakeholder made a general point of opposition without specifying why (1) whilst another felt that adult education below level 4 would be underfunded.

**Summary of non-stakeholder responses**

**Of those comments received in support of the proposals relating to skills** these were underpinned by a belief that they would ultimately stimulate productivity and growth and be beneficial for the local economy (8). A number of participants made comments in specific support of the proposals relating to adult education (5) and others recognised the opportunities which would be provided for people to refresh and/or learn new skills (4).

**A total of 29 non-stakeholder participants left comments in opposition to the proposals relating to skills.** Aside from general statements of disagreement with the proposals (5), some participants disagreed specifically with the proposal relating to the Freeport (4).


Finally, a lot of the comments received in response to the proposals relating to skills constituted suggestions containing clarifications/additional detail. For example, participants referenced the need for the Adult Education Budget to be integrated and joined up (7), more of a guarantee that education and training would lead to a skilled workforce (resulting in jobs and an increase in employment opportunities) (10), the need for adequate funding (8) and the importance of considering the role schools play alongside FE colleges and universities (10).

**2.2.4 Transport**

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to transport. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,561) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,711). Of those who disagreed with the proposals, the majority (1,215) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 2.4: Agreement with the proposals relating to transport**

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to transport?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,465 agreed with the proposals relating to transport with 1,121 saying they strongly agreed and 1,344 saying they agreed. The greatest level of

disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 492 disagreed whilst 1,212 strongly disagreed. There were 516 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the proposals relating to transport. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, the majority (96) agreed with the proposed arrangements, whilst only seven disagreed.

### Summary of stakeholder responses

**Those stakeholder comments in support of the proposals** felt that the plans would deliver a joined up and integrated transport network (6). Other comments supported the proposals relating to smart ticketing, with some also supporting the additional £0.5m per annum funding (4). Other elements of the proposals which attracted support included those relating to the Key Route Network (2) as well as for the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy.

**Of the five stakeholders making comments in opposition to the proposals**, there was no one issue driving this opposition. A single stakeholder felt that transport would end up being underfunded (1) whilst there was some concern that transport leading to larger cities would be prioritised ahead of smaller, more remote/rural areas (1).

### Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 525 non-stakeholders who provided comments in response to the proposals for transport. A total of 71 comments were made in support of the proposals with 84 providing comments which disagreed in some way with an element of them.

**Supportive comments from non-stakeholders** generally agreed with the objective of the transport proposals, specifically to deliver a joined up and integrated network across the proposed EMCCA area (28). In particular, smart ticketing received a number of supportive comments (14).

**One of the greatest concerns for non-stakeholders** was a lack of belief that the proposals would be sufficiently funded (24). Many did not think that the funding allocated would be enough and that smaller towns and villages, including rural areas, would be less of a priority for improvement compared to the big cities (22). Some participants also expected the system to be poorly managed (based on their experience of the system at the moment), which would ultimately result in it not working (18). Others did not believe that the proposals would result in a truly integrated network (10).


There was also some disagreement with the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy (45) which some participants felt would drain funding from wider railway improvements, as well as not be of benefit to smaller, more rural parts of the proposed EMCCA area.

### 2.2.5 Reducing carbon/Net Zero

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, more agreed with the proposals (2484) than disagreed (1580).

**Figure 2.5: Agreement with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero**

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,385 agreed with the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals. Of those non-stakeholders who agreed, 1,061 strongly agreed and 1,324 agreed. The greatest level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 439 disagreed whilst 1,132 strongly disagreed.

Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 99 agreed with the proposals whilst only 9 disagreed.

#### Summary of stakeholder responses

**Overall, the majority of stakeholders made comments in agreement with the proposals.** Most of the comments stated general support for the objectives set out (14) whilst other comments referred to energy/power renewables being aided by a renewable energy agenda (1), an extended tram network (1) and an extended rail network (1).

**Of the six stakeholders who made comments in opposition to the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals,** some (2) felt Net Zero to be unrealistic and unachievable. Further comments related to fusion energy being unrealistic and unachievable (2). There was also concern that Net Zero will be underfunded (1) and will not deliver benefits for local people (1).

#### Summary of non-stakeholder responses

**Of the 42 non-stakeholders who made comments in support of the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals,** 18 stated that they supported the proposals and 19 expressed conditional support. Other comments agreed with sustainability more generally (4) and that energy/power renewables will be aided by a renewable energy agenda (2), as well as support for an extended tram network (1).


**A total of 84 non-stakeholders made comments in opposition to the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals.** A key factor in this opposition was the feeling that the proposals are unrealistic and unachievable (29). Concerns was also raised about the financial elements of the proposal, specifically the potential high administrative costs (13), the potential for them to be underfunded (11) and the potential need for tax increases to pay for them.

### 2.2.6 Public Health

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals for Public Health. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, a majority agreed with the proposed arrangements (2,490). Overall, 1,580 disagreed, with two-thirds of these strongly disagreeing (1,091).

**Figure 2.6: Agreement with the proposals relating to public health**

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to public health?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,391 agreed with proposals. The greater level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 485 disagreed whilst 1,086 strongly disagreed. There were 708 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the public health proposals than non-stakeholders. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 99 agreed with the proposed arrangements whilst only nine disagreed.

### Summary of stakeholder responses

There were comparatively few comments received from stakeholders concerning the public health proposals. **Of the six stakeholders who made comments in support of the proposals**, four gave their general support for the proposals without providing further detail. Others provided conditional agreement (1) or concluded that extended tram (1) and extended rail (1) would improve public health in the region.

**Of the three stakeholder organisations which made comments in opposition to the proposals on public health**, there was concern about the additional layer of government and bureaucracy which could lead to duplication (2), whilst others were concerned about the lack of funding for staff such as doctors, nurses and other healthcare professionals (1).

## Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There was a greater number of comments from non-stakeholders who disagreed with the proposals relating to public health. **Of those making comments in support of the proposals**, most just referenced their agreement which they felt would deliver a joined up and integrated healthcare system (2) whilst others also offered general support.

**The main reason given for participants not supporting the proposals** was that it would not work because ‘it hasn’t worked elsewhere’ (14). This scepticism extended to the potential bureaucracy which would have to be put in place to deliver (4) and there were also concerns that larger cities may be prioritised over smaller, more rural areas (6) and that the size and diversity of the area within the proposed EMCCA remit would make it unmanageable (4).

# 3 Governance

## 3.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the proposed governance structures and ways of working as detailed in the consultation document.

### Governance

In order that powers and funding are available, suitable governance arrangements must be put in place which provide Government with assurance that funding will be spent appropriately, and statutory functions will be delivered effectively and efficiently.

The proposed Governance will include:

- A new directly elected Mayor who will bring new powers and funding from central Government to the local level. This includes powers to set a budget and issue a precept.
- In addition, the EMCCA will feature eight members, consisting of a Lead Member and one further member appointed by each Constituent Council (Derbyshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Derby City Council and Nottingham City Council).
- The EMCCA will appoint four non-constituent members from the Area's district and borough councils.
- The EMCCA will also appoint up to a further four non-constituent or associate members.
- The EMCCA will ensure that there is suitable representation from business.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

### 3.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposed governance arrangements for the EMCCA. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, slightly more disagreed with the proposed arrangements (2,206) than agreed (2,032). Of those who disagreed, the majority (1,627) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 3.1: Agreement with the proposed governance arrangements for the East Midlands CCA**

Q1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed Governance arrangements for the East Midlands County Combined Authority?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 1,949 agreed with proposed revised governance arrangements with 609 saying they strongly agreed and 1,340 saying they agreed. The greatest level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 572 disagreed whilst 1,613 strongly disagreed. There were 513 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the proposed governance arrangements than non-stakeholders. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 83 agreed (31 strongly) with the proposed arrangements whilst only 21 disagreed (14 strongly).

### 3.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

On the whole stakeholders showed greater support for the proposed governance arrangements compared to non-stakeholders. Overall, 50 stakeholders made comments about governance – 16 made supportive comments whilst 10 made comments in opposition.

**Of the 16 stakeholders who made comments in support of the proposed governance arrangements**, five made comments in support of a mayor, who they felt would provide a much needed voice and raise the profile of the proposed EMCCA area. Further comments concerning the proposed mayor’s role included their role in stimulating productivity and therefore economic growth (2) and establishing an integrated EMCCA (2).

Other comments agreed with the proposal relating to the Education and Skills Advisory Board (6) whilst there was also support expressed for the proposals relating to business and the economy (5) – both of these were raised by stakeholders as key advantages but not by non-stakeholders.

**Of the 10 stakeholder organisations which made comments in opposition to the proposed governance arrangements**, the majority of these (6) disagreed with the election of a mayor, which they felt was unnecessary. There was also concern that too much power would sit with a single person (4). Further concerns were raised that EMCCA members would not be representative of the local area and therefore care about local issues (2) whilst some felt they should be able to vote in EMCCA members (2).

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the proposed governance arrangements and the key points are summarised below:

- Mansfield District Council felt that the governance proposals were unclear as to how they would ensure an equitable approach towards the deployment of investment funding, in particular to ensure that the two cities do not attract all the capital investment when there are a number of local important towns in need of ‘levelling up’. It wants to see local need and areas of deprivation prioritised for funding in the future;
- Newark and Sherwood District Council supported devolution and felt that a mayor would help the CCA area to speak with one voice, represent visible leadership and be accountable to residents;
- The Peak District National Park Authority broadly supported the proposed devolution but felt it important that they are given a clear and visible role within the new CCA given the National Park’s importance to the regional economy and in delivering net zero and nature recovery ambitions. It also highlighted its statutory role as the local planning and minerals authority and given such statutory purposes span a large geographic area felt that it should be represented as a non-constituent or associate member;
- Derbyshire Dales District Council supported the inception of the EMMCA but highlighted the political challenges of representing local district and borough councils (given only four seats have been provided for);

*“Whilst no detailed observations were expressed in regard to the content of the Devolution Deal, the Council welcomed the engagement and involvement of District/Borough Council in relation to governance arrangements.”*

#### *Derbyshire Dales District Council*

- Ashfield District Council (and the Independent Alliance on Nottinghamshire County Council) welcomed the steps towards more localised decision making but felt that the governance proposal created a democratic deficit between the borough and district councils, as their participation is minimal;
- Overseal Parish Council strongly believed that any more money required to create the additional tier of government should not be borne by residents or businesses, especially in the current financial crisis given pressures are being felt within households and by businesses alike. Practically, there is a fear that a tier of local government will be lost as the Parish Council relies heavily on South Derbyshire District Council to resolve many local issues;
- East Midlands Councils (EMC) expressed concerns from a number of member councils about using the term ‘East Midlands’ to describe a Mayoral CCA for the D2N2 area. It also proposed

further dialogue concerning the proposed CCA's membership of the EMC and how it could establish constructive working relationships with neighbouring authorities;

- Leicestershire County Council questioned the description of devolution as being 'for the East Midlands' when it only includes the area known in local public sector and business circles as D2N2;

*“Devolution to the area known as the 6Cs (the cities of Derby, Leicester and Nottingham and the counties of Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire, to which can be added Rutland) has a much stronger claim to a regional devolution deal than D2N2 and would have a much greater impact in levelling up against the West Midlands.”*

#### *Leicestershire City Council*

- North East Derbyshire District Council did not think the devolution deal is in the best interests of its residents and felt powers should be devolved to existing local councils rather than a mayor for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire;
- South Derbyshire District Council did not consider the new governance proposals to be in the best interests of residents of South Derbyshire and expressed opposition to the proposed geographical basis of the Devolution Deal linking Derbyshire to Nottinghamshire to form a CCA;
- Bolsover District Council opposed the creation of a mayoral CCA and has expressed its opposition in writing to its local MP;
- The East Midlands Green Party did not support the proposal, in particular the 'imposition' of a mayoral system by a majority vote of local councillors – it instead proposed local referendums to understand popular support for the proposals. It also believed that a mayoral model was 'unproven'. It also felt that the proposal perpetuates the 'discredited first past the post' electoral system, criticised the lack of transparency when it comes to appointing members and did not think the mayor would be held properly to account. It also did not feel that the interests of borough and district councils would be properly represented;
- The Co-Operative Party felt that in order for the mayoral model to work in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, it must be underpinned by co-operative solutions and ideals. It also felt that Business and Economy Advisory Board should contain representatives from different business models such as co-operatives, employee owned businesses and social enterprises;
- The universities of Nottingham Trent, Derby and Nottingham submitted a joint response which was supportive of the opportunity to establish a mayoral CCA across the D2N2 area. It proposed that universities be represented on the main CCA board (whilst recognising that universities could not fill all four places). The institutions felt that the CCA should consider establishing an integrated unit that provides data and insight, informs strategy, guides investment decisions, oversees programme monitoring and supports the evaluation of activity creating an iterative approach to the work of the CCA. In addition, the University of Derby urged the proposed EMCCA to continue to explore the opportunity to incorporate Leicester and Leicestershire;
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals relating to governance and reiterated its role as an anchor institution which it felt would add significant value to the formal governance of

the EMCCA at the highest level. It welcomed a ‘sharp focus’ on skills, business growth and the research and innovation eco-system and are keen to help broker workable governance solutions, ensure a university vote on the main EMCCA board and observer status for all three of the universities and the opportunity to drive forward place based advocacy and investment;

