**Appendix A - Summary of the Consultation and the Constituent Councils' Response**

This report is based upon the main themes identified through the consultation and outlines the changes to Lancashire's Combined County Authority (CCA) Proposal.

1. **Cross cutting themes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Consultation response theme** | **Constituent Council's response** | **Change to CCA Proposal** |
| 1.1 | Some concerns in relation to conduct of the consultation including:   * That the period for consultation from mid-December to mid-January, with Christmas in between was inadequate * That questions could only be answered in a way that would give a false impression of support, and not allow true feelings of respondents to be expressed * That insufficient effort was made to communicate with people | The consultation period is considered to have been adequate. There is no statutory minimum period for a public consultation. The holiday period was factored into the consultation period. The consultation ran from 1 December 2023 to 26 January 2024, a period of 8 weeks. This was a sufficient period for the consultation, which is evident from the extent of responses, both in support of and in opposition to the Proposal.  With regard to questions only being able to be answered in a certain way, this is not the case. There were both closed questions, where respondents could indicate from strong agreement to strong disagreement with the Proposal. The consultation document also allowed for free text responses in which respondents could include any response at length, and it is therefore not correct to suggest that responses were in some way restricted in nature. Comments were received setting out the reasons for opposition to the Proposal. These have been identified by the Ipsos Report and considered within this report document.  The communications strategy for the Lancashire Devolution Consultation focused on driving visitors to the website and engaging through in-person events across the proposed CCA area.  Results included: -  • Coverage by regional television, radio and other news outlets resulted in more than 100 media reports  • Best performing social media channels were Facebook, reaching over 167,000 views and Linkedin with 134,000 views  • Engagement with more than 1,500 individuals at over 50 events | No change. |
| 1.2 | Concern that the proposals are vague and lacking detail. | The Proposal sets out the intentions of the proposed CCA in relation to the various functions that the Constituent Councils seek to be devolved to the proposed CCA should it be established.  Should the CCA be formed, more detailed plans will be developed across the thematic areas in formulating the policy position of the proposed CCA. These detailed plans will, where appropriate, be subject to further consultation. Decisions required in the planning of the proposed CCA will be taken publicly by the Councils and through the Joint Committee, ensuring the process is transparent. | No change. |
| 1.3 | Concern the proposed CCA would create an additional layer of local government, with high running and administration costs. | The proposed CCA would have a role in co-ordinating the work of Councils across Lancashire, helping to improve places by being smarter about what we do. The proposed CCA will bring the governance that currently sits at national government level down into the CCA area, much closer to businesses and communities. Place making functions will be delivered through the existing arrangements, such as planning.  The Constituent Councils consider therefore that rather than adding a further layer of governance, the proposed CCA would fulfil an additional role which is beneficial to the existing regional structures of governance.  If approved, the Constituent Councils expect the proposed CCA to be funded from committed central Government funding associated with the proposed CCA, including capacity funding. In addition, the proposed CCA will be expected to generate additional income over time that will allow it to scale up its operation in line with increased levels of funding. | No change. |
| 1.4 | Concerns that the proposed arrangements would be undemocratic; that there would be reduced transparency and accountability; that there would be mismanagement of funds; and, that promises would be broken. | The proposed CCA if established would be subject to usual rules about finance, conduct and management that are designed to ensure the appropriate management of investment.  Careful consideration has been given to the intended structure of the proposed CCA. The proposed governance structure is intended to ensure accountability, including representation from outside of the Constituent Councils.  The proposed internal structures of the proposed CCA would also provide safeguards, including by way of at least one Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and an Audit Committee. Consideration will be given in establishing other elements of the internal governance structure of the proposed CCA with a view to ensuring accountability, scrutiny and transparency. | No change. |
