







# 2022 County Deal for Suffolk



## Suffolk County Council consultation report

### Closed question responses







1. In what capacity are you responding to this consultation? (Please choose 1).Note: We understand that you might be able to answer these questions from multiple perspectives, but please pick the most important to you.				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	As a resident of Suffolk		94.62%	1690
2	As a representative of a business		1.29%	23
3	As a member or representative of a voluntary and community sector organisation		0.56%	10
4	As a member or representative of a public sector organisation (e.g. NHS, Police)		0.56%	10
5	As an elected member (e.g. Suffolk County Councillor, District or Borough Councillor or Parish or Town Councillor)		1.96%	35
6	Other (please specify):		1.01%	18
			answered	1786
			skipped	1

2. If you've indicated above that you represent a business or organisation, please provide the name of the business or organisation you are representing.				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	34
			answered	34
			skipped	1753

### 3. Is your response the formal response of your organisation?






Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		53.49% 23
2	No		46.51% 20
		answered	43
		skipped	1744

### 4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the general idea of devolving powers and funding from Government to Suffolk County Council?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		22.17% 395
2	Agree		26.26% 468
3	Neither agree nor disagree		10.21% 182
4	Disagree		10.38% 185
5	Strongly disagree		29.18% 520
6	Don't know		1.80% 32
		answered	1782
		skipped	5

<b>Agree</b>	<b>48.43%</b>
Disagree	39.56%
Neither	10.21%
Don't Know	1.8%

### 5. Control of a new £480 million investment fund over 30 years to fund local priorities

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very important		38.99%	616
2	Somewhat important		19.94%	315
3	Not very important		12.15%	192
4	Not at all important		22.09%	349
5	Don't know		6.84%	108
			answered	1580
			skipped	207






Please explain your answer (811)

<b>Important</b>	<b>58.93%</b>
Not Important	34.24%
Don't Know	6.84%

### 6. If the deal were to go through, how would you like Suffolk County Council to spend this £480 million investment fund? For example, elsewhere, this has included offering local business support, investing in infrastructure and helping people access free bus travel.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	1297
			answered	1297
			skipped	490






## 7. Control over the £9.4 million a year budget and plan for adult education in Suffolk

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very important		32.04%	447
2	Somewhat important		27.96%	390
3	Not very important		13.76%	192
4	Not at all important		21.22%	296
5	Don't know		5.02%	70
			answered	1395
			skipped	392

Please explain your answer (768)

<b>Important</b>	<b>60%</b>
Not Important	34.98%
Don't Know	5.02%

## 8. £5.8 million of new funding to develop brownfield sites for housing and new powers to purchase land for development, regeneration or infrastructure projects






Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very important		40.66%	566
2	Somewhat important		24.93%	347
3	Not very important		9.63%	134
4	Not at all important		20.91%	291
5	Don't know		3.88%	54
			answered	1392
			skipped	395

Please explain your answer (844)

**8. £5.8 million of new funding to develop brownfield sites for housing and new powers to purchase land for development, regeneration or infrastructure projects**

<b>Important</b>	<b>65.59%</b>
Not Important	30.54%
Don't Know	3.88%




**9. Multi-year transport funding, rather than on an annual basis.**

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very important		46.56%	616
2	Somewhat important		22.60%	299
3	Not very important		8.84%	117
4	Not at all important		16.86%	223
5	Don't know		5.14%	68
			answered	1323
			skipped	464



Please explain your answer (769)

<b>Important</b>	<b>69.16%</b>
Not Important	25.70%
Don't Know	5.14%

**10. The ability for residents to directly elect the Leader for Suffolk County Council in addition to their local County Councillor**

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very important		40.84%	544
2	Somewhat important		17.94%	239
3	Not very important		9.68%	129







**10. The ability for residents to directly elect the Leader for Suffolk County Council in addition to their local County Councillor**

4	Not at all important		27.03%	360
5	Don't know		4.50%	60
			answered	1332
			skipped	455

Please explain your answer (770)

<b>Important</b>	<b>58.78%</b>
Not Important	36.71%
Don't Know	4.5%

**11. Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Suffolk County Council should accept the proposed deal, including the change to a directly elected leader, which is a requirement of the deal?**

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		29.32%	394
2	Agree		19.20%	258
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.18%	110
4	Disagree		8.41%	113
5	Strongly disagree		31.62%	425
6	Don't know		3.27%	44
			answered	1344
			skipped	443

Please explain your answer (625)

11. Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Suffolk County Council should accept the proposed deal, including the change to a directly elected leader, which is a requirement of the deal?