- Nottingham Trent University welcomed the EMCCA as a statutory body as it would allow the D2N2 area to speak with one voice. The proposed governance arrangements allow four non-constituent or associate members and the University stated its intention to discuss the universities being represented on the main EMCCA board. It welcomed the proposed establishment of advisory boards and endorsed those in the proposal. It also felt an Innovation Board could be established to develop and implement an Innovation Accelerator-style approach for the area, which would work alongside the sectors highlighted in the proposal document. The University also encouraged the establishment of a unit that provides data and insight, informs strategy, guides investment decisions, oversees programme monitoring and supports the evaluation of activity;
- Nottingham College felt it was important that further education was well represented within governance and was keen that the new CCA did not destabilise current providers. It suggested that a minimum of two of the non-constituent/associate member places be allocated to local FE college principals. It felt that the case for higher education representation on the EMCCA board is limited;
- Derwentio Housing Trust urged the need for VCSE representation and felt the proposed governance arrangements were top heavy;
- Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing felt that ‘the Combined Authority will work best through the full engagement of the East Midlands’ local authorities at county, borough and district level and all relevant stakeholders’;
- Visit Peak District and Derbyshire felt that a business advisory board is needed to provide the sector with an opportunity to be visible and ensure that it's highlighted as part of any growth plans (e.g. plans across the CCA need to acknowledge the changes in infrastructure across DMOs and the development of Local Visitor Economy Partnerships (LVEPs) and Destination Development Partnerships (DDPs));
- Derwent Valley Trust felt that there is a risk that the more rural areas, in terms of businesses and local communities, could be disadvantaged due to the creation of the EMCCA and this will need to be addressed to ensure an equitable approach;
- Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement expressed concern about the proposed governance as it felt too much power was being placed into the hands of an individual mayor to the detriment of campaign groups similar to itself. It did not believe that the power and control in the hands of one individual would improve equality and inclusion. It also questioned whether the cabinet make up would include any input by the voluntary sector and groups of people with protected characteristics;
- The Environment Agency supported the formation of the EMCCA as it represents a ‘great opportunity’ for the region to become an exemplar for climate change adaptation;

- Arts Council England felt it important for a place to be reserved for culture in any governance arrangements given the significant (and recently increased) investment in culture across the East Midlands region;
- Nottingham Growth Board welcomed the importance that the proposed governance arrangement places on the businesses and the business community. It questioned the level of influence of the proposed Business and Economy Advisory Board and also how businesses would be represented on the main CCA board. It also highlighted the role of the three universities and felt there was a strong case for all three to be present at the meetings of the board;
- East Midlands Chamber emphasised the need for the voices of both the private and third sectors to be meaningful in the EMCCA, which it didn't feel was sufficiently defined in the proposal. It also highlighted the need for business representation, both in terms of the diverse sectors and clusters across the CCA area and of different scales of business;
- The Derby and Derbyshire Local Access Forum (LAF) called for closer and more effective partnership working of the four LAFs in the CCA area. However, they wanted to retain the existing LAFs and thought consideration should be given within the EMCCA for the appointment of advisory bodies with non-executive functions;
- TUC East Midlands proposed two key governance mechanisms in the EMCCA: (1) Formal representation of the TUC as one of the four 'Non-Constituent or Associate Members (similar to the West Midlands CA structure which it says is working well); and (2) Additional advisory boards for housing, transport, Net Zero and skills, as well as boards for public service provision and social mobility. The TUC also stated its desire to be included on the Education and Skills Advisory Board and the Business and Economy Advisory Board.

### 3.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 891 non-stakeholder participants who provided a response on the proposed governance arrangements, of which 24 made comments in support of the proposal and 552 made comments in opposition.

**Of the 24 participants who provided a response in support of the governance arrangements for the proposed CCA**, around half (13) agreed with the need for a mayor. Another six agreed that the mayor's role would raise the profile of the East Midlands and give them a voice to lobby for their collective needs.

*“A strong Mayor, like Andy Burnham in Manchester, could be a valuable asset. A party-driven one like Tees Valley, could be a problem.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Others (2) reiterated their general support of the governance arrangements without elaborating further, whilst a further two participants felt that EMCCA members would be local and therefore more representative of local public opinion.

Others commented that it would help to create an integrated EMCCA. Two participants specifically referenced their preference for this type of governance compared to the existing governance from Nottingham City Council.

**A total of 552 participants left comments in opposition to the proposed governance arrangements for the CCA.** The overriding reason for this was opposition towards the role of the mayor (199), as participants did not believe it is necessary. A further 127 participants went on to argue that a mayor would be a waste of money and an additional tier of local government, which would be expensive (some specifically referenced their likely salary in making this point).

*“What concerns me is the way the money will be spent in financing a mayor and all the various Committee members that will be appointed and the additional bureaucracy that this will bring.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

There was also concern that a single post would have disproportionately too much power – 107 participants felt that power would be too concentrated in one individual. Other concerns with the mayor included:

- Potential conflicts of interest if the mayor is affiliated to a particular political party (39);
- The perceived lack of democracy in electing a mayor, which they felt should have a public vote (34);

*“There was a vote on elected mayors recently and the vote was a resounding no for Nottingham.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

- A lack of local representation given the potential for the mayor to not be ‘local’ and therefore detached from local issues (30). If they were from another part of the CCA area there was concern that they might prioritise their own area to the detriment of others (12);
- A potential lack of transparency and accountability (22);
- A potential increase in tax/introduction of a mayoral precept (17);
- Potential conflicts of interest, be it to other areas (5) or to external business interests (5).

Beyond the mayoral issue, other concerns related to the proposed EMCCA body itself. A total of 68 non-stakeholders felt that EMCCA members would receive excessive salaries and therefore be too expensive. There were also concerns about a lack of representativeness – 56 participants felt its make-up would not be representative of the area whilst a further 42 participants questioned the competence of prospective members and whether they would be sufficiently qualified and/or have the right level of experience.

Participants also raised concerns about prospective EMCCA members similar to those expressed about the mayor, specifically that there would be a lack of democratic representation (26), potential conflicts of interest if affiliated to certain political parties (20) and the perceived lack of transparency and accountability (20).

*“Another layer of bureaucracy that will cost money that could be better spent on other things. More jobs, probably highly paid, for the select few.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Concerns were also raised about the potential outside business interests of EMCCA members (13).

Finally, there were a few questions as to whether a police and crime commissioner was needed if the mayor could perform this role (9).

*“I think a mayor and PCC are incompatible. The Police Crime Commissioner would be a redundant post and would make more sense and reduce bureaucracy if the mayor absorbs the two roles.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

## Suggestions

Some responses suggested changes to the proposed governance arrangements. A total of 369 participants made such comments. The main suggestions included:

- EMCCA membership should not be comprised of existing local authorities in the area – this is mainly due to a perceived lack of competence (122);
- Guaranteeing the competence and experience of EMCCA members (39), the need to ensure there is sufficient accountability and oversight of them (39); ensuring they are representative of local people (37) and parishes/boroughs/districts (27);
- Guaranteeing the competence and experience of the mayor (23) who should be accountable (21) and not affiliated to a political party (20);
- EMCCA should take responsibility for the environment and climate crisis (16) and be representative of the local community and voluntary sector (13).

# 4 Homes

## 4.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the proposals relating to homes as detailed in the consultation document.

### Homes

We will work with local authorities, landowners, developers and the full range of housing providers to promote regeneration, create affordable, good quality housing options and to retrofit existing homes to be more environmentally sustainable.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- £16.8 million of funding controlled locally to spend in 2024/25 to support the building of new homes on brownfield land;
- £9 million of housing capital funding to support the delivery of housing priorities;
- New, broad powers to acquire and dispose of land to build houses, commercial space and infrastructure, for growth and regeneration;
- The Mayor's power to designate Mayoral Development Areas and to create Mayoral Development Corporations (which is a statutory body created to bring forward the regeneration of a defined area). This will support delivery on strategic sites across the Area through drawing on existing work, subject to the agreement of local partners.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

## 4.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to homes. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,239) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,913). Of those who disagreed with the proposed governance arrangement, the majority (1,273) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 4.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to homes**

Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to homes?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,156 agreed with homes proposals with 704 saying they strongly agreed and 1,452 saying they agreed. Of those who disagreed with the proposals, more strongly disagreed (1,268) than disagreed (628). Proportionately there was a greater level of agreement from stakeholders to the proposals – only 16 disagreed with the majority (83) in agreement.

## 4.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

A total of 37 stakeholders provided specific comments relating to the proposals for homes. Of these, 11 were supportive whilst seven included an element of opposition to the proposals.

**The supportive comments made by stakeholders were generally more diverse than non-stakeholder participants**, although around half (6) made statements in support of the proposals without elaborating further as to why. Other comments related to support for the protection of greenbelt land (3), the provision of better housing (1), the allowance for effective planning when it comes to new housing (2), agreement with the extra funding to construct new homes (2) and support for Mayoral Development Corporations (2).

**A few stakeholders made negative comments in response to the proposals.** These included the negative impact the proposals might have on the greenbelt and open spaces (1), disagreement with Mayoral Development Areas and the power to acquire and dispose of land (2), the unsustainability of the proposals without a commitment to complementary infrastructure (1) and the potential lack of (or mismanagement of) funding (2).

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the proposals relating to homes and the key points are summarised below:

- Derwentio Housing Trust emphasised the need for greater social housing;
- Mansfield District Council posed questions about how the deployment of resources would link with local housing providers' programmes of improvements and whether new build properties would be prioritised for brownfield land sites and be mixed tenure or purely private ownership homes;
- Newark Town Council did not want the needs of the travelling community overlooked when it came to housing strategies;
- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service emphasised the importance of housing projects (both new and retrofitted) being designed with the principle of fire safety in mind and fitted with domestic sprinklers;
- Railfuture agreed with the proposals relating to homes and felt that an EMCCA should enable good planning practice by promoting new housing on brownfield land served by high quality, sustainable transport;
- The MP for Rushcliffe broadly agreed with the aims set out. They highlighted the removal of the Duty to Cooperate, contained within the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill, which prioritises the use of brownfield land over greenfield land for development and felt it important that the EMCCA reflects this policy objective and others locally. They would actively oppose any proposals to undermine the powers they give local people to determine the way in which their communities develop. They also wanted greater ambition to be shown in terms of the funding allocation for building new homes. Finally, they wanted clarification on how the consent of the borough council (whose jurisdiction any planning powers are being exercised under) would be determined;
- Manchester and East Midlands Rail Action Partnership emphasised the importance of co-locating new housing with transport links;
- Derby and Derbyshire LAF urged the EMCCA to work with local authorities and other stakeholders to ensure new housing is well connected by infrastructure, particularly walking and cycling. It also emphasised the importance of seeking developer contributions towards the cost of any additional infrastructure required;
- Nottingham Growth Board agreed with the proposals relating to homes but wanted greater prominence applied to the inter-connection of themes so the EMCCA considered interventions at a holistic level. It also advocated a target for house building at a CCA level;
- The Green Party felt that the proposal lacked detail as to how the EMCCA and the district/borough councils would work together and take planning decisions. It also felt the proposals lacked detail about the mechanisms which would underpin its new powers and questioned what is meant by Mayoral Development Areas and the creation of Mayoral Development Corporations;

- The Co-Operative Party felt that the housing powers should include the ability to promote community-led housing and establish similar structures and funds to the GLA’s Community Housing Hub and Fund;
- The CBI was encouraged by the housing and planning powers (i.e. the ability to establish Mayoral Development Corporations) as well as ringfenced funding for house building on brownfield land. It emphasised the importance of adequate housing to ensure people can live and work in the East Midlands;
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals relating to homes and felt that good quality, affordable and sustainable housing was vital for students and staff. It also referenced the Student Living Strategy (developed with Nottingham Trent University and Nottingham City Council) as a blueprint across a wider geography;
- Nottingham Trent University welcomed the priority and importance placed on homes and the proposed investment plans. It encouraged the funding to support new properties which are built to high environmental standards and encouraged the need to retrofit homes which have already been constructed.

#### 4.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 486 non-stakeholder participants who provided a response on the proposals relating to homes, of which 48 made comments in support of the proposals and 160 made comments in opposition. The majority of responses (325) made suggestions of how the proposals could be altered or improved.

**Of the 48 participants who provided a response in support of the proposals relating to homes, 12 made general comments in support of the principle of additional homes. Another 26 made comments in support but these were more conditional and relied on other factors being resolved as well – principally the need for additional and supportive infrastructure and the ongoing protection of the greenbelt land (which they felt was not explicit in the proposals).**

*“The housing plans are commendable but make no mention of protecting the limited Greenfield sites and focus on the optimum re-use of built-up land.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“More houses are needed but they must come with more schools, doctors, shops, etc.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“The plans for housing are great but they need to be supported by a transport and public services infrastructure (schools and health facilities).”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Other supportive comments focussed on how the homes will make use of existing brownfield sites, thereby protect pre-existing greenbelt land (8) whilst others mentioned the likely improvement in the quality of housing stock (2) and the provision of more affordable housing which is so needed in the region (2).

**A total of 160 non-stakeholder participants left comments in opposition to the proposals relating to homes.** These can be summarised under three main themes:

- The potential negative impact on greenbelt and wider open spaces (37);

*“I need to be convinced that the EMCCA would not use its powers to allow building on green areas while we have brownfield sites in need of redevelopment.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

- The potential for some areas to become overcrowded and overdeveloped (32); and

*“We don’t need to keep building houses, especially in small rural areas, as these villages are not large enough to cope with such expansion to their infrastructure.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

- General disagreement with the proposals (without necessarily stipulating why).