| 1.5 | Concern the proposed CCA would not ensure an equitable approach towards the deployment of investment funding and would focus on larger towns and cities, thereby exacerbating regional inequalities and not benefitting local people. Concerns were expressed in relation to rural areas being overlooked and local people would not have a say in decision making, weakening the power and influence of district councils. | This concern was expressed in comments in relation to the various theme areas specifically, as well as comments made more generally. The response of the Constituent Councils applies to all these comments and is addressed here.  The role of all the members of the proposed CCA would be to make decisions in the best interests of the Lancashire CCA area. Investment decisions will be made in the best interests of the whole of the CCA area based on data and need, ensuring equity, transparency and accountability.  Principle five of the Proposal relates to working collaboratively, providing that “we will work collaboratively on our collective priorities sharing ideas, assets, skills and knowledge”.  The establishment of the proposed CCA would enable decisions to be taken at a Lancashire wide level, considering the interests of all areas and residents. The Proposal recognises the long history of Lancashire local authorities of joint working to deliver projects and services for the whole county. The establishment of the proposed CCA will enhance this by devolving functions which currently sit at a national level to Lancashire and much closer to businesses and communities.  The membership of the proposed CCA has also been designed to ensure that the interests across Lancashire are represented, including two non-constituent members to be nominated directly by the District Councils acting jointly.  The Proposal will not result in funding being withdrawn from existing local authorities, though it is acknowledged that funding streams may be received by the proposed CCA as opposed to directly to the Councils within Lancashire if the proposed CCA is established. Where this is the case then the Constituent Councils consider that such funding would be applied, considering the best interests of the whole of the CCA area. The proposed CCA would be better placed to secure additional funding streams.  The Proposal acknowledges that some priorities will be focussed on urban areas and others on market towns and others on rural areas. New investment will be aimed at delivering regional wide benefits.  Finally, principle seven of the Proposal “listening to residents” provides that “we will be active listeners in building our plans for Lancashire. Everyone will be able to contribute to shaping our shared future”. | No change |
| 1.6 | Concern the CCA will take UKSPF away from districts councils and therefore diminish the effectiveness of the fund. | The proposed changes to the national UKSPF programme are being led by national Government and not by the Constituent Councils. The Constituent Councils and Government recognise the continued importance of Lancashire's districts in delivering any future rounds of UKSPF. Additional wording has previously been incorporated within the Lancashire Deal text (section 36) to reflect this point.  The potential benefits of the changes proposed include that Lancashire would be able to 1) generate economies of scale from managing the funds, and 2) allow for the development of projects that area better placed to respond to Lancashire wide challenges.  UKSPF was brought in to replace European Structural Funds (ESF), previously managed at the regional and sub regional level. Any future UKSPF funding will be focused in those areas that have the highest need, as was the case with ESF. For example, when Lancashire County Council had strategic oversight of ESF it set priorities for skills and employment provision based on evidence (residents, geography, sectors) and then monitored the delivery and worked with local authorities and providers to close gaps. | Reference to be added that priorities for UKSPF will be evidence-based and funds will be directed towards areas of need. |
| 1.7 | Concern £20m of capital funding is insufficient and does not compare to the level of funding in other devolved areas. On this basis some respondents considered the devolution deal to be poor and that it should be rejected. | The initial funding is just that. The proposed CCA will be much better positioned to receive further investment, either through bidding into Government funds or being directly awarded funding, as continues to be seen in other combined authority areas.  The amount of funding to be provided is consistent with a Level 2 deal, which is what Government are prepared to offer to Lancashire at this time.  The Constituent Councils note that a number of respondents to the consultation advocated for a Level 3 deal with an elected Mayor. A Level 3 deal would offer the most potential for additional funding. This was not considered to be an appropriate step for Lancashire at this time, and the deal that has been offered by Government is a Level 2 deal.  The Constituent Councils do not consider that the devolution deal should be rejected on the basis of this level of funding being provided. | No change. |