Agree	48.52%
Disagree	40.03%
Neither	8.18%
Don't Know	3.27%

12. Do you have any other comments or anything else we should consider about the proposed deal? This includes any positive or negative impacts on you.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	663
		answered	663
		skipped	1124

13. If you choose not to answer any of these questions, please tick the 'Prefer not to disclose' option so that we are aware of your choice.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Prefer not to disclose	100.00%	274
		answered	274
		skipped	1513

### 14. Which age group do you fit into?






Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Under 16	0.00%	0
2	16-24	3.91%	46
3	25-34	8.16%	96
4	35-44	9.52%	112
5	45-54	15.38%	181
6	55-64	23.36%	275
7	65-74	23.19%	273
8	75+	10.03%	118
9	Prefer not to say	6.46%	76
		answered	1177
		skipped	610

### 15. How did you hear about this consultation?




Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Facebook	33.75%	377
2	Twitter (X)	2.51%	28
3	Local Press - Printed Newspaper	3.67%	41
4	Local Press - Online	11.19%	125
5	Word of mouth	11.28%	126
6	Radio	0.72%	8
7	TV	0.36%	4




### 15. How did you hear about this consultation?

8	Nextdoor App		10.12%	113
9	Instagram		1.43%	16
10	Youtube		8.15%	91
11	Google		1.52%	17
12	Other (please specify):		21.13%	236
			answered	1117
			skipped	670

16. The provision for disability within Equalities legislation defines a person as disabled if they have a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long term (i.e. has lasted or is expected to last at least 12 months) and has an adverse effect on the person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Do you consider yourself to have a disability according to the terms given in the Equality legislation?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		15.83% 186
2	No		73.87% 868
3	Prefer not to say		10.30% 121
			answered 1175
			skipped 612




### 17. To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Asian or Asian British: Indian		0.51% 6
2	Asian or Asian British: Pakistani		0.08% 1
3	Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi		0.17% 2






17. To which of these groups do you consider you belong?				
4	Any other Asian background - please specify in the box below.		0.00%	0
5	Black or Black British: Caribbean		0.51%	6
6	Black or Black British: African		0.17%	2
7	Any other Black background - please specify in the box below.		0.00%	0
8	Chinese		0.00%	0
9	Mixed: White and Black Caribbean		0.42%	5
10	Mixed: White and Black African		0.00%	0
11	Mixed: White and Asian		0.51%	6
12	Any other Mixed background - please specify in the box below.		0.25%	3
13	White: English		50.93%	600
14	White: Irish		1.02%	12
15	White: Scottish		0.93%	11
16	White: Welsh		1.27%	15
17	White: British		27.16%	320
18	Gypsy or Irish Traveller		0.17%	2
19	Other White background - please specify in the box below		1.02%	12
20	Prefer not to say		10.78%	127
21	Other (please specify):		4.07%	48
			answered	1178
			skipped	609

18. Are you:			
Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Female	37.33%	442

### 18. Are you:

2	Male		52.03%	616
3	Prefer not to say		8.53%	101
4	Prefer to self-describe (please specify):		2.11%	25
			answered	1184
			skipped	603

### 19. In your view, does the proposed deal have the potential to be beneficial or detrimental to you?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total	
1	The proposed deal will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)		15.86% 188	
2	The proposed deal will be detrimental to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)		14.60% 173	
3	No impact		26.58% 315	
4	Not applicable (no protected characteristics)		23.04% 273	
5	Unsure		19.92% 236	
			answered	1185
			skipped	602

Please add any comments you'd like to share to explain why you think this (204)

## Devolution Consultation Free Text responses

- Q1 (p1) In what capacity are you responding to this consultation? (OTHER) (18 responses)
- Q2 (p2) If you've indicated above that you represent a business or organisation, please provide the name of the business or organisation you are representing. (34 responses)
- Q5 (p3) Control of a new £480 million investment fund over 30 years to fund local priorities – Please explain (811 responses)
- Q6 (p52) If the deal were to go through, how would you like Suffolk County Council to spend this £480 million investment fund? For example, elsewhere, this has included offering local business support, investing in infrastructure and helping people access free bus travel (1,297 responses)
- Q7 (p134) Control over the £9.4 million a year budget and plan for adult education in Suffolk (please explain) (768 responses)
- Q8 (p174) £5.8 million of new funding to develop brownfield sites for housing and new powers to purchase land for development, regeneration or infrastructure projects (please explain) (844 responses)
- Q9 (p220) Multi-year transport funding, rather than on an annual basis (please explain) (769 responses)
- Q10 (p264) The ability for residents to directly elect the Leader for Suffolk County Council in addition to their local County Councillor (please explain) (770 responses)
- Q11 (p307) Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Suffolk County Council should accept the proposed deal, including the change to a directly elected leader, which is a requirement of the deal? (625 responses)
- Q12 (p343) Do you have any other comments or anything else we should consider about the proposed deal? This includes any positive or negative impacts on you. (663 responses)
- Q15 (p384) How did you hear about this consultation? (other) (236 responses)
- Q17 (p392) To which of these groups do you consider you belong? (other) (48 responses)
- Q18 (p393) Are you (prefer to self-describe) (25 responses)
- Q19 (p393) In your view, does the proposed deal have the potential to be beneficial or detrimental to you? (204 responses)