*“The very last thing the East Midlands needs is more housing.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Other comments were made in disagreement with the Mayoral Development Areas and the power to acquire and dispose of land (20). There was also a belief that the proposal would not benefit local people and, ultimately, not deliver against its targets for more homes (20). There were a number of comments also expressing concern that the proposals would be unsustainable without improvements to infrastructure (15).

*“Local council already trying to build on green belt areas, but not increasing infrastructure and facilities to match the increase in housing. Services are overstretched already with lack of essential facilities and services.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Concern was raised about the proposed funding, with some participants believing that the proposal would end up being underfunded (14) or that funds would be mismanaged (9), whilst some comments relating to underfunding were specific to the need to adequately fund energy efficiency and home insulation (3). The potential lack of local control over housing policy (i.e. by local councils) was also raised as a point of opposition (14). Some comments also referenced the potential negative impact on biodiversity/wildlife (6) and agriculture and farm land (4).

*“There has been no thought for the environment, biodiversity with the developers being the only people who have benefited.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

## Suggestions

A relatively greater proportion of comments in response to the proposal for homes made suggestions to change or improve the proposals, including:

- A guarantee to prevent the loss of green land and a commitment to only develop on brownfield sites (90);
- The need to invest in infrastructure before beginning the construction of any new homes (63);
- Homes should be made affordable (49);
- The need to first explore/exhaust the potential to redevelop older buildings and houses (i.e. what is already standing) (39);
- The need to invest in social housing (26);
- A guarantee about the quality of construction, with ‘no corners cut’ concerning the quality of the materials and construction process (17), as well as the importance of using sustainable materials (13);
- The importance of investing in insulation and energy efficiency measures (18) and also retrofitting homes to maximise efficiency (15), as well as the need to invest in solar panels (16);
- The need to align home building with other environmental targets and objectives, such as Net Zero (16);
- Stricter regulations and planning permission (14) which should also apply to those in the private rented sector (10);
- Protection of small/more remote/rural areas from over-development (13);
- Removal of proposals relating to housing altogether to ensure management is retained by the relevant local authorities (10);
- The need to build homes specifically to house homeless people (10);
- The need to prioritise first time buyers/those trying to get on the property ladder (9);
- Protection of heritage sites (7);
- The potential to construct houses for specific sub-groups of the population, including those already residing locally (7) and the elderly, disabled and vulnerable (5); and
- A few suggestions supporting construction of housing on the greenbelt and to not be solely focussed on brownfield sites (7).

# 5 Skills

## 5.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the proposals relating to skills as detailed in the consultation document.

### Skills

We will work collaboratively with employers, skills providers and local authorities to ensure our citizens have the opportunity to develop key skills and access opportunities to work well and build fulfilling careers. This will also help the creation of a strong and sustainable local economy.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- Holding the Adult Education Budget (AEB) from academic year 2025/26;
- Owning the ability to set allocations and outcomes to skills providers;
- Supporting and shaping the Local Skills Improvement Plan (LSIP) for the Area.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

## 5.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to skills. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,504) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,534). Of those who disagreed with the proposals, the majority (1,060) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 5.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to skills**

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to skills?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,414 agreed with the skills proposals with 859 saying they strongly agreed and 1,555 saying they agreed. Proportionately there was a greater level of agreement from stakeholders to the proposals – only 10 disagreed, with the majority (90) in agreement.

## 5.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

A total of 42 stakeholders provided specific comments relating to the proposals for skills. Of these, 18 were supportive whilst only two included an element of opposition to the proposals.

**Those stakeholders making supportive comments** stated their overall support for the proposals (10) along with their belief that the proposals would ultimately stimulate productivity, benefit the regional economy and lead to job creation (4). Some gave specific support for the Adult Education Budget (3) whilst there was also support for the Freeport (2) along with the proposals relating to green growth (1). There was also some support for the D2N2 LEP (2) and the Local Skills Improvement Plan (1).

**There was minimal opposition to the proposals relating to skills amongst stakeholders.** One stakeholder made a general point of opposition without specifying why (1) whilst another felt that adult education below level 4 would be underfunded.

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the proposals relating to skills, some of which included suggestions to enhance them. One such comment was the need to ensure that proposals relating to skills delivers against all socio-economic challenges which exist across the proposed EMCCA area. The main points made by stakeholders include:

- Derventio Housing Trust highlighted the importance of ensuring support for those furthest away from being active in the labour market;
- Mansfield District Council posed questions about whether adult education spend would drive lower average skill levels up towards the UK average or focus on higher level skills, how the cycle of poor educational experience and low wages, poverty and ill health will be broken and emphasised the importance of engagement with local level engagement and intervention programmes;
- Overseal Parish Council was concerned that residents would only be able to attend education providers which had a contract with the EMCCA, whereas they can currently attend any provider they want;
- Newark Town Council emphasised the importance of skills being led locally by employers and the need to reflect the differing needs across diverse parts of the CCA area;
- Burton and South Derbyshire College emphasised the importance of adult skills and the experience which further education institutions have in planning and delivering adult education. It wanted a formal governance role to support the EMCCA;
- Nottingham College felt that a devolved skills budget would bring with it funding entitlements which ensure adult learners in the CCA area can access learning across English and maths and levels 1-3 qualifications. It thought that it would be important to protect the skills budget accordingly in order to continue to address social mobility and the impact of deprivation in the CCA area;
- West Nottinghamshire College felt that the Adult Education Budget must build on a partnership approach and not through competitive procurement. It highlighted the importance of the EMCCA recognising the expertise of partners to manage the budget on its behalf rather than be too prescriptive and demanding;

*“Through devolution we can work together as partners to address the underlying causes: housing, family circumstance, criminality, exploitation, benefit rules, health, childcare, language, culture, security, prior experience of education/work etc. & support each individual to become an asset to our communities & progress to a secure, well-paid career.”*

*West Nottinghamshire College*

- Futures Advice, Skills and Employment felt it would be essential that devolved skills funding is not commissioned in isolation from other factors impacting socio-economic prosperity, such as employment support, business support, community development and regeneration. It thought sufficient consideration should be given to existing local infrastructure and partnerships already well established in the area and local consortia should be trusted to deliver. It also wanted the integration of skills with other public services and programmes designed to address deprivation

and social exclusion, such as care leavers, refugees and asylum seekers, young people that are not in education, employment and training, those with long term health conditions, ex-service personnel, ex-offenders and others. They felt that it also needs to take account of the divergence in economic geography across the region;

- D2N2 Public Service Compact also highlighted the strength of the existing local infrastructure which it felt should be the vehicle for managing devolved skills funding. It felt that skills must also be delivered in a way that is integrated and aligned with other public services and programmes designed to address deprivation and social exclusion. It also made the same points as Future Advice, Skills and Employment about the need to take account of the divergence in economic geography across the region;
- The East Midlands Chamber highlighted the importance of private sector training providers alongside further and higher education providers as being fundamental to the skills strategy;
- Newark and Sherwood District Council supported the potential devolution of the 16-18 skills budget being devolved to remove national constraints and wanted the EMCCA to embolden its vision to transform the skills system to be of greater benefit to local communities and businesses. It identified the potential to invest in green skills training at local further education providers;
- Visit Peak District and Derbyshire welcomed the skills plan but worried that there would be a focus on high skill sectors and that VE, hospitality, retail and culture and heritage employer skills needs will be 'left behind';
- Derwent Valley Trust supported the EMCCA placing a greater emphasis on partnering with volunteer organisations to better deliver on active travel projects including infrastructure. It highlighted the potential of LAFs, alongside the creation of joint teams to bid for funding when it comes to larger projects;
- Railfuture emphasised the importance of employment and training provision being well served by sustainable transport;
- The MP for Rushcliffe agreed that shaping the Local Skills Improvement Plan and holding the Adult Education Budget would enable local decision makers to focus budgets on the skills gap in the economy of the East Midlands and to work in partnership with local employers;
- Manchester and East Midlands Rail Action Partnership identified greater challenges accessing employment training and skills in Derbyshire compared to other parts of the CCA area and urged focus on 'unique challenges' to prevent a 'brain drain' to other areas of the country;
- Derby and Derbyshire LAF recognised the role of volunteering and urged collaborative working with those organisations that could provide such experiences;
- Nottingham Growth Board welcomed the collaborative narrative when it comes to skills and felt it set out the scale of the skills challenge in the D2N2 area. It felt that the Skills Advisory Board should work with stakeholders to set an integrated skills strategy for the area. It also appreciated the potential for destabilisation of existing providers and urged careful consideration of how the budget is pooled and administered;

- The Green Party did not think the case for sub-regional decision making about education and training had been adequately made. It felt that the proposal was too focussed on work, careers and the economy and they would have liked to see a broader view of adult learning articulated in the proposals. The Party did not feel that the proposal took into account the national context for skills provision;
- The CBI felt that the devolution of the Adult Education Budget would be an important tool with regards to overcoming skills shortages, particularly around reskilling and upskilling and encouraged the Skills Directorate within the EMCCA to work collaboratively with the Local Skills Improvement Plans. It also suggested that the EMCCA explores the potential for the functions of the D2N2 Local Economic Partnership to be integrated;
- The TUC welcomed the devolution of the Adult Education Budget and responsibility for making funding allocations to skills providers and urged the EMCCA to follow the West Midlands Combined Authority/TUC Skills Partnership model, which facilitates unions to work with the Combined Authority to deliver work-based skills training;
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals and made a number of comments, including the design of degree apprenticeship programmes, the upskilling of local young people, its work with local schools to provide a variety of workshops and its EDI Task Force, which works with local employers in a way that directly benefits the local population and the potential of partnership working to create opportunities linked to digital skills and inclusion;
- Nottingham Trent University supported the ambition identified when it comes to skills and acknowledged the challenges identified in the proposal document. It supported the need for a Skills Advisory Board and encouraged the EMCCA to explore innovative approaches to the management of devolved funds (e.g. commissioning based upon outputs and outcomes). It urged the EMCCA to review the Adult Education Budget which only supports learners up to level 3 – the role of the Board to include higher technical skills should also be considered. Finally, it felt that the issue in retaining graduates was overstated and there are examples of using funding to place graduates into business – the deployment of UK SPF might be considered to help stimulate the demand for higher value jobs and make a positive contribution to graduate retention.

#### 5.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were fewer comments received concerning the proposals relating to skills compared to other proposals contained in the devolution deal - a total of 190 non-stakeholder participants provided responses. Of these, 29 made comments in support of the proposals and another 29 comments were received in opposition to them. The remainder constituted suggestions on how the proposals could be improved.

**Of the 29 participants who provided a response in support of the proposals relating to skills,** around a third of these (9) made general statements of support in favour of them. Others acknowledged that the proposals would stimulate productivity and economic growth, thereby benefitting the local economy and create jobs for local people (8).

*“Education and skills is particularly important because it will help to create new industry and revitalise neglected town centres.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

A number of participants made comments in specific support of the proposals relating to the Adult Education Budget (5) and others recognised the opportunities which would be provided for people to refresh and/or learn new skills (4).

**A total of 29 non-stakeholder participants left comments in opposition to the proposals relating to skills.** Aside from general statements of disagreement with the proposals (5), other comments questioned whether the proposals relating to skills are realistic and therefore achievable (4), whilst some felt they would lead to larger cities being prioritised at the expense of smaller towns/villages and remote areas (4). There was also some who felt the D2N2 area is too diverse in terms of industries and educational attainment to be covered by a single authority (3).

*“D2N2 does not make sense as an area with e.g. rural areas around Bakewell having little in common with central Nottingham.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Finally, there were some comments which predicted that adult education would be underfunded (2) and also a lack of adult education courses (2) which are not anticipated to deliver useful and practical skills for local jobs (2).

### Suggestions

A relatively greater proportion of comments in response to the proposal for skills made suggestions to change or improve the proposal, including:

- The need for the Adult Education Budget to be integrated and joined up (7);
- More of a guarantee that education and training would lead to a skilled workforce, resulting in jobs and an increase in employment opportunities (10);
- The need for adequate funding (8);
- Inclusion of schools alongside FE colleges and universities (10);
- The need to invest in vocational skills (6);
- The importance of equity and fairness in allocating funding between education and training providers (4);
- The importance of investing in green skills, education and training for new green jobs (5);
- The possibility for the Adult Education Budget to be allocated directly to education and training providers (3);
- The need to encourage agriculture and farming to increase food production (6);
- The need to invest in the creative industries (4).

# 6 Transport

## 6.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the proposals relating to transport as detailed in the consultation document.

### Transport

We will work with transport providers inside and outside the EMCCA Area to develop our collective infrastructure and create the best possible public transport system for our citizens, reflecting the strengths already within the four Councils to set our aspirations and support regeneration.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- A combined transport budget, with the Mayor and the EMCCA responsible for setting a transport strategy for the Area, including for public transport;
- An additional £500,000 of funding in both 2023/24 and 2024/25 ;
- The ability to accelerate the delivery of smart, integrated ticketing across all local modes of transport in the Area;
- The opportunity to coordinate a Key Route Network (a collection of the most important local authority roads within the Area) across the Area;
- Mass transit opportunities, including integrating and potentially expanding the NET tram system, in support of the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

## 6.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals relating to transport. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, there was a greater level of agreement in favour of the proposals (2,561) compared to those who disagreed with it (1,711). Of those who disagreed with the proposals, the majority (1,215) strongly disagreed.

**Figure 6.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to transport**

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to transport?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,465 agreed with the proposals relating to transport with 1,121 saying they strongly agreed and 1,344 saying they agreed. The greatest level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 492 disagreed whilst 1,212 strongly disagreed. There were 516 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the proposals relating to transport. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, the vast majority (96) agreed with the proposed arrangements, whilst only seven disagreed.