| 1.8 | Desire for a referendum or other form of vote on the question of formation of a CCA. | The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act requires a consultation to be undertaken across the area before a Proposal for a CCA can be submitted to the Secretary of State. A referendum could not replace a consultation in this context and so a consultation was legally required to be carried out. Any referendum would also be limited in the scope of the response that would be provided, and further consultation in relation to a proposal would be required subsequent to any such referendum. The responses to closed questions within the consultation indicate an overwhelming support for the Proposal overall. | No change. |
| 1.9 | View a more fundamental local government re-organisation is required, or that devolution was not necessary to deliver the matters within the Proposal.  This included suggestions to dissolve the three Constituent Councils and create a smaller unitary authority. | The Proposal responds to the opportunity for Lancashire to form a CCA (as set out in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act) to give Lancashire a national voice and ensure that decisions about Lancashire are made locally.  Local government re-organisation would be an expensive and timely distraction for Lancashire in terms of establishing devolution.  With regard to devolution not being necessary to deliver matters within the Proposal, this is not accurate. The creation of the CCA will enable powers and funding to be transferred to it which otherwise sit at a national or individual Council level. For example, skills powers and funding currently sit with Westminster.  The suggestions to dissolve the three Constituent Councils and to create a smaller unitary authority were made by only 9 and 7 people respectively. Fundamental reform of this nature would involve significant legislative change and decision from central Government. These suggestions are therefore not considered to be viable at this time. | No change. |
| 1.10 | Doubts over the securing or realising significant or long-term investment. Any investment would be only short term. | As set out in the Proposal, devolution in Lancashire would ensure that the area benefits from a boost in Government funding.  The Constituent Councils believe that in establishing the proposed CCA they would put Lancashire in a stronger position with regard to bidding for Government funding.  In the longer term the benefits that the Constituent Councils intends to be realised in relation to each of the focus areas of the Proposal would lead to a more prosperous Lancashire and create a self-perpetuating cycle of improvement and greater wealth of the area that would lead to the ability to continue to invest and improve. The Constituent Councils recognise that investment does not only come from Government but also in the form of investment into the area from business. The Proposal would make Lancashire a more attractive prospect for business investment for the reasons set out in the Proposal. | No change. |
| 1.11 | General disagreement with the Proposal | The Ipsos Report indicates that general disagreement was expressed to the Proposal by a number of respondents. The Constituent Councils are unable to respond substantively where no further detail has been provided in relation to the reasons for disagreement or opposition to the Proposal. In contrast however, the overwhelming support for the Proposal as indicated in responses to closed questions across all themes is noted by the Constituent Councils. The Ipsos Report also indicates that comments were made providing general support for the Proposal. | No change. |
| 1.12 | Concerns that council tax would increase | As stated in the Proposal, the proposed CCA would not have the power to raise a precept and so will not be able to raise money through increasing Council Tax. | No change. |

**Consideration of consultation responses for each Theme Group area**

1. **Delivering our ambitions (Governance)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 | Positive comments were received in support of the Proposal (10.3.1 and 10.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils notes the positive responses received on this aspect of the Proposal. | No change. |
| 2.2 | Concern the CCA will not include appropriate representation from district authorities. | The commitment to a meaningful role for district councils is reflected in the principles set out on page 26 of the Proposal, including 'Effective leadership', 'Working collaboratively' and 'Being open and transparent'. This includes membership of the proposed CCA itself, which means that district councils would be participating in transport & adult skills decisions (both upper tier functions) for the first time, and therefore this represents a positive opportunity for district influence.  Districts would also be offered seats on the Audit and Scrutiny committees of the proposed CCA, meaning they would also be able to have oversight of the proposed CCA's decisions, activities and spending. The Constituent Councils have stressed repeatedly the importance of district engagement and will continue to seek to work with districts. | Amended to increase the district representation on the Audit committee to two members from district councils. There remains a wider commitment to ensure representation from district councils in the governance structures of the CCA |