**DISCLAIMER: Whilst we have done our best to redact (remove) any inappropriate language, this document contains 7112 free text comments submitted by members of the public and therefore we cannot guarantee that they do not contain material that some may find offensive.**

**Q1. In what capacity are you responding to this consultation? (Please choose 1). Note: We understand that you might be able to answer these questions from multiple perspectives, but please pick the most important to you.**

Employee of SCC

Employee Suffolk County Council

England

hello

I live in england

I need work doing in y bungalow but I did live in a beautiful house so why move me were iam

Idiot on You tube

member of the public

Other (please specify):

Parish Council

Partner of resident and frequent visitor

Resident

Suffolk County Council employee

visitor to suffolk

work in suffolk

**Q2. If you've indicated above that you represent a business or organisation, please provide the name of the business or organisation you are representing.**

Adult and Community Services

Alpha Rural Services Ltd

AMS Business Consultants

Associated British Ports (ABP)

BJM IG Privacy Ltd

Bungay Community Support

Cross Country Carriers Ltd

East Coast College

East of England Co-op

Fire and Feast Suffolk

George White Associates

Guided Innovation Ltd

Haydon holdings ltd

Hedingham and Chambers

James White Drinks Ltd

Konect Bus

Langer Flood Group

Microplant

Opergy Group

Oxer & Arbon

PACT Parents and Carers Together CIC

Parburch Medical Developments Ltd

police officer

Second Meadows livery ltd, lavenham wellness centre

Snobby Eddy Crafts

Suf

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk New College

Sustrans

Sweco UK

University of Suffolk

University of Suffolk

Wolsey 550 CIC

**Q5. Control of a new £480 million investment fund over 30 years to fund local priorities –  
Please explain your answer**

.local projects to be decided

£16 m p.a is quite insufficient - it will do no more than allow central govt to shift blame and criticise the local authority

£16 m pa on every mentioned "investment" is tiny, also reducing by inflation to almost [REDACTED] all over thirty years.

£16 million a year especially after a few years will be a minimal amount. It would be better if there was a commitment from national government that went up with inflation without a major constitutional change locally.

£16 million is peanuts

£16 Million PA will only pay for a Mayor and his office.

£16 million per year for 30 years will not be enough money, especially the way SCC wastes money. This money will just mean more empires built and more money wasted.

£16m a year is not a lot around the county

£16m a year is nothing

£16m in 30 years with inflation will be to a packet of peanuts

£16M per annum is almost insignificant, it's the devolved powers that will be the real gain.

£16M per annum, before 30 years of compound inflation, is wholly inadequate to create real devolved power and prioritisation.

£16m per year is a drop in the ocean compared to the overall budget of SCC. As each year goes by that £16m is effectively eroded away and what seems a lot of money today will be very little in 10 years let alone 30 years.

£16M will likely be worth £7.87M in 2054 i.e. half of what it is today. I feel this settlement may be short sighted if not managed correctly. Given that Manchester received £736M and West Midlands £704M, is Suffolk not being short changed here? I fear this money will be squandered on vanity projects and not used where it is actually required.

£480 million might sound a lot but it is not enough over 30 years.

"£480 million over 30 years isn't very much, in fact, it's hardly any money at all over 30 years.

If it does go ahead, councilors will skim money off for themselves, it's inevitable."

£480 million over 30 years would not cover Suffolks' needs .

£480 million over the course of 30 years is a pittance compared to the money that has been taken away from SCC and the people of Suffolk by central Government cuts

£480 million vs £0 million. Is it a choice?

£480 sounds a lot - but over 30 years and not linked to inflation could leave Suffolk worse off.

£480m is a big number, but over 30 years where there will be inflation and relative to Suffolk's overall budget it looks under-baked. Better a shorter term settlement or a formula based amount per annum.