## 6.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

A total of 43 stakeholders provided specific comments relating to the proposals for transport. Of these, 16 were supportive whilst only five included an element of opposition to the proposals.

**Those making comments in support of the proposals** felt that the plans would deliver a joined up and integrated transport network (6). Another eight stakeholders offered specific support for the proposals relating to smart ticketing, with some also supporting the additional £0.5m per annum funding (4). Other comments supported the proposals because the outcome would be affordable, convenient and reliable public transport serving the proposed EMCCA area (3), whilst there was also support for proposals relating to the Key Route Network (2). In addition to this, four stakeholders offered explicit support for the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy.

**Of the five stakeholders making comments against the proposals**, there was no one issue driving this opposition. A single stakeholder felt that transport would end up being underfunded (1) whilst there was some concern that transport leading to larger cities would be prioritised ahead of smaller, more remote/rural areas (1).

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the proposals relating to transport, some of which included suggestions to enhance them. The key points include:

- Derventio Housing Trust emphasised the need for the needs of both employers and employees to be balanced and the system integrated ‘sensibly’;
- Derby City Council raised the need for tram links to go into Derby City centre in order to benefit its residents;
- Mansfield District Council highlighted the need to improve east-west links and questioned whether this would be a priority along with a focus on sustainable transport options to encourage modal shift at a local area level;
- Overseal Parish Council was concerned that Overseal might not benefit from improved transport connections compared to those into the city centres;
- Newark and Sherwood District Council supported the benefits of integrating the transport system, in particular smart ticketing;
- The Association of Local Bus Undertaking Managers was opposed to a move towards a franchising model and felt the needs of bus users should come first – these would be better understood by commercial operators;
- The East Midlands Chamber emphasised the need for an inclusive transport strategy which included improvement to rural infrastructure and connectivity, which it felt was lacking in the proposals. It also felt the Midland Mainline electrification was of vital importance given the reduced HS2 specification for the CCA area;
- Visit Peak District and Derbyshire questioned whether the transport proposals would go far enough to address the ‘last mile’ challenge and provide rural solutions. They also welcomed a smart ticketing solution;
- Derbyshire Transport Action thought that production of an area-wide local transport plan by March 2024 was ‘ambitious’. It also wanted to see more ambition in the proposals. It supported smart ticketing and agreed the need for a key route road and public transport network, along with a clean fuel infrastructure network. It emphasised the importance of sustainable transport links and felt committing to improving the existing route network is contradictory to the target of achieving net zero. It also supported the suggestion that one associate members of the EMCCA should be a planner to ensure that major housing developments can be easily served by public transport/active travel;
- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service highlighted the importance of investment influenced by the need for safer roads to reduce the numbers of people killed or seriously injured on them;

- Derwent Valley Trust highlighted the importance of an active travel network across the CCA area to encourage more walking and cycling, which might necessitate additional compulsory purchase powers to create the trails required. Also, it wanted greater capacity for the transport of bikes on trains into the more rural areas;
- The Campaign to Protect Rural England Nottinghamshire welcomed the introduction of bus franchising powers and smart ticketing and felt the new powers could help to integrate the transport system as well as encourage active travel. It also highlighted the isolation experienced by those living in rural areas whose transport services have been reduced in the recent past;
- Railfuture supported a local transport plan to integrate the network for all transport modes and also thought devolution would provide an opportunity to promote improvement via HS2, main line electrification and upgrades to regional railways. It also supported smart ticketing. It felt that more could be done to improve local routes, particularly in rural areas (e.g. Derbyshire and the Peak District/Buxton);
- The MP for Rushcliffe felt that a joined up, region wide approach to transport infrastructure planning would have a positive impact, allowing more people to access the jobs market and promote economic growth and regeneration, as well as being key to ensuring the success of the East Midlands Freeport;
- Manchester and East Midlands Rail Action Partnership highlighted the need to focus on central Derbyshire, which it felt has poor public transport and roads. It called for the reinstatement of the Peaks and Dales Line, specifically the return of fixed link connectivity between Ambergate and Buxton / Chinley via Matlock, with Derby – Manchester rail services;
- Derby and Derbyshire LAF recognised the importance of working with providers beyond the EMCCA area boundary. It questioned if funding for the Derbyshire and Derby City Bus Service Improvement Plan would be retained. It highlighted a priority to provide the necessary infrastructure to encourage active travel and emphasised the importance of complying with LTN 1/20 government guidelines to attract funding from Active Travel England;
- Nottingham Growth Board supported the proposed transport interventions and suggested that the existing Travel to Work and Travel to Learn schemes should guide an integrated transport approach across neighbouring areas. It also felt multi-modal transport should be given greater prominence in the consultation document;
- Midlands Connect recognised the importance of the East Midlands as vital parts of its network. It highlighted the ‘Share Vision’ for transport priorities in the East Midlands (which it had produced within Transport for East Midlands) and felt the priorities align with the ambitions set out in the consultation document. It set out a number of areas where they can offer support, including promoting the importance of East-West connectivity, building on the opportunities for HS2 and decarbonising the transport systems;
- The Green Party supported improvements to public transport which would encourage and enable more people to give up their private vehicles. However, it expressed concern that the proposal may enhance the cities of Nottingham and Derby at the expense of the rest of the CCA area. It also felt that the proposal was too concerned with mobility rather than accessibility;

- The CBI identified the importance of transport as a key enabler for greater productivity and to widen talent pools for businesses, thereby driving economic growth. They supported powers such as responsibility for the key route network and smart ticketing to be given to the mayor and stressed the importance of working with Midlands Connect to improve connectivity between the East and West Midlands;
- The TUC urged quick regulation of the bus network through franchising and integrated ticketing. It also wanted to establish a coordinated transport body for the region (such as Transport for the West Midlands and Transport for Greater Manchester);
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals relating to transport and felt the transport network, which its staff and students rely on, is hampered by a lack of integration. It thought the creation of the EMCCA would provide a more coherent voice for advocating connectivity with other parts of the country and highlighted its academic expertise in this area, with one of its academics currently on secondment to the Department for Transport as Chief Scientific Advisor;
- Nottingham Trent University supported the integrated approach to transport planning but would like to have seen a more cohesive look at active travel facilities through the refreshment of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

#### 6.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 525 non-stakeholders who provided comments in response to the proposals for transport. A total of 71 comments were made in support of the proposals with 84 providing comments which disagreed in some way with an element of them.

There were then a range of comments made specific to certain transport types (rather than about the overall package). In addition, 216 participants made comments which were mainly suggestions about further considerations or potential alterations to the devolution proposal.

**Of the 71 participants who provided a response in support of the proposals relating to transport,** the majority articulated their general support for the proposals (24) and welcomed how they would deliver a joined up and integrated network across the proposed EMCCA area (28).

*“I especially like the idea of integrated transport ticketing for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. This already works well in London and the West Midlands conurbation, and with Nottingham and Derby continuing to grow and become more entwined with one another, it seems silly not to have a unified transport plan as the cities are very interdependent and have much going on between them.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Smart ticketing was one particular area of the proposals which received a number of comments in support (14).

*“Integrated ticketing is essential. Public transport must be simple to use with through ticketing across modes. Standard practice throughout most of Europe.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“A system of smart ticketing across all the public transport providers in the EMCCA would be a huge step forward.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Other comments relating to the support of proposals related to specific transport types, including:

- Support for HS2 and the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy (1);
- Improvements to the road infrastructure (2);
- Provision of a more cost effective and affordable bus network (2), as well as improvements in flexibility (2);
- The importance of trams in driving the economy (2).

**A total of 84 participants left a comment in opposition to some of the proposals relating to transport.** One of the biggest concerns was whether the proposals would be sufficiently funded (24), with many not thinking that the funding allocated will be enough and the potential for smaller towns and villages, including rural areas, being less of a priority for improvement when compared to the big cities (22).

*“I do not think the money promised will be forthcoming and if it is it will not be spent properly. An extra £500,000 on transport budget will not achieve anything.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“There is no suggestion of improved rural transport or infrastructure. I cannot see how eight representatives can represent all the views of such a large and diverse area.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

There was an expectation amongst some participants that transport would continue to be poorly managed and therefore wouldn't work, with limited evidence that it has worked elsewhere to date (18). Some also did not think the proposals would result in a truly integrated transport network (10).

*“The bus franchising proposals elsewhere in England have been mired in problems and delays, and the London scheme is under pressure due to cost with government.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Other comments cast doubt on whether the smart ticketing proposals would actually work, with some thinking it was a 'red herring' given there is due to be a national scheme emerging from the Department for Transport soon (5).

*“I consider the transport element to be very thin on ideas, integrated ticketing is already being planned and implemented by the individual councils.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

There was concern that the proposals would end up being too expensive and therefore unaffordable (5) whilst perhaps not delivering benefits for local people (5). A few participants also raised concerns about the breadth of the proposed EMCCA area which would be prohibitive to an integrated network (3) and the potential for inequitable funding (2), with some not thinking it necessary anyway as they would prefer to leave it as it is (3).

There were a number of comments received which expressed opposition to the proposals relating to certain transport types, including:

- Disagreement with the prospect of HS2 and the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy (45), which could drain resources away from other priorities for railway funding (6) as well as not benefiting smaller and more remote areas (3). There was also concern about HS2's perceived negative impact on the environment (5);

*“In the light of the severe curtailment of HS2 (thank heavens!!) and other matters surrounding this ill-fated project this section needs to be rewritten to properly reflect the current government policy situation post autumn statement.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“HS2 makes no actual sense and only feeds the country's London centric way of operating which is outdated post pandemic and the rise of people working from home.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“Would not want to see area becoming embroiled in the HS2 project and find itself committed to funding money to cover that which has already been wasted on this through its mismanagement and political game playing.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

- Trams being too expensive and unsustainable because they are not self funding (16);
- Disagreement that trams should be included (14) with some not thinking they are needed (3);
- Concern that the road infrastructure will be underfunded (3) and/or unnecessary (2).

## Suggestions

There were 216 participants who made comments which were more suggestions to change or improve the proposals relating to transport, including:

- Proposals should go further to integrate transport than is actually being proposed (46);
- Extension of the transport network to reach smaller and more remote/rural areas (41);
- Proposals should be bolder to remove cars from the road and reduce car journeys, thereby lowering emissions (34);
- Guaranteeing the affordability of transport (36);
- The need to align with other proposals relating to Net Zero (20);

- The need to focus solely on public transport proposals (22);
- Extension of the network beyond the EMCCA area (18);
- The importance of properly funding the proposals (14);
- Operating and improving regulated services which are publicly controlled and not run by private operators purely for profit (12);
- The need for increased frequency (9);
- The potential for free/subsidised transport to encourage use (9);
- Specific improvements required in High Peak (8), Derbyshire (4), Derby City (3), Nottingham (3);
- Provision of a 24/7 system which is reliable and includes Sunday services (8);
- The need to propose ways of improving transport for the elderly/disabled/vulnerable (6);
- Improvements needed to better connect Nottingham and Derby (3);
- Not introducing congestion charges or an Ultra Low Emission Zone (3).

# 7 Reducing Carbon/Net Zero

## 7.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals as detailed in the consultation document.

Our carbon reduction/net zero ambition – we will work across the Area to lead the way in moving from fossil to fusion and play our part in meeting the national ambition to achieve net zero by 2050. Our ambition is that the EMCCA Area will be a leader in pioneering new forms of clean energy generation and will act as an exemplar for climate change adaption.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- An investment in the EMCCA Area of £9 million via a Net Zero funding pot;
- The opportunity to increase the Area’s electricity network capacity;
- The opportunity to explore the establishment of heat network zoning in England (this is developing heat networks in specific areas where they can provide the lowest cost, low-carbon heat to consumers) to decarbonise heating and hot water within specific zones;
- The potential for increased investment from the UK Infrastructure Bank.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

## 7.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, more agreed with the proposals (2484) than disagreed (1580).

**Figure 7.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero**

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net Zero?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,385 agreed with the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals. Of those non-stakeholders who agreed, 1,061 strongly agreed and 1,324 agreed. The greatest level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 439 disagreed whilst 1,132 strongly disagreed. There were 706 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 99 agreed with the proposals whilst only nine disagreed.

### 7.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

Stakeholders showed greater support for the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals compared to non-stakeholders. Overall, 27 stakeholders made comments about the proposals– 16 made supportive comments whilst six made comments in opposition.

**Of the 16 stakeholders which made comments in support of the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals**, 14 stated that they supported the proposals without elaborating further, and another (1) expressed conditional support. Other comments referred to energy/power renewables being aided by a renewable energy agenda (1), an extended tram network (1) and an extended rail network (1).

**Of the six stakeholders who made comments in opposition to the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals**, some (2) felt Net Zero to be unrealistic and unachievable. Further comments related to fusion energy being unrealistic and unachievable (2). There was also concern that Net Zero would be underfunded (1) and would not deliver benefits for local people (1).