| 2.3 | Concern CCA members will not be representative of local areas and might not care about local issues. | Members of the proposed CCA will be drawn from elected representatives from across Lancashire. This will mean that decisions about Lancashire currently taken by central Government will in future be taken by people who represent, understand and care about the local area. | No change. |

**3. Innovation Trade and Investment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (3.3.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal in relation to innovation, trade and investment. | No change. |
| 3.2 | Both positive and negative comments that proposals would (and would not) stimulate productivity and local economic growth. | Devolution offers opportunities to advance Lancashire's strategic economic development plans, including the Innovation Plan. Whilst there may be some doubt as to whether the proposals for innovation, trade and investment may be achievable the Constituent Councils do not consider this to be a reason not to proceed with the Proposal. The Constituent Councils consider there to be significant benefits to be gained from the Proposal and it will be for the proposed CCA if established to appropriately manage matters to ensure their success. | Information on the duty to produce an economic assessment of the proposed CCA area. |
| 3.3 | Concern plans do not considerhow inequalities, socio-economic factors and social mobility will be addressed. | Lancashire strategic economic development plans will continue to take account of the need for inclusive economic growth.  The concept of 'social value' forms an important aspect of Lancashire's Proposal and builds upon previous joint work carried out at the Lancashire level (including through the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership). | Additional information on the proposed social value framework linked to the Data Observatory. |
| 3.4 | Concern existing functions of the Local Enterprise Partnership had not been built upon by the proposal. | LEP integration is an important part of the Proposal. Both government and the Constituent Councils are committed to a strong business voice on the proposed CCA**.** The Proposal includes the appointment of an Associate Member who can represent the views of business on the proposed CCA, integrating this function of the LEP into the proposed CCA by way of the creation of a Business Board. A level of detail in relation to the proposed Business Board is included already within the Proposal, but it is considered by the Constituent Councils that further information in this regard is appropriate in light of the comments from respondents. | No change. |
| 3.5 | Views expressed that small businesses and SMEs should be prioritised and that certain sectors including the voluntary and community sector needed to have more consideration | We recognise that SMEs (including freelancers) make up a very significant proportion of Lancashire's business base. This will be relevant to the formulation of policy and exercise of functions of the CCA if established. | No change. |
| 3.6 | Suggestion to stimulate the local economy; invest in small businesses and SMEs; invest in local high streets and city centres; and, to reduce business rates | If the proposed CCA is established then the suggestions raised will be relevant to the formulation of future policy and application of the functions afforded to the proposed CCA.  The suggestion that various local organisations would need to collaborate to ensure the Proposal’s success is noted. The Constituent Councils consider that the establishment of the proposed CCA will provide enhanced opportunities in this regard. Principle five of the Proposal explicitly recognises the need to work collaboratively. | No change. |

1. **Skills**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (4.3.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal with regard to skills. | No change. |
| 4.2 | Suggestions to focus on improvements in local people’s skills to benefit the local economy; a focus on employment through practical skills; enhanced opportunities to retrain and upskill local residents; adopting a tailored approach to different areas across Lancashire; aligning training and education to the needs of local businesses; a focus on the long term unemployed; and promoting apprenticeships. | The majority of the suggestions received are supportive of the Proposal so far as it relates to skills. The Adult Education Budget would be devolved as part of the devolution deal if the proposed CCA is established and this does not involve apprenticeships. The level and type of education courses that would be funded will form part of the considerations of the proposed CCA if it is established. | Reference to the proposed skills and employment strategy for the CCA area. |