16 mill will soon disappear as costs increase over the next 30 years. Something would have to give and our council tax would increase

16 million each year over 30 years is a drop in the ocean. And as can be seen by the state of Suffolk's infrastructure in general, the councillors do not seem to be able to control or properly utilise what they have at the moment.

16 million is a drop in the ocean.....in 29yrs time it will be meaningless in monetary terms for suffolk

16m a year is insignificant in the scale of things

"16m per year is peanuts and will decrease each year with inflation. If SCC accepts the government offer it will take on more responsibilities but with not enough money to do a good job, for which the public will criticise it and the government will be pleased to have got itself off the hook by making a relatively small payment.

So, SCC and the councils must press gov for a better funding deal, which of course must be inflation linked. If it had not been for these conditions then I would have ticked the 'very important' box"

16M per year would be gobbled up in no time and probably wasted

16million/year is not a lot of money, is this index linked? 16million/year in 30 years will be a 'tiny' sum.

16mpa. Too small. Not inflation proofed. Responsibility transfers but funding declines annually.

22 Mill overspent this year, seems like 16 million to disappear on burcreacy of additional devolved services

22million overspent on existing services provided...16 million for other services. Concern is that bureaucracy will erode some of this "additional" money

480 million is insignificant over 30 years, and I don't trust it to be spent wisely.

480 over 30 years does not amount to too much money future govts likely to renege on this anyway

A conversation between residents and the county council will be more effective than nationally.

A lack of confidence that decisions made locally will be in the interests of local people. Local authorities often 'consult' using loaded questions or ignore the results if they come back with the 'wrong' result.

A load of money will be wasted in additional layers of admin and management, and as always the money will go to the cities.

A local say is clearly critical, but I wonder if the County is a suitable geography to choose. Might a slightly larger region be better - recognising some of the important elements that cross existing boundaries (Felixstowe/Harwich etc.)?

A lot can happen 30 years, so the money is not guaranteed.

A pittance dressed up to look like a lot, in order to excuse the government's responsibilities

A recipe for postcode lotteries with regard to services which should be universally available across the country.

A relative pittance with only £16m a year & not inflation proof so how much will that actually be worth from 2035 onwards?

A Suffolk Council should know what is needed locally more than central government does.

Actually very little money per year if you consider how large our funding gap is

Additional decision making coming to local leaders should be welcomed because they have an on-the-ground knowledge of where the resources need to be spent. But the reality is that £16m is a drop in the ocean compared to the current annual budget of £750m+. The other question is whether the money coming to Suffolk for those additional powers is more or less than what would be spent in Suffolk on those from central government in any case.



additional funding always welcome but it should be spent on specific projects and with minimal administration fees

Additional funding that would not be available if we don't devolve.

Additional funding would be beneficial and generally welcomed depending on conditions that may apply. The information attached indicates that the majority of the funding would not be new, such that the implication of an additional £480 million may be construed as being misleading.

Additional investment can only be a good thing for our county.

After 20 then 30 years, £16M will not be worth much at all. Any acceptance deal should demand it is triple locked funding, as pensions are at the moment. It NEEDS to rise with inflation!

All devolution, regional mayors, parliaments etc are a money sucking disaster. They fracture cohesion & waste billions of pounds. They should all be scrapped. NOT EXPANDED.

All it would mean in the long term is less money and a risk of mismanagement without government oversight

All local business' need support especially small business' who add so much to the local area by attracting visitors and encouraging locals to support their home towns. It is essential for older people access free travel to shop, visit friends etc. it is good for their mental and physical well being and will therefore also benefit the NHS. Maintaining our local roads and pavements would also be helpful, to put mildly.

All localities are different so to allow for our local council to collaborate and directly fund projects and services would be a huge boost to a more targeted allocation of funding where it's needed most.

All of the Suffolk county needs to be considered not just Ipswich

Allows Suffolk to target what is most important for funding in our communities, as what Westminster May view as important for local council May not be in line with what is actually important for the county as a whole

Although £480m over 30 years isn't going to go very far.

An integrated local plan can more effectively be planned.

Any money is important but the government will squeeze direct funding forcing council tax to increase even more.

Any shortfall would be placed on the shoulders of home and business owners, which is not fair

"Areas outside main towns need investment.... e.g. to allow children to access cultural, social and sporting opportunities, lack of transport limits this for many.

Opportunities for all age groups.... rural isolation is massive problem. Access to basic amenities e.g. GP, matter and new building in villages has made accessing these services even more difficult. And if you work full-time then accessing banks now entailed 30 mile round trip!"