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals and the key points are summarised below:

- Newark and Sherwood District Council felt that devolution would allow them to work more effectively on a larger scale to allow residents to benefit from cleaner air and lower heating costs to move towards being carbon neutral;
- The Member of Parliament for Rushcliffe supported the Net Zero plans, particularly the ambition behind the fossil to fusion project, as well as the plans to develop specific heat networks to increase the efficiency of (and decarbonise) heating and hot water systems. They also felt that the plans should be updated to include the hydrogen cluster that is currently planned for the Ratcliffe on Soar Tax Site of the East Midlands Freeport and believe this would allow the region to take full advantage of all of the decarbonisation opportunities available to them;
- The East Midlands Green Party supported the general ambitions with regard to reducing carbon, but were concerned that the commitment to Net Zero by 2050 lacked urgency and that this should be brought forward to 2030. They also felt it was unclear how the EMCCA would deliver economic growth whilst achieving its ambitions for reducing carbon/Net Zero. They expressed further concern about the references to nuclear fusion and hydrogen as sources of clean energy;
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals and also encouraged the creation of a new regional low-carbon translation centre as a strategic priority to support the transition to Net Zero and the decarbonisation of the local economy. They also suggested that the EMCCA support efforts to coordinate plans and activity, amplify the messaging and drive a shared and stretching ambition in the area;

- Nottingham Trent University suggested that the EMCCA should explore innovative approaches to the management of devolved funds and referred to the European Social Fund (ESF) as a very effective external source of funding for introducing employees to university expertise enabling them access to higher level skills. They felt that this model could be considered as a potential initiative for Shared Prosperity Funding linking to skills for low carbon;
- The Nottingham Student’s Partnership welcomed the ambition to lead on carbon reduction as they felt sustainability and the future of the environment is a deep concern for the students of Nottingham. They did, however, express concern that Net Zero by 2050 is not ambitious enough;
- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service supported the commitment to work towards a greener environment with the ambition of achieving Net Zero status by 2050 and emphasised its own commitment to doing more to reduce their own carbon footprint by taking steps to embed sustainability into service culture and operations;
- TUC Midlands believed that the establishment of a combined authority presents opportunity to set regional climate targets, roll out new infrastructure to support decarbonisation as well as retrofitting existing infrastructure. It also encouraged the EMCCA to support employers and unions to decarbonise industries and ensure that new green jobs are quality jobs;
- The National Lottery Heritage Fund welcomed the commitment to Net Zero by 2050 and strongly believed that the proposed EMCCA should consider the importance of managing landscapes in order to store carbon whilst increasing and protecting biodiversity;
- Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust supported the commitment to creating a Net Zero future for the East Midlands;

*“The East Midlands will not be the first combined authority in England, but it could be the first to really prioritise nature’s recovery. This would be consistent with the UK Government’s commitment to protect 30% of land for nature by 2030, and the East Midlands can be a vital partner in achieving this goal. Enshrining nature’s recovery into the governance of the combined authority at its inception would allow the East Midlands to steal a march on other local government structures and become a beacon of best practice in England.”*

*Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust*

- Arts Council England was in favour of environmental considerations being at the forefront of the proposed devolution deal;
- The Environment Agency felt that the formation of EMCCA represents a ‘great opportunity’ for the region to become an exemplar for climate change adaptation;
- Railfuture welcomed the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals and felt that rail offers much potential for low or zero carbon travel, both directly through electrification and indirectly through modal shift from road. It also expressed that these benefits may be strengthened should the electricity itself come from renewable sources.

## 7.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 230 non-stakeholder participants who provided a response on the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals, of which 42 made comments in support of the proposal and 84 made comments in opposition.

**Of the 42 non-stakeholders who made comments in support of the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals**, 18 stated that they supported the proposals and 19 expressed conditional support. Other comments agreed with sustainability more generally (4) and that energy/power renewables will be aided by a renewable energy agenda (2), as well as support for an extended tram network (1).

*“It is heartening to see that the EMCCA proposals strongly reflect the overriding and urgent need to move to a zero-carbon world. That this is a thread that runs through virtually every section is very encouraging.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

**A total of 84 non-stakeholders made comments in opposition of the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals**, a key factor in this opposition was the feeling that the proposals are unrealistic and unachievable (29).

*“Net zero is an unrealistic target and does not help the environment.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

There was also concern surrounding financial aspects of the proposals, including:

- High administrative costs (13);
- Potential underfunding (11); and
- A potential increase in council tax (4) and business rates (1).

*“Net Zero is yet another form of taxation tax which is being promoted.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Participants also expressed concern that the Net Zero proposals would be poorly managed (11), with eight participants stating that the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals would not deliver benefits for local people. One participant also suggested that the proposals were motivated by greed. Others (9) expressed their disagreement with nuclear power.

*“Not happy about nuclear energy - would prefer fracking, solar, tidal/water, wind, heat pumps etc.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

## Suggestions

Some responses suggested changes to the reducing carbon/Net Zero proposals. A total of 103 participants made such comments. The main suggestions included:

- The proposals should introduce measures which would protect the environment (18), mitigate climate change (13), protect woodlands and increase tree planting (13), protect greenbelt/rural areas (10), and improve sustainability (6);
- Renewable energy should be promoted and encouraged (11);
- Net Zero should be brought forward from 2050 (7);
- The Net Zero agenda should not be placed above all else (8);
- Net Zero should incentivise solar panels for homes and new builds (6); and
- Net Zero should encourage public engagement to help deliver on objectives (6).

# 8 Public Health

## 8.1 Background

Before answering this question, participants were provided with the following information regarding the public health proposals and ways of working as detailed in the consultation document.

Using powers under the NHS Act 2006, the EMCCA will complement and support the action already being taken by Constituent Councils to improve people's health and well-being across the Area.

This will allow us to consider health and well-being throughout the EMCCA's activities as well as enable work on local issues where health plays a key role, for example, tackling homelessness and rough sleeping.

Devolution will help us deliver this by:

- Ensuring that improving and protecting the public's health is a central consideration to everything the EMCCA does, including in environmental considerations, planning, regeneration and transport;
- Providing the EMCCA, under the NHS Act 2006, with the opportunity to deliver public health initiatives throughout the Area;
- Enabling the EMCCA to support the Constituent Councils with tackling local issues such as homelessness and rough sleeping through integrating the consideration of public health into use of other powers by the EMCCA such as housing powers.


A hyperlink to the consultation document was also provided for participants to review additional detail.

## 8.2 Summary of closed responses

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the proposals for public health. Of the 4,849 who responded to this question, a majority agreed with the proposed arrangements (2,490). Overall, 1,580 disagreed, with two-thirds of these strongly disagreeing (1,091).

**Figure 8.1: Agreement with the proposals relating to public health**

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to public health?



Of the 4,727 non-stakeholders who responded to the question, 2,391 agreed with proposed revised arrangements for public health with 977 saying they strongly agreed and 1,414 saying they agreed. The greater level of disagreement came from non-stakeholders – 485 disagreed whilst 1,086 strongly disagreed. There were 708 non-stakeholders who did not have an opinion either way.

Stakeholder participants were much more supportive of the public health proposals than non-stakeholders. Of the 122 stakeholders which responded to the question, 99 agreed with the proposed arrangements whilst only nine disagreed.

## 8.3 Summary of stakeholder responses

On the whole, a small number of stakeholders provided comments on the public health proposals, but of those that did, there were more in support than in opposition. Overall, 15 stakeholders made comments about the public health proposals– six made supportive comments whilst three made comments in opposition.

**Of the six stakeholders which made comments in support of the proposals on public health,** four gave their general support for the proposed arrangements, without providing further detail. Others provided conditional agreement (1) or concluded that extended tram (1) and extended rail (1) would improve public health in the region.

**Of the three stakeholder organisations which made comments in opposition to the proposals on public health** there was concern about the additional layer of government and bureaucracy which could lead to duplication (2), whilst others were concerned about the lack of funding for staff such as doctors, nurses and other healthcare professionals (1).

Key stakeholders made specific points regarding the public health proposals which are summarised below:

- Mansfield District Council queried whether or not there would be a commitment to engage with local, non-constituent authorities for any proposals that specifically affect their area (in terms of homelessness, health and social care programmes);
- East Midlands Green Party questioned how the proposals to improve health and wellbeing would integrate with the proposed CCA's four main priorities. It felt that there were no reasons given on why current health services are inadequate, and it was unclear on how the proposals would improve matters. It suggested that the proposals may add further complications to 'an already fractured environment'. It went on to say that it was not clear that any EMCCA-led activity would add any value to the work already being undertaken by constituent councils;
- NHS Derby and Derbyshire Integrated Care Board was supportive of the proposals and highlighted the importance of socioeconomic regeneration on the wider determinants of health. It went on to suggest that the NHS be considered as a member of the EMCCA arrangements. It was also keen to understand ambitions regarding public health and NHS powers;
- The University of Nottingham agreed with the proposals relating to public health;
- Nottingham Trent University agreed in principle with the inclusion of public health within the remit of the EMCCA. However, it felt it would be helpful to understand the practicalities to avoid any extra layers of complexity. It also felt that the interface between EMCCA's public health responsibility and the health and social care system needed to be fully explored.
- Nottingham Growth Board was supportive of the inclusion of public health within the remit of the EMCCA, although it was wary of creating an additional layer of complexity with the work already done;

*“It would be helpful to understand how the interface between the EMCCA and health and social care will work, there is a risk of creating an additional layer of complexity.”*

*Nottingham Growth Board*

- Railfuture felt that good public links would promote mobility for everyone and they argued this would lead to reduced social isolation and enhancing both prosperity and wellbeing;
- Derby and Derbyshire LAF highlighted the importance of parks and green spaces for health and wellbeing. It felt that public health initiatives should be targeted in deprived total areas and not just focussed in city and town centres.

#### 8.4 Summary of non-stakeholder responses

There were 227 non-stakeholder participants who provided a response on the public health proposals, of which 19 made comments in support of the proposal and 49 made comments in opposition.

**Of the 19 participants who provided a response in support of the public health proposals**, around half (10) gave no further detail than their agreement with the proposed arrangements. Two participants

felt that the proposals would deliver joined up and integrated healthcare services. A further six agreed in principle with the proposals and offered their conditional support.

*“NHS services are provided at risk in both counties and communities are struggling to engage with basic service need. Some organisations depend on social care delivery and if devolution was in place the counties would be able to provide quality safe services for all. I support this proposal and I am pleased to see this move.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

**A total of 49 participants left comments in opposition to the public health proposals for the CCA.**

The reasoning given by 14 non-stakeholder participants was that it would be a bad idea that would not work as it hasn't worked elsewhere in the country.

*“Public health functions in local authorities weak/non-existent in practice. Budgets cut. Better when in NHS. Not clear how EMCCA will work with NHS structures.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“Will this not just increase the burden on Local Authorities when they are already stretched and cannot fill vacancies? Additional funding does not solve the problem of not being able to recruit to roles, and the AEB cannot solve this short term.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

A further four participants were unhappy with the thought of an additional layer of bureaucracy or tier of government being created relating to public health. There were also concerns that larger cities may be prioritised over smaller, more rural areas (6) and that the size and diversity of the area within the CCA remit would make it unmanageable (4).

*“I am not sure about public health being done at this level, as this requires local knowledge and is better done by districts and City councils - unless there are additional levers that will support public health that the Combined Authority could pull.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Additional concerns were raised that public health would be negatively impacted (5), or would be underfunded generally (4), as well as relating to the funding of social care more specifically (4). Other concerns included:

- A lack of joined up, integrated or efficient working given this currently does not happen already (4).

*“These systems can't collaborate effectively on health and aren't ready for devolution. Manchester has shown plenty of examples of worsening conditions and it's likely that the money will be sucked into areas with more political contacts.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

- It would be expensive or incur high admin costs (3); and

- It could lead to mismanagement of funding (2).

### Suggestions

Some responses suggested changes to the public health proposals. A total of 139 non-stakeholder participants made such comments. The main suggestions included:

- Public health bodies should already be improving services without relying on devolved powers to do so (74);
- The NHS and other healthcare services should already receive more/more adequate levels of funding (26);
- That more joined up, integrated and efficient health services should be delivered (16);
- NHS healthcare services should be improved (13); and
- The network should be extended to reach more rural and remote areas (10).

# 9 Summary of other comments

## 9.1 Background

A total of 2,277 participants made general comments in response to the devolution proposals which did not fit under each of the specific themes. These comments were about the principles of devolution more generally, support/opposition for devolution, the principle of local decision making/transferring powers from the government in Westminster to the East Midlands or the specific proposals in more detail.

## 9.2 Summary of responses

A total of 2,201 members of the public made general comments. **Of these, 406 participants made comments in general support of devolution.** The majority of these (231) offered conditional support for the EMCCA proposal or just offered support for it (78). Some of the conditions presented included:

- The politics of, for example, the mayor (and whether they can work together);
- The level of involvement of existing East Midlands local authorities;
- The need to include Leicestershire;
- The potential for disproportionate spending across the proposed EMCCA area (particularly rural vs cities); and
- Potential additional layers of bureaucracy and a complicated governance structure which would not be understood by everyone.

However, there was support shown for the £1.14billion funding which would be secured from central government (67). Other comments supported the transfer of power locally, thereby allowing local people to make decisions for the benefit of the area (43) with people seeing the benefits to the area as a result (25).

There was also a feeling that devolution was long overdue and should be actioned as soon as possible (31) whilst others acknowledged the success of it elsewhere in the country (19). Some comments also felt that the deal would allow for strategic decisions and opportunities to be capitalised on in the East Midlands (24) whilst comments were also received about the integrated and efficient combined authority which would be put into place (23).

**A total of 1,726 comments were received which opposed the general principle of devolution.** Of these, some comments just cited disagreement with the EMCCA proposal (318). The overriding reason for this was the creation of another layer of bureaucracy/tier of government, which would be a duplication of the current local government structure (727). Other comments focussed on the potential high cost of implementing the devolution deal and that it would be a waste of money (490).