| 4.3 | Concern that adult education would be underfunded and provide courses that are not relevant to the labour market needs. | The devolution of the Adult Education Budget provides a route to influence how skills provision can link to the needs of our regional economy. There are significant sectors with huge growth potential, and we need to ensure that we are training people appropriately to fill these gaps. Examples include skills gaps in 'cyber' and 'low carbon and energy'. Devolution will enable Adult Education provision to be viewed as part of a wider jigsaw of skills and employment provision, which will enable adults to develop their skills and progress towards better paid employment.  If a decision is taken to progress the proposed CCA, the Constituent Councils propose the development and agreement of a single, shared evidence base.  The work of the proposed CCA would be informed by a Lancashire Data Observatory that would be an alliance of local authorities, industry experts and academic researchers delivering sub-regional research. This would need to draw on quantitative and qualitative information over a range of socio-economic factors (including issues raised via the consultation process around matters such as rurality, deprivation, business need, green agenda and groups furthest from the skills/ job market). This evidence base would then be used to continue to provide a focus for skills interventions and prioritisation for the proposed CCA area. | Additional information on the proposed Data Observatory. |
| 4.4 | View that the Proposal would not improve the education of children and young people, and that the CCA should invest in - schools / early years / education of children. | These age groups are out of scope for Level 2 deals and could be considered under future deals.  That said, the Skills and Employment Hub supports all secondary schools and colleges, including special schools and alternative providers to develop careers programme that meet national standards of excellence - based on local labour market intelligence. This also includes encounters with employers and experiences of the workplace, so young people are better informed about local businesses and future job opportunities. | Wording in skills section of the Proposal changed to make it clear that the focus is on adult education, including change to the title of the section to ‘Skills & Adult Education’.  Additional text to be inserted regarding the Lancashire Careers Hub. |
| 4.5 | Doubts as to whether the Proposal would prevent a skills drain to regions outside of Lancashire. | Concern was expressed from respondents that the lack of skilled workers in the area was not due to funding of training, but due to those with skills and qualifications moving out of the area because of the low pay for the same job.  The Constituent Councils do not consider this to be a reason not to procced with investment in local skills. Improving skills in the local area has the potential to attract businesses to the area and will improve the prospects of residents of Lancashire in itself. Together with investment in innovation and trade then there is the potential for the Proposal to benefit the economic performance of Lancashire whilst improving the skills and prospects of residents. | No change. |
| 4.6 | Perceived lack of benefit for local universities, and a suggestion to have coordinated efforts with universities and higher education institutions. | The proposed CCA will only receive devolved Adult Education Budget. This budget is specifically targeted at those who are aged 19 or above and on qualifications that are up to and including Level 3 skills. This does not therefore include university level courses or qualifications. Funding for Free Courses for Jobs would also be devolved under the devolution deal, but this again is not targeted at university level education.  Note: All HEIs operating in Lancashire have provided their written support for the devolution plans. | No change. |
| 4.7 | Exclusion of the voluntary and charitable sector from the Proposal. | The Constituent Councils do not consider that the voluntary and charitable sector has specifically been excluded from the Proposal. As set out above, if the proposed CCA is established then it will draw on an appropriate evidence base so as to determine a focus for skills interventions and prioritisation for the proposed CCA area. | No change. |

1. **Transport**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (5.3.1 and 5.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal about transport. | No change. |
| 5.2 | Concern about level of funding and perceived inadequacy of funding/budget; and also views that the economic benefit of transport proposals will not be realised | This is a theme dealt with in the cross-cutting section above but was also specifically raised by respondents in relation to transport proposals.  As set out above, the funding which will be received and which is specified in the Proposal is new and additional funding. Enabling the Lancashire CCA area to spend on transport networks outside of the big city regions, bus improvement plans and potholes at a regional level which will lead to better co-ordination and integration of the transport offer, which will in turn lead to economic benefits for the area. This would not be possible without the CCA. | No change. |
| 5.3 | Concerns that there will be unequal treatment of transport with rural areas particularly missing out. | Again, this is a cross-cutting theme which has been raised above but has also been specifically raised in relation to transport.  The funding already announced and allocated, and detailed in the Proposal specifically includes funding to improve transport links outside of the big city areas. We are aware that rural transport networks could be improved and we consider that the CCA will allow this to be achieved more effectively, with additional funding and in a more joined up way. | No change. |
| 5.4 | Doubts that local transport will improve or that the integrated transport network would be realised or that decision making will improve; and general disagreement with the proposal on transport. | It is proposed that the CCA will use its powers to improve and better integrate local transport and strengthen co-ordination across public transport.  Without the CCA it is not possible to co-ordinate transport across the areas of the three councils in the ways proposed. Accordingly, it is our view that the delivery of transport generally, and the decision making in relation to it will be improved by the creation of the CCA.  As set out in the cross-cutting themes above we cannot respond to general disagreement on the proposal without further specifics. | No change. |
| 5.5 | Concerns that net zero targets and targets around active travel will not be achieved or supported by the proposals. | The CCA has clear ambitions on net zero and on active travel and intends to exercise its transport functions in a way designed to achieve those objectives.  The Proposal includes specific proposals around EV charging, as well as increased spending on active travel. | No change. |
| 5.6 | Views that there should be greater investment in public transport services, active travel, and improving and maintaining road and rail infrastructure to create a more joined up, affordable and integrated transport network. | The proposed CCA will be much better positioned to receive further investment, either through bidding into Government funds or being directly awarded funding, as continues to be seen in other combined authority areas.  The CCA proposals do not include powers in relation to rail or motorways. However, wherever possible the CCA will use its greater influence to influence national policy and investment in these areas. | No change. |
| 5.7 | Views that the plans are a step in the right direction need to go further and show greater levels of ambition | The proposals reflect the level of opportunity under a Level 2 deal. Future deals would be able to build upon the current proposals in terms of level of ambition. | No change |

**6. Net Zero and Climate Change**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (6.3.1 and 6.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils notethe positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal with regard to net zero and climate change. | No change. |
| 6.2 | Devolution not necessary to achieve a focus on net zero and climate change | The Constituent Councils acknowledge that the Government has set targets for 2050 in relation to net zero and these will apply regardless of whether the proposed CCA is established. However, the Proposal would assist in achieving net zero and providing climate change benefits. This will require funding and the establishment of the proposed CCA is anticipated to provide further opportunities for the Lancashire area to bid for and benefit from additional funding sources. The anticipated £2m additional capital investment for the Cosy Homes in Lancashire retrofit scheme is one example of this. | No change. |
| 6.3 | Some respondents disagreed with the proposals suggesting that the targets were unrealistic and that residents may not be able to afford low carbon measures | The ambitions on net zero align with the national ambition and UK Net Zero targets. (There are no specific net zero targets proposed for Lancashire). The Proposal seeks to support residents with the transition to net zero, with additional investment in the Cosy Homes in Lancashire scheme to support with domestic retrofit, delivery of affordable low carbon transport options, and Electric Vehicle Infrastructure. The Constituent Councils have taken into account the negative comments set out in part 6.4.2 of the Ipsos report. | No change. |
| 6.4 | Action to mitigate climate change must be a priority. How will devolution make a difference? | The investment included in the proposed devolution deal will support delivery of local low carbon and nature recovery schemes, such as Cosy Homes in Lancashire, low carbon travel opportunities and delivery of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. It provides opportunity for the CCA to take on a key role in future energy planning and the delivery of heat decarbonisation infrastructure in Lancashire, as well as supporting the growth of the low carbon sector and development of new technology to support the move to net zero. | No change. |
| 6.5 | Concern that the Proposal was vague or lacking detail, that it should go further, and is unclear on how it would work to achieve objectives. | The Constituent Councils acknowledge that the Proposal does not include all of the detail as to how the elements of the Proposal relating to net zero and climate change will be achieved. The Proposal is intended to set out the initial details on the proposed steps that would be taken were the CCA to be established. It will be for the proposed CCA to further develop the detail in relation to these matters in formulating policy and exercising the functions of the CCA. | No change. |