*“Just another layer of government managed by the same people and doing the same things as currently being done by existing councils.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

*“The cost of this new layer of local government is unnecessary. We need a slimmer local government not another layer on top of councils which are starved of funds and in the case of Borough/District Councils have consistently failed to deliver good services.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Concern was expressed that the devolution deal would create a large and unmanageable EMCCA area, which is too diverse in terms of its needs and, also, removes decision making powers from local people (378).

*“This all sounds positive for larger towns and the cities, one can see there are advantages, however I am not convinced that country areas will benefit for this proposal.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Other comments felt that devolution was a bad idea or felt that it wouldn't be properly managed and therefore wouldn't work (294), whilst the projected benefits will not materialise and promises would be broken (295). There were also concerns about the potential mismanagement of funding (229);

*“Councils in general...have a proven track record of irresponsible fiscal behaviour with taxpayers money, and no further funding or spending should be allowed by any such combined authority.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

A number of comments were also received in response to local politicians, with many viewing the proposals as a political power grab which would lead to politically (and therefore negatively) influenced decisions (200) with some believing that it is motivated by greed (87). The lack of a democratic mandate for the deal was also raised, with some wanting a public vote (123).

There was a lack of belief that local councils would/could work together under a EMCCA and therefore creation of an integrated CCA would be difficult to achieve (108), whilst other comments expressed a clear desire to retain existing geographic boundaries (34).

*“These authorities fail to address these issues individually. I'm not sure how they will address them as a combined authority.”*

*Non-stakeholder participant*

Finally, there were comments about the funding arrangement. Some felt that the funding allocations would be inequitable across the CCA (77) whilst a number of participants did not consider the deal appropriate in the current economic climate (58). Some expressed a belief that the deal would lead to a loss of services and cutbacks (30) whilst others felt it would also lead to a rise in unemployment in the proposed EMCCA area (21).

# 10 Our standards and accreditations

Ipsos' standards and accreditations provide our clients with the peace of mind that they can always depend on us to deliver reliable, sustainable findings. Our focus on quality and continuous improvement means we have embedded a "right first time" approach throughout our organisation.



## ISO 20252

This is the international market research specific standard that supersedes BS 7911/MRQSA and incorporates IQCS (Interviewer Quality Control Scheme). It covers the five stages of a Market Research project. Ipsos was the first company in the world to gain this accreditation.



## Market Research Society (MRS) Company Partnership

By being an MRS Company Partner, Ipsos endorses and supports the core MRS brand values of professionalism, research excellence and business effectiveness, and commits to comply with the MRS Code of Conduct throughout the organisation. We were the first company to sign up to the requirements and self-regulation of the MRS Code. More than 350 companies have followed our lead.



## ISO 9001

This is the international general company standard with a focus on continual improvement through quality management systems. In 1994, we became one of the early adopters of the ISO 9001 business standard.



## ISO 27001

This is the international standard for information security, designed to ensure the selection of adequate and proportionate security controls. Ipsos was the first research company in the UK to be awarded this in August 2008.



## The UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the UK Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018

Ipsos is required to comply with the UK GDPR and the UK DPA. It covers the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy.



## HMG Cyber Essentials

This is a government-backed scheme and a key deliverable of the UK's National Cyber Security Programme. Ipsos was assessment-validated for Cyber Essentials certification in 2016. Cyber Essentials defines a set of controls which, when properly implemented, provide organisations with basic protection from the most prevalent forms of threat coming from the internet.



## Fair Data

Ipsos is signed up as a "Fair Data" company, agreeing to adhere to 10 core principles. The principles support and complement other standards such as ISOs, and the requirements of Data Protection legislation.

# Appendix A – Response form



## East Midlands Devolution Consultation

The consultation will run from 14 November 2022 until midnight on 9 January 2023

ADDRESS 1  
ADDRESS 2  
ADDRESS 3  
ADDRESS 4  
ADDRESS 5

### What is the East Midlands County Combined Authority?

On 30 August 2022, Derbyshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Derby City Council and Nottingham City Council entered into a £1.14 billion devolution deal with the Government.

The Councils have now jointly produced a draft proposal which proposes to create a new entity called the East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA), including an elected Mayor. Please read the proposal document for more details on all elements of the deal ([www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk](http://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk))

If the proposal is implemented, existing funding and powers will move from London, directly to us in the East Midlands, which means that local voices will play a greater role in decision making, the area will secure more investment to support future regeneration and will ultimately deliver better outcomes for local communities.

#### Why are we proposing these changes?

Our vision is for the 2.2 million people who live and work in the EMCCA Area to enjoy better health, greater prosperity, and an increased sense of wellbeing through the opportunities available to them within an inclusive and competitive area at the heart of the country.

We believe that the funding and powers we will receive as part of creating the EMCCA can help us to deliver this vision.

#### Our shared objectives are:

- Boosting productivity, pay, jobs and living standards
- Spreading opportunities and improving public services
- Restoring a sense of community, local pride and belonging
- Empowering local leaders and communities

The draft proposal on devolution provides a unique opportunity for the EMCCA to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the people who live and work in the area.

We have identified **four priorities** to focus on:

1. **Our homes** – we will work with local authorities, landowners, developers and the full range of housing providers to promote regeneration, create affordable, good quality housing options and to retrofit existing homes to be more environmentally sustainable.
2. **Our skills** - we will work collaboratively with employers, skills providers and local authorities to ensure our citizens have the opportunity to develop key skills and access opportunities to work well and build fulfilling careers. This will also help the creation of a strong and sustainable local economy.
3. **Our transport** - we will work with transport providers inside and outside the EMCCA Area to develop our collective infrastructure and create the best possible public transport system for our citizens, reflecting the strengths already within the four Councils to set our aspirations and support regeneration.
4. **Our carbon reduction/net zero ambition**– we will work across the Area to lead the way in moving from fossil to fusion and play our part in achieving our national ambition to achieve net zero by 2050. Our ambition is that the EMCCA Area will be a leader in pioneering new forms of clean energy generation and will act as an exemplar for climate change adaptation.

### What will devolution mean?

- £38 million per annum over the next 30 years - with a total guaranteed funding stream of £1.14 billion to help level up the Area.
- The ability for local voices to play a greater role in setting and delivering to the Area's priorities.
- Local control over a range of budgets like the Adult Education Budget, so that we can target our spend to the needs of people in our communities.
- Local powers to tackle challenges specific to our Area and harness its true economic potential, for the benefit of everyone who lives and works here.
- A new Mayor for the Area to give us a bigger voice, more influence, and a higher profile to make a strong case to the Government for more investment in the Area.
- Working more effectively on a larger scale across council boundaries, further strengthening partnership working across and between our counties and cities; supporting future regeneration and ultimately delivering better outcomes for local communities.

This deal would not mean removing or merging local councils. Each council would continue to exist and would still be responsible for most public services in the area. There will be no transfer of district and borough powers as part of the draft proposal.

### What do you think?

The four councils have approved a consultation on the draft proposals. This deal would not mean removing or merging local councils.

The draft proposal document is available in the supporting documents section, along with "Frequently Asked Questions" and other documents which you may want to consider. These are available at [www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk](http://www.eastmidlandsdevolution.co.uk).



This consultation asks for your views on the different priorities proposed for the EMCCA. At the end of the survey, you will have the opportunity to provide comments on the draft proposal more generally.

The results of the consultation will be considered in the first quarter of 2023 when the four councils are asked to consider whether to agree the final proposal for submission to Government. Following submission of the final proposal it will be considered by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, and if they are content that the proposal meets the relevant requirements the devolution process will then be progressed, and legislation creating the EMCCA will be laid.

### Questionnaire

How are you responding to this consultation?

- I am a member of the public, giving my views as an individual
- I am responding on behalf of, or as a representative of, a business or organisation

Please provide the first half of your postcode:

(e.g. LS1) PLEASE WRITE IN





## Section 1 – Governance

In order that powers and funding are available, suitable governance arrangements must be put in place which provide Government with assurance that funding will be spent appropriately, and statutory functions will be delivered effectively and efficiently.

The proposed Governance will include:

- A new directly elected Mayor who will bring new powers and funding from central Government to the local level. This includes powers to set a budget and issue a precept.
- In addition, the EMCCA will feature eight members, consisting of a Lead Member and one further member appointed by each Constituent Council (Derbyshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Derby City Council and Nottingham City Council).
- The EMCCA will appoint four non-constituent members from the Area’s district and borough councils.
- The EMCCA will also appoint up to a further four non-constituent or associate members.
- The EMCCA will ensure that there is suitable representation from business.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed Governance arrangements for the East Midlands County Combined Authority?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the Governance proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.



## Section 2 – Homes

Our homes – we will work with local authorities, landowners, developers and the full range of housing providers to promote regeneration, create affordable, good quality housing options and to retrofit existing homes to be more environmentally sustainable.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- £16.8 million of funding controlled locally to spend in 2024/25 to support the building of new homes on brownfield land
- £9 million of housing capital funding to support the delivery of housing priorities
- New, broad powers to acquire and dispose of land to build houses, commercial space and infrastructure, for growth and regeneration.
- The Mayor’s power to designate Mayoral Development Areas and to create Mayoral Development Corporations (which is a statutory body created to bring forward the regeneration of a defined area). This will support delivery on strategic sites across the Area through drawing on existing work, subject to the agreement of local partners.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to homes?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the Homes proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.



## Section 3 – Skills

Our skills - we will work collaboratively with employers, skills providers and local authorities to ensure our citizens have the opportunity to develop key skills and access opportunities to work well and build fulfilling careers. This will also help the creation of a strong and sustainable local economy.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- Holding the Adult Education Budget (AEB) from academic year 2025/26
- Owning the ability to set allocations and outcomes to skills providers
- Supporting and shaping the Local Skills Improvement Plan (LSIP) for the Area.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to skills?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the Skills proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.



## Section 4 – Transport

Our transport - we will work with transport providers inside and outside the EMCCA Area to develop our collective infrastructure and create the best possible public transport system for our citizens, reflecting the strengths already within the four Councils to set our aspirations and support regeneration.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- A combined transport budget, with the Mayor and the EMCCA responsible for setting a transport strategy for the Area, including for public transport
- An additional £500,000 of funding in both 2023/24 and 2024/25
- The ability to accelerate the delivery of smart, integrated ticketing across all local modes of transport in the Area
- The opportunity to coordinate a Key Route Network (a collection of the most important local authority roads within the Area) across the Area
- Mass transit opportunities, including integrating and potentially expanding the NET tram system, in support of the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to transport?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the Transport proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.

## Section 5 – Reducing Carbon/ Net Zero

Our carbon reduction/net zero ambition – we will work across the Area to lead the way in moving from fossil to fusion and play our part in meeting the national ambition to achieve net zero by 2050. Our ambition is that the EMCCA Area will be a leader in pioneering new forms of clean energy generation and will act as an exemplar for climate change adaption.

Devolution will help us deliver this through:

- An investment in the EMCCA Area of £9 million via a Net Zero funding pot
- The opportunity to increase the Area’s electricity network capacity
- The opportunity to explore the establishment of heat network zoning in England (this is developing heat networks in specific areas where they can provide the lowest cost, low-carbon heat to consumers) to decarbonise heating and hot water within specific zones
- The potential for increased investment from the UK Infrastructure Bank.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/net zero?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the reducing carbon /Net Zero proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.

## Section 6 – Public Health

**Public Health** – using powers under the NHS Act 2006, the EMCCA will complement and support the action already being taken by Constituent Councils to improve people’s health and well-being across the Area. This will allow us to consider health and well-being throughout the EMCCA’s activities as well as enable work on local issues where health plays a key role, for example, tackling homelessness and rough sleeping.

Devolution will help us deliver this by:

- Ensuring that improving and protecting the public’s health is a central consideration to everything the EMCCA does, including in environmental considerations, planning, regeneration and transport
- Providing the EMCCA, under the NHS Act 2006, with the opportunity to deliver public health initiatives throughout the Area
- Enabling the EMCCA to support the Constituent Councils with tackling local issues such as homelessness and rough sleeping through integrating the consideration of public health into use of other powers by the EMCCA such as housing powers.

**Please find further details in the proposal document enclosed.**

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to public health?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Don’t know

If you have any comments you would like to make around the public health proposals, you will have an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire.



## Your Comments

Q7. If you have any comments you would like to make about the proposals for the East Midlands Combined County Authority, please tell us using the space below.

**PLEASE WRITE IN BELOW**





## About you

So that we can ensure we capture a diverse range of views through this consultation, it would be helpful if you could provide some information about yourself. This information is not compulsory, so please complete the questions where you feel comfortable.

The personal information you provide will only be used in the manner described in the privacy policy which is included with this questionnaire. In addition to the information provided in the privacy policy, any information submitted via this document will also be processed, analysed and reported by Ipsos on behalf of Derbyshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Derby City Council and Nottingham City Council.

**IF RESPONDING ON BEHALF OF, OR AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF, A BUSINESS OR ORGANISATION**

If you told us you are responding to the consultation with views that represent a group or organisation please complete questions 8 and 9.

If you told us you are responding as an individual, please skip ahead to question 10.