| 6.6 | Suggestions at part 6.3.3 and 6.4.3 of the Ipsos Report. | A number of suggestions are made which the Constituent Councils interpret as being consistent with the Proposal. The proposed CCA will take these into account in the formulation of policy, should the CCA be established. | No change. |

**7.Digital and Cyber**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (7.3.1 and 7.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal regarding digital and cyber. | No change. |
| 7.2 | That devolution was not necessary to achieve the ambitions and objectives, including that it is not required to set up a National Cyber Force in Samlesbury. | The point regarding devolution not being necessary to achieve aims and ambitions is one which is made in relation to a number of the focus areas and is addressed in the cross-cutting themes section above. In relation to National Cyber Force, the Proposal intends that this will benefit from allocation of a proportion of the £20m capital in the current spending review that will be provided to support innovation led growth. This funding will be used to secure assets to maximise the benefits of the National Cyber Force in Samlesbury. The Proposal would also bring £6m investment to establish an Innovation Hub in the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone which will help to maximise the benefits of the National Cyber Force in Samlesbury. Such funding would be made possible by the establishment of the proposed CCA. | No change. |
| 7.3 | Concerns about the increased use of CCTV and erosion of privacy. | The Proposal does not include the increased use of CCTV or other forms of digital monitoring. To the extent that any initiatives or projects in relation to digital infrastructure that might be considered by the proposed CCA if it is established in Lancashire might involve elements of monitoring or the processing of personal data then these would be subject to the legal requirements of the data protection legislation and duties relating to confidentiality, as well as any other applicable legislation relating to monitoring and surveillance. This might include, for example, undertaking appropriate data protection impact assessments prior to a project proceeding and liaison with the Information Commissioner’s Office as might be required pursuant to relevant legislation. | No change. |
| 7.4 | Suggestions at part 7.3.3 and 7.4.3 of the Ipsos Report. | There are a number of suggestions made by respondents within these parts of the Ipsos Report. These comments do not raise opposition to the Proposal but make suggestions as to the formulation of policy by the proposed CCA should it be established. If established then these matters will be considered by the proposed CCA in formulating policy, and in the application/exercise of functions afforded to the CCA.  A number of the suggestions also raise matters that are addressed in the cross cutting themes section above. | No change. |

**8.Culture and Tourism**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (8.3.1 and 8.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal about culture and tourism. | No change. |
| 8.2 | Some considered that devolution is not needed to deliver the proposals, in particular indicating that Eden Morecambe has been announced before the devolution deal has been announced, and expressing the view specifically that devolution was not required to set up a Local Visitor Economy Partnership. | Integrating these elements into the devolution deal presents distinctive opportunities to guarantee the enduring influence of Lancashire's tourism and culture within the broader Lancashire offer. While devolution may not be essential for delivering specific culture and tourism proposals, the inclusion of these aspects in the devolution deal establishes a strategic foundation to protect and elevate Lancashire's standing as an appealing destination. The collaborative engagement with DCMS ALBs and tourism-focused organisations signifies a dedication to optimising the region's cultural and economic potential within the overarching framework of devolution. | No change |
| 8.3 | No reference to Blackpool Pleasure Beach Resort. | To add reference to Pleasure Beach Resort as an example of a major asset in relation to culture and tourism. | Reference to Pleasure Beach Resort |
| 8.4 | Suggestions at parts 8.3.3 and 8.4.3 **o**f the Ipsos Report. | There are a number of suggestions made at these parts of the Ipsos Report and the Constituent Councils interpret these are being supportive of the Proposal. The suggestions will be relevant to policy formulation and the exercise of the functions of the proposed CCA if established. | No change. |

**9.Housing and Land**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.1 | A number of comments were received in support of the Proposal (9.3.1 and 9.4.1 of the Ipsos Report) | The Constituent Councils note the positive comments that were provided in relation to the Proposal with regard to housing and land. | No change |
| 9.2 | Suggestions are made in relation to the Proposal at part 9.3.3 and 9.4.3of the Ipsos Report. | The suggestions made at these parts of the Ipsos Report are largely supportive of the Proposal. These will be taken into account in formulating the policy position of the proposed CCA if established.  A number of the suggestions also relate to matters that would be taken into account as part of any decision in relation to individual planning applications or in granting consent to development proposals. Such matters would be taken into account in the planning process.  It is noted that general comments are made as to the perceived vagueness of the Proposal. These are comments made elsewhere in relation to the key areas of the Proposal and are addressed in the cross cutting themes above. | Reference to the Lancashire Strategic Employment Sites Report (Stantec) recently developed in support of the Lancashire Infrastructure Strategy. |
| 9.3 | Support for the proposals included investment in Cosy Homes in Lancashire (although £2m is too little) | It is recognised that the additional investment secured for CHL is a relatively small amount. The proposed CCA would have the ability to bid for more funding for retrofit schemes to improve housing.  This point was also raised in relation to net zero and is also addressed above. | No change. |
| 9.4 | Opposition to the compulsory purchase of land, and that devolution is not a pre-requisite for compulsory purchase. | The compulsory purchase of land is subject to a specific statutory regime, and it would be a matter for the proposed CCA if established to decide on a case by case basis whether or not it would be appropriate to exercise the power to compulsorily purchase land.  It is noted that suggestions to the Proposal at 9.4.2 of the Ipsos Report refer to redeveloping or renovating older buildings, derelict houses and brownfield sites. This accords with the Proposal but which also recognises that ownership can lead to a blocker in the redevelopment of these sites, alongside issues such as the contamination of land. The power to compulsorily purchase land can be of particular benefit in such circumstances and enable the redevelopment of these sites to take place.  The Proposal intends that the exercise of compulsory purchase powers by the proposed CCA would require the consent of the local authority in whose area the land intended to be purchased is located. | No change. |
| 9.5 | Plans would lead to overdevelopment and overcrowding, urban sprawl, erosion of the countryside and overstretched infrastructure. | Operating at a regional level, if established, the proposed CCA would be able to support prioritisation of new housing linked more coherently to future anticipated areas of economic growth and seek to ensure coordination with infrastructure investments. This would contribute to enhancement of the self-containment of the proposed CCA area’s regional economy, reducing the need for net commuting into the region and reducing average journey to work distances. The current planning powers remain the same. | No change |
| 9.6 | Concerns as to overstretched services not keeping up with housing developments. | This is a recognised concern in relation to all local authority areas both within and outside of Lancashire. The Constituent Councils agree with the need for development to be supported by appropriate infrastructure and services, including education and healthcare for example.  The planning process enables the imposition of conditions and obligations requiring the impacts of development to be appropriately mitigated. This can involve the requirement for payment of financial contributions to be utilised in the provision of infrastructure and services, or requirements for these to be provided as part of any development directly by the developer.  By working in a joined up way across the region, the proposed CCA will seek to support the regional pipeline of proposed housing schemes, as well as focusing investment on infrastructure to enable such development. | No change. |
| 9.7 | The Proposal would not deliver more affordable homes. | No further detail is provided in the responses as to why it is considered that the Proposal would not deliver affordable homes. The Proposal explicitly recognises the need for more affordable homes. As stated in the Proposal, there is a clear understanding across Lancashire as to the brownfield opportunities. By affording the proposed CCA the proposed planning powers, including in relation to compulsory purchase, then this provides the potential for the proposed CCA to drive regeneration of sites that might otherwise not come forward for regeneration, build more affordable homes, increase supply, and bring down existing costs.  It is therefore envisaged that the Proposal has the potential to increase the supply of affordable homes across Lancashire. | No change. |
| 9.8 | The Proposal would lead to negative impacts on the countryside and open space. | The Proposal envisages the redevelopment of brownfield sites as a priority and recognises the current issue blocking the regeneration of such sites. The Proposal is aimed at addressing these matters with a view to enabling the regeneration of these brownfield sites.  If the proposed CCA is established then national planning policy would still apply. This prioritises brownfield land for development.  In this context it is not envisaged that the Proposal would lead to potential negative impacts to development any greater than currently exist, but it would provide greater opportunity to avoid such impacts by focusing development in relation to the regeneration of brownfield sites. | No change. |