### Responding on behalf of a group or organisation

Q8. Please select the sector that best describes your group or organisation:

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Local government
- Voluntary and community sector
- Elected representative
- Civil service or government
- Charity
- Academic
- Action group
- Transport
- Business (please answer Q8b-Q8d)
- Something else
- Prefer not to say

If 'something else' PLEASE WRITE IN:





**Q8b. If you selected 'business' - please select the sector that best describes your business**  
**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY**

- Manufacturing
- Food and drink manufacturing
- Creative and digital
- Health and life sciences
- Low carbon and environmental
- Financial and professional services
- Something else
- Prefer not to say

If 'something else' **PLEASE WRITE IN:**

**Q8c. What size organisation?**  
**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY**

- Large business - a business with 250 or more employees
- Medium-sized business - a business with 50 to 249 employees
- SME - a business with 0 to 49 employees

**Q8d. Within which local authority area is your business located?**  
**PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY**

- Derby City Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Amber Valley Borough Council
- Bolsover District Council
- Chesterfield Borough Council
- Derbyshire Dales District Council
- Erewash Borough Council
- North East Derbyshire District Council
- High Peak Borough Council
- South Derbyshire Council
- Ashfield District Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- Broxtowe Borough Council
- Gedling Borough Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- Mansfield District Council
- Rushcliffe Borough Council
- Other/out of area **PLEASE WRITE IN:**

Page No.

East Midlands Devolution Consultation





Q9. Please tell us about the group, organisation, or business you represent:

Name of organisation:

Your position in the organisation:

### Responding as an individual

Q10. Please tell us which of the Local Authority Areas you live in? (NB - this is the council who collect your bins.

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Derby City Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Amber Valley Borough Council
- Bolsover District Council
- Chesterfield Borough Council
- Derbyshire Dales District Council
- Erewash Borough Council
- North East Derbyshire District Council
- High Peak Borough Council
- South Derbyshire Council
- Ashfield District Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- Broxtowe Borough Council
- Gedling Borough Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- Mansfield District Council
- Rushcliffe Borough Council
- Other/out of area PLEASE WRITE IN:

Q11. How do you describe your gender identity?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Female
- Male
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Prefer to describe as PLEASE WRITE IN:





Q12. How old are you?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- Prefer not to say
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75+

Q13. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes, limited a lot
- Yes, limited a little
- No
- Prefer not to say

Q14. What is your ethnic group identity?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

**White/White British**

- English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish traveller
- Eastern European
- Any other White background

**Asian/Asian British**

- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Kashmiri
- Any other Asian background

**Black/African/Caribbean/Black British**

- African
- Caribbean
- Any other Black/African/Caribbean background

**Mixed/multiple ethnic groups**

- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background

**Other ethnic group**

- Arab
- Other ethnic group
- Prefer not to say





Q15. What is your religion?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- None
- Christian (all denominations)
- Muslim
- Sikh
- Jewish
- Hindu
- Any other religion
- Prefer not to say

Q16. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Heterosexual or straight
- Gay or lesbian
- Bisexual
- Prefer not to say

Prefer to describe as PLEASE WRITE IN:

**END OF QUESTIONS**

**Thank you for completing the consultation document.  
Your feedback is important to us.**

Please return your completed questionnaire to us in an envelope via or freepost address  
(no stamp required):

**Freepost East Midlands Devolution Consultation**

by 9 January 2023.





## Nottinghamshire Derbyshire Devolution Consultation Privacy Policy

### This Ipsos UK Market Research Study and your personal data

- 22-079695-01 Nottinghamshire Derbyshire Devo Consultation

This Privacy Notice explains who we are, the personal data we collect, how we use it, who we share it with, and what your legal rights are.

### About Ipsos UK

- Ipsos UK Limited is a specialist research agency, commonly known as “Ipsos UK”. Ipsos UK is part of the Ipsos worldwide group of companies, and a member of the Market Research Society. As such we abide by the Market Research Society Code of Conduct and associated regulations and guidelines.

### What is Ipsos UK’s legal basis for processing your personal data?

- Ipsos UK requires a legal basis to process your personal data. Ipsos’ legal basis for processing is your consent to take part in this research survey. If you wish to withdraw your consent at any time, please see the section below covering ‘Your Rights’.

### How will Ipsos UK use any personal data including survey responses you provide?

Firstly, responding to this survey is entirely voluntary and any answers are given with your consent.

- Ipsos UK will keep your responses in strict confidence in accordance with this Privacy Policy. Ipsos UK can assure you that you will NOT be identifiable in any published results
- Ipsos UK will use your personal data and responses solely for research purposes and to produce anonymous, statistical research findings and insights

### How will Ipsos ensure my personal information is secure?

- Ipsos UK takes its information security responsibilities seriously and applies various precautions to ensure your information is protected from loss, theft or misuse. Security precautions include appropriate physical security of offices and controlled and limited access to computer systems.
- Ipsos UK has regular internal and external audits of its information security controls and working practices and is accredited to the International Standard for Information Security, ISO 27001.

### How long will Ipsos UK retain my personal data and identifiable responses?

- Ipsos UK will only retain your data in a way that can identify you for as long as is necessary to support the research project and findings. In practice, this means that once we have



satisfactorily reported the anonymous research findings, we will securely remove your personal, identifying data from our systems.

- For this project we will securely remove your personal data from our systems by 9/7/23.

## Your rights

- You have the right to access your personal data within the limited period that Ipsos holds it.
- Providing responses to this survey is entirely voluntary and is done so with your consent. You have the right to withdraw your consent and to object to our processing of your personal data at any time.
- You also have the right to rectify any incorrect or out-of-date personal data about you which we may hold.
- If you want to exercise your rights, please contact us at the below Ipsos address.
- You have the right to lodge a complaint with the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO), if you have concerns on how we have processed your personal data. You can find details about how to contact the Information Commissioner’s Office at <https://ico.org.uk/global/contact-us/> or by sending an email to: [casework@ico.org.uk](mailto:casework@ico.org.uk).

## Where will my personal data be held & processed?

All of your personal data used and collected for this survey will be stored by Ipsos in data centres and servers within the United Kingdom.

## How can I contact Ipsos UK about this survey and/or my personal data?

- **Contact Ipsos:**

Email: [compliance@ipsos.com](mailto:compliance@ipsos.com) with “22-079695-01 Nottinghamshire Derbyshire Devo Consultation” in the email subject line

**Post:**

22-079695-01 Nottinghamshire Derbyshire Devo Consultation  
UK BES Helpdesk  
Compliance Department  
Market and Opinion Research International Limited  
3 Thomas More Square  
London E1W 1YW  
United Kingdom.

## Appendix B – Codeframe

Under separate cover.

# Appendix C – Participant profile

## C.1 Gender (base=4,664)

Female	1,691
Male	2,494
Other	15
In another way	61
Prefer not to say	403

## C.2 Age (base=4,664)

U18	68
18-24	177
25-34	419
35-44	562
45-54	793
55-64	946
65-74	874
75+	342
Prefer not to say	483

## C.3 Health problem/disability (base=4,664)

Yes, limited a lot	296
Yes, limited a little	684
No	3,216
Prefer not to say	468

**C.4 Ethnic group identity (base=4,664)**

English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/ British	3714
Irish	47
Gypsy or Irish traveller	8
Eastern European	21
Any other White background	104
African	17
Caribbean	24
Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	1
Indian	36
Pakistani	10
Bangladeshi	3
Chinese	7
Kashmiri	1
Any other Asian background	16
White and Black Caribbean	15
White and Black African	3
White and Asian	29
Any other Mixed/multiple ethnic background	22
Arab	3
Other ethnic group	18
Prefer not to say	565

**C.5 Religion (base=4,664)**

None	1941
Christian (all denominations)	1778
Muslim	29
Sikh	10
Jewish	18
Hindu	12
Any other religion	120
Prefer not to say	756

**C.6 Local authority of residence (base=4,664)**

<b>Derbyshire County</b>	<b>1,516</b>
Derby City Council	365
Nottingham City Council	590
Amber Valley Borough Council	255
Bolsover District Council	122
Chesterfield Borough Council	162
Derbyshire Dales District Council	189
Erewash Borough Council	268
North East Derbyshire District Council	124
High Peak Borough Council	191
South Derbyshire District Council	205
<b>Nottinghamshire County</b>	<b>2,036</b>
Ashfield District Council	226
Bassetlaw District Council	171
Broxtowe Borough Council	383
Gedling Borough Council	421
Newark and Sherwood District Council	257
Mansfield District Council	194
Rushcliffe Borough Council	384
Other/out of area	57
Prefer not to say	100

## Appendix D – Local authority breakdown

This appendix breaks down the responses by local authority. The base size indicates the number of participants who provided information about where they live (NB – the total base across all local authorities does not add up to the total participating in the consultation because some (a) were residing out of the Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire area and/or (b) preferred not to say.

### Governance

Q1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed Governance arrangements for the East Midlands County Combined Authority?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District I	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	10%	16%	10%	16%	4%	8%	13%	14%	5%	10%	13%	18%	12%	10%	18%	11%	13%	8%	16%
<b>Agree</b>	26%	24%	33%	25%	28%	30%	25%	29%	15%	23%	29%	38%	28%	22%	34%	29%	28%	28%	27%
<b>Neither/nor</b>	11%	6%	9%	9%	16%	10%	11%	7%	14%	9%	13%	9%	10%	16%	11%	14%	14%	13%	11%
<b>Disagree</b>	14%	10%	13%	7%	10%	13%	17%	13%	20%	13%	13%	8%	13%	11%	10%	13%	14%	11%	15%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	39%	42%	36%	43%	40%	38%	32%	35%	44%	45%	31%	25%	35%	39%	25%	32%	29%	38%	27%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	*	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%

## Homes

Q2: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to homes?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	12%	17%	10%	20%	10%	13%	15%	14%	8%	8%	15%	23%	12%	13%	20%	12%	16%	11%	17%
<b>Agree</b>	28%	26%	36%	25%	24%	24%	32%	31%	25%	19%	32%	39%	28%	22%	38%	32%	33%	36%	32%
<b>Neither nor</b>	14%	11%	16%	11%	22%	15%	11%	11%	15%	12%	13%	13%	12%	18%	12%	14%	10%	9%	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	15%	12%	11%	8%	16%	14%	16%	15%	17%	20%	14%	9%	19%	16%	14%	15%	14%	13%	11%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	31%	34%	26%	36%	26%	32%	25%	27%	34%	42%	24%	16%	29%	29%	16%	25%	27%	30%	23%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	*	-	2%	*	1%	*	2%	2%

## Skills

Q3: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to skills?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District I	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	15%	19%	16%	21%	11%	16%	17%	19%	10%	14%	19%	24%	18%	18%	23%	16%	19%	17%	20%
<b>Agree</b>	31%	26%	32%	25%	36%	30%	37%	33%	27%	26%	34%	38%	32%	29%	40%	34%	33%	35%	34%
<b>Neither/nor</b>	16%	13%	19%	14%	17%	16%	12%	17%	20%	12%	15%	14%	14%	20%	14%	16%	16%	13%	16%
<b>Disagree</b>	11%	11%	7%	7%	10%	12%	11%	8%	14%	15%	10%	7%	11%	12%	9%	10%	9%	9%	10%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	25%	29%	24%	32%	23%	24%	22%	22%	26%	33%	20%	15%	24%	20%	13%	22%	23%	25%	19%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	1%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	*	2%	1%

## Transport

Q4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to transport?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District I	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	19%	28%	20%	24%	11%	18%	29%	18%	15%	16%	24%	34%	19%	17%	35%	20%	24%	15%	29%
<b>Agree</b>	27%	19%	34%	21%	30%	27%	26%	30%	18%	23%	31%	34%	33%	25%	29%	32%	30%	37%	31%
<b>Neither/nor</b>	12%	9%	11%	11%	15%	15%	8%	13%	15%	8%	10%	11%	9%	14%	8%	10%	12%	14%	10%
<b>Disagree</b>	12%	12%	9%	10%	14%	13%	12%	10%	14%	17%	10%	5%	11%	16%	12%	12%	8%	7%	8%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	30%	33%	26%	34%	28%	27%	25%	28%	38%	35%	23%	15%	28%	27%	16%	25%	25%	27%	21%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	1%	*	-	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%

## Carbon/net zero

Q5: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to reducing carbon/Net zero?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District I	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	18%	23%	19%	22%	19%	21%	18%	20%	15%	16%	24%	29%	20%	20%	30%	23%	19%	18%	29%
<b>Agree</b>	28%	20%	31%	24%	26%	26%	31%	31%	26%	22%	29%	32%	28%	25%	32%	26%	31%	35%	28%
<b>Neither/nor</b>	16%	13%	13%	14%	21%	19%	16%	12%	23%	14%	14%	15%	15%	20%	12%	15%	13%	12%	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	10%	9%	8%	9%	9%	9%	11%	9%	10%	12%	10%	7%	11%	12%	9%	10%	11%	9%	7%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	26%	34%	27%	30%	23%	24%	22%	25%	24%	36%	22%	16%	26%	19%	16%	24%	23%	24%	21%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	*	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	*	4%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%

## Public health

Q6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals relating to public health?																			
	Derbyshire County	Derby City	Amber Valley Borough	Bolsover District	Chesterfield Borough	Derbyshire Dales District I	Erewash Borough	North East Derbyshire District	High Peak Borough	South Derbyshire District	Nottinghamshire County	Nottingham City	Ashfield District	Bassetlaw District	Broxtowe Borough	Gedling Borough	Newark and Sherwood District	Mansfield District	Rushcliffe Borough
<b>Base</b>	<b>1,516</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2,036</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	16%	23%	19%	20%	12%	13%	18%	21%	14%	15%	22%	26%	14%	20%	30%	19%	24%	19%	25%
<b>Agree</b>	29%	22%	30%	29%	31%	31%	33%	32%	21%	25%	31%	35%	34%	32%	35%	32%	28%	33%	27%
<b>Neither/nor</b>	16%	12%	16%	12%	18%	16%	15%	14%	21%	13%	14%	17%	15%	15%	11%	16%	13%	11%	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	10%	11%	8%	7%	14%	9%	10%	7%	11%	12%	11%	8%	13%	12%	11%	9%	12%	11%	12%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	27%	31%	26%	30%	22%	29%	22%	23%	31%	35%	20%	13%	23%	20%	13%	22%	23%	25%	19%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	*	1%	1%	*	1%	1%	2%	*	-	2%

# Appendix E – List of stakeholders

## 3III TRAINING LIMITED

A NETWORK OF COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

AA HOMES & HOUSING LTD

ACADEMY TRANSFORMATION TRUST FURTHER EDUCATION (ATTFE)

ACCESS TRAINING (EAST MIDLANDS) LTD

ACN HOLDINGS LTD

ACTIVE PARTNERS TRUST

AGEUK

ALL SOULS ORGANISATION CIC

ALSTOM UK&I

AMBER VALLEY RAMBLERS

APPLECROSS SOLUTIONS LTD

ARTS COUNCIL ENGLAND

ASHFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL AND THE INDEPENDENT ALLIANCE ON NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL.

ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL BUS UNDERTAKING MANAGERS (ALBUM)

BEGIN (BASIC EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE)

BLUEBELL DAIRY LTD

BOLSOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

BURTON AND SOUTH DERBYSHIRE COLLEGE

C&CP LTD

CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

CBI EAST MIDLANDS COUNCIL

CJK PACKAGING LTD

CLLR DAVID J LLOYD, NEWARK & SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

COLLINGHAM PARISH COUNCIL

COMPOSITE BRAIDING LTD

CONNECT

CT MOTORS

D2N2 GROWTH HUB

D2N2 PUBLIC SERVICE COMPACT

DARLEY MOOR MOTOR CYCLE ROAD RACING CLUB LTD

DCG - DERBY COLLEGE GROUP

DEAF-INITELY WOMEN

DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

DERBY CITY COUNCIL

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

DERBYSHIRE DALES DISTRICT COUNCIL

DERBYSHIRE FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE

DERBYSHIRE TRANSPORT ACTION

DERBYSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST & NOTTINGHAMSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST

DERVENTIO HOUSING TRUST

DERWENT VALLEY TRUST

DIOCESE OF DERBY

DISTRICT COUNCILLOR, NORTH EAST DISTRICT COUNCIL

**EAST MIDLANDS CHAMBER**  
**EAST MIDLANDS COUNCILS**  
**EAST MIDLANDS GREEN PARTY**  
**EM DEVCO LTD**  
**EMA TRAINING LIMITED**  
**ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**  
**EXECUTIVE SCRUTINY BOARD**  
**FUTURES ADVICE SKILLS AND EMPLOYMENT**  
**GELDARDS LLP**  
**GIORGIOS CONTINENTAL LIMITED**  
**GMJ SOLUTIONS**  
**HODSOCK PRIORY ESTATE**  
**INNOVATION NOTTINGHAMSHIRE**  
**INSPIRE - CULTURE LEARNING LIBRARIES**  
**INSPIRE LEARNING / NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**INSPIRING PEOPLE SOLUTIONS LTD**  
**JOHN PALIN (WHOLESALE) LTD**  
**LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LINDHURST ENGINEERING**  
**MANCHESTER AND EAST MIDLANDS RAIL ACTION PARTNERSHIP LTD (MEMRAP)**  
**MANSFIELD DC**  
**MARKETING DERBY LTD**  
**MAXIMUS**  
**MEDILINK MIDLANDS**  
**MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR RUSHCLIFFE**  
**METROPOLITAN THAMES VALLEY HOUSING**  
**MIDLAND COUNTIES HEATING SERVICES**  
**MIDLANDS CONNECT**  
**MONKEY PARK CIC**  
**NEOS COMPOSITE SOLUTIONS LTD**  
**NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**NEWARK BUSINESS CLUB**  
**NEWARK TOWN COUNCIL**  
**NEXOR LTD**  
**NG1 GROUP LTD**  
**NHS DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE INTEGRATED CARE BOARD**  
**NLT TRAINING SERVICES LTD**  
**NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**NORTHERN TEA MERCHANTS LTD**  
**NOTTINGHAM CITY 5**  
**NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**  
**NOTTINGHAM CITY HOMES**  
**NOTTINGHAM COLLEGE**  
**NOTTINGHAM ENERGY PARTNERSHIP**  
**NOTTINGHAM GROWTH BOARD**  
**NOTTINGHAM HEALTH & EDUCATION**  
**NOTTINGHAM STUDENTS' PARTNERSHIP**

**NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY**

**NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM AND UNIVERSITY OF DERBY**

**NOTTINGHAMSHIRE DISABLED PEOPLES MOVEMENT**

**NOTTINGHAMSHIRE, LINCOLNSHIRE AND EREWASH CO-OPERATIVE PARTY**

**OVERSEAL PARISH COUNCIL**

**PARTNERSHIPS FOR BETTER BUSINESS LTD**

**PAUL BARTON CONSULTANCY LIMITED**

**PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PEAK NDT LIMITED**

**PLANNED CONSULTANCY LTD**

**PORTLAND COLLEGE**

**POSITIVE HOMES LTD**

**PROJECT DELIVERY CONSULTING SERVICES LTD**

**RAILFUTURE - EAST MIDLANDS BRANCH**

**RANSOMWOOD ESTATES UK LTD**

**RDC AVIATION**

**REBEL RECRUITMENT LIMITED**

**REGENCY SOURCE LTD**

**RENTING FOR UKRAINE**

**RESIDENT SERVICES, NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

**ROLLS-ROYCE SUBMARINES LIMITED**

**SACRED NATURE INITIATIVE**

**SCRASE LIMITED**

**SIMPSON JONES LLP**

**SIX TILL SIX LTD**

**SMITH COOKSON**

**SOUTH DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**SPRITE LABELS LIMITED**

**STAPLEFORD COMMUNITY GROUP**

**SYNERGY FIRE ENGINEERING LTD & SYNERGY FIRE TECHNOLOGIES LTD**

**TAGG LANE DAIRY LTD**

**THE NATIONAL LOTTERY HERITAGE FUND**

**THOMPSON BUTLER ASSOCIATES**

**THORNBRIDGE BREWERY**

**TOYOTA MOTOR MANUFACTURING (UK) LTD**

**TRADES UNION CONGRESS MIDLANDS**

**UNIVERSITY OF DERBY**

**UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM**

**UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM STUDENTS UNION**

**VISIT NEW MILLS**

**VISIT PEAK DISTRICT AND DERBYSHIRE**

**WEST NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COLLEGE**

**WEST STOCKWITH PARISH COUNCIL**

**WESTVILLE**

## Appendix F – Late responses

A total of five responses were submitted via email after the consultation closing date. These have not been included in the analysis. A brief summary of the substance of each response is shown below:

- A Derby City resident emphasised the importance of not side-lining Derby and felt more information could be included on the use of brownfield land (housing);
- Another member of the public submitted a response felt an extra tier of local government was being forced on the EMCCA area and had concerns that the district and borough councils were being left out of the system. However, the participant agreed overall with the stated aims;
- Derbyshire Police and Crime Commissioner had concerns about the possible dilution of local accountability if a proposed mayor was given responsibilities for the governance of policing. It referenced a 'lessons learnt' from the Warwickshire and West Mercia Strategic Policing Alliance (which was terminated due to the complexities of having two police forces involved within a single governance structure). This subsequently led to a breakdown in relationships across both police force areas, which created an alliance that no longer delivered efficient and effective policing to the communities of West Mercia. Finally, it urged future consultation of both Police and Crime Commissioners on any future proposal relating to the elected roles;
- Derbyshire Police felt that any devolution deal might dissolve and weaken the identify of its communities, particularly in those harder to reach communities and emphasised the importance of smaller, more nuanced connections its agencies have with communities. It also had concerns about the geographical and community variance that requires different policing, and whether this might become lost by a more complex governance structure. Finally, it placed real value in the Police and Crime Commissioner and felt it was an important element in delivering policing;
- Awsworth Parish Council did not support the EMCCA devolution proposal. This decision stems primarily from its concerns and misgivings about the potential practical implications for Awsworth Parish and its residents. Awsworth Parish Council referenced the funding amount and questioned whether it would cover inflation. It was concerned about equitable spending across the CCA area, in particular to smaller parish-level projects. It also expressed concerns about the roles of Nottinghamshire County Council and Broxtowe Borough Council being weakened over time, which could then place greater demands on the Parish precept.

# Appendix G - Technical note on coding

## Receipt and handling of responses

The handling of responses was subject to a rigorous process of checking, logging and confirmation in order to support a full audit trail. All original electronic and hard copy responses remain securely filed within Ipsos, catalogued and serial numbered for future reference.

## Development of initial code frame

Coding is the process by which free-text comments, answers and responses are matched against standard codes from a coding frame Ipsos compiled to allow systematic statistical and tabular analysis. The codes within the coding frame represent an amalgam of responses raised by those registering their view and are comprehensive in representing the range of opinions and themes given.

The Ipsos coding team drew up an initial code frame for each open-ended free-text question using the first thirty to forty response form responses. An initial set of codes was created by drawing out the common themes and points raised across all response channels by refinement. Each code thus represents a discrete view raised. The draft coding frame was then reviewed before the coding process continued. The code frame was continually updated throughout the analysis period to ensure that newly emerging themes within each refinement were captured.

## Coding using the Ascribe package

Ipsos used the web-based Ascribe coding system to code all open-ended free-text responses found within completed response forms and from the free-form responses (i.e. those that were letters and emails etc.). Ascribe is a proven system which has been used on numerous large-scale projects. Responses were uploaded into the Ascribe system, where the coding team worked systematically through the verbatim comments and applied a code to each relevant part(s) of the verbatim comment.

The Ascribe software has the following key features:

- Accurate monitoring of coding progress across the whole process, from scanned image to the coding of responses.
- An “organic” coding frame that can be continually updated and refreshed; not restricting coding and analysis to initial response issues or “themes” which may change as the consultation progresses.
- Resource management features, allowing comparison across coders and question/issue areas. This is of particular importance in maintaining high quality coding across the whole coding team and allows early identification of areas where additional training may be required.
- A full audit trail – from verbatim response, to codes applied to that response.

Coders were provided with an electronic file of responses to code within Ascribe. Their screen was divided, with the left side showing the response along with the unique identifier, while the right side of the screen showed the full code frame. The coder attached the relevant code or codes to these as appropriate and, where necessary, alerted the supervisor if they believed an additional code might be required.

If there was other information that the coder wished to add they could do so in the “notes” box on the screen. If a response was difficult to decipher, the coder would get a second opinion from their supervisor or a member of the project management team. As a last resort, any comment that was illegible was coded as such and reviewed by the Coding Manager.

### **Briefing the coding team and quality checking**

A small, core team of coders worked on the project, all of whom were fully briefed and were conversant with the Ascribe package. This team also worked closely with the project management team during the set-up and early stages of code frame development.

The core coding team took a supervisory role throughout and undertook the quality checking of all coding. Using a reliable core team in this way minimises coding variability and thus retains data quality.

To ensure consistent and informed coding of the verbatim comments, all coders were fully briefed prior to working on this project. The Coding Manager undertook full briefings and training with each coding team member. All coding was carefully monitored to ensure data consistency and to ensure that all coders were sufficiently competent to work on the project.

The coder briefing included background information and presentations covering the questions, the consultation process and the issues involved, and discussion of the initial coding frames. The briefing was carried out by Ipsos’s executive team.

All those attending the briefings were instructed to read, in advance, the consultation document and go through the response form. Examples of a dummy coding exercise relating to this consultation were carefully selected and used to provide a cross-section of comments across a wide range of issues that may emerge.

Coders worked in close teams, with a more senior coder working alongside the more junior members, which allowed open discussion to decide how to code any particular open-ended free-text comment. In this way, the coding management team could quickly identify if further training was required or raise any issues with the project management team.

The Ascribe package also afforded an effective project management tool, with the coding manager reviewing the work of each individual coder, having discussions with them where there was variance between the codes entered and those expected by the coding manager.

To check and ensure consistency of coding, at least 10% of coded responses were validated by the coding supervisor team and the executive team, who checked that the correct codes had been applied and made changes where necessary.

## Updating the code frame

An important feature of the Ascribe system is the ability to extend the code frame “organically” direct from actual verbatim responses throughout the coding period.

The coding teams raised any new codes during the coding process when it was felt that new issues were being registered. In order to ensure that no detail was lost, coders were briefed to raise codes that reflected the exact sentiment of a response, and these were then collapsed into a smaller number of key themes at the analysis stage. During the initial stages of the coding process, meetings were held between the coding team and Ipsos executive team to ensure that a consistent approach was taken to raising new codes and that all extra codes were appropriate and correctly assigned. In particular, the coding frame sought to capture precise nuances of participants’ comments in such a way as to be comprehensive.

A second key benefit of the Ascribe system is that it provides the functionality of combining codes, revising old codes and amending existing ones as appropriate. Thus, the coding frame grew organically throughout the coding process to ensure it captured all of the important “themes”.

# For more information

3 Thomas More Square  
London  
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

[www.ipsos.com/en-uk](http://www.ipsos.com/en-uk)  
<http://twitter.com/IpsosUK>

## About Ipsos Public Affairs

Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. Combined with our methods and communications expertise, this helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.