As a council you waste money hand over fist. I cannot see giving you yet more will improve your ability to do things wanted by the residents of Suffolk whom you do not listen to.

As a County with a relatively small but comfortably off population, I feel that Suffolk gets ignored in the levelling up debate.

As a resident I would appreciate expenditure priorities to be clear and basis upon which they are established. Cost of road maintenance?

As a resident of Ipswich I cannot see that we will benefit given what appears to be the constant attrition between SCC and IBC. We see plenty of money squandered now vanity projects and schemes that a lot of people don't want

As a resident, it is better that local government are in charge of this fund as they're in a better position to collect enough big picture data to analyse which area in the local economy would benefit most.

as i am against devolution in any guise

As it stands the council in Lowestoft and controlling councils would get large pay rises first before the investments were used or help lower Suffolk bills like council tax

As it's not inflation linked, I feel central government may be handing over a problem

As it's not indexed, the value diminishes over time. Better to keep current arrangements in place whereby there will be spending uplifts from time to time.

As living in Lowestoft, nothing will happen everything will happen for Ipswich. Also look at London and there mayor what a joke. No way we should have this devolution

As Long as it's spent with the people in mind and bring more opportunities to Suffolk and make it even more desirable than it already is! We need more open air swimming pools and country clubs and activities for the kids ! Money needs to be put into social clubs for the young like for example Youth clubs and stuff which keeps the children out of serious trouble! Love and support is needed when dealing with the money and employing the correct people is vital.

As long as some of it used to fix the [REDACTED] potholes.

As long as the whole of Suffolk benefits and deprivation is addressed.

as long as there is accountable on what it is spent on

As someone new to Suffolk, I have come across lots of issues involving public transport and a lack of support for public services such as libraries in the few months I have lived here. I also have noticed that there are more small businesses on the high street who could use financial support than there were in my previous county. Suffolk County Council being able to use their funding as they wish would allow them to bring a higher level of understanding to the way funding is used, and would mean a more thorough use of funding, rather than the detached uses of funding that the government might use, for their lack of experience on issues across the county.

As the value will decrease in real terms, I can't see how it will be of value over a 30 year period.

"as the council aware that 480 divided by 30 is 16 million PA

the current annual budget is 752, adjusting for inflation at a rate of say 1.5 % over a 30 year period leaves a sum of 8.8 million when over the same period of time the annual budget will exceed 1 billion pounds

"

Bad idea

"Badly worded question,

SCC not capable of managing big budgets"

Be closer to the people regarding public spending

Because I say No

Because it will go on consultancy fees and the end product is very minimal to impact... there is too much bureaucracy for this to actually make a difference. The make up suffolk is too complicated from urban to rural to coastal.

Because of abuse by councillors and complete lack of accountability, look at towns like Bungay left to rot whilst Lowestoft has a bridge that goes nowhere. It's amazing how much money disappears on high end consultations.

Because that amount over 30 years is a drop in the ocean and we all know that it will be wasted because councils spend money on vanity projects

Because this money is only about a tenth of what Suffolk. Once the money is accepted it'll be all Suffolk will get

Because you couldn't run a wheel stall, but it does not matter what voters think you will do it anyway and we will be ignored as usual.

Because you will just waste it on wokery fake diversity scams and net zero which is basically a death sentence to life on this planet!

Because you won't be devolved, therefore irrelevant!

"Being able to dictate how the money is used within the local area will be more beneficial to a local area than for Central Government choosing the terms which would not necessarily fit local needs best.

Not needing to request funding for each separate area, instead being able to choose how to spend the money (and presumably when?) would also fit local priorities better"

Being able to make decisions based on local need and being able to input as a resident  
best left to Parliament

Better for democracy because the decisions are more visible and closer to home

Better for someone with a more intimate local knowledge of the requirements to decide spending priorities.

Better understanding of specific issues in Suffolk

Birmingham and Nottingham are a good reason not to devolve

Businesses do not always strive for the benefit of the community

But have severe reservations about Councillor ability to a. Decide b. Work with partners effectively on an equal ( not hierarchical ) basis. C actually drive through to see and experience outcomes.

But how do people know that the money would be spent in areas that people wanted it to be spent

But I hope to see Benefit for all Suffolk residents primarily

But I wouldn't trust SCC with this based on previous decisions made by the council. Too many other LAs are already going bankrupt due to poor decision making by councillors.

"But is this new money or just government recycling?"

also £16m a year small beer to what was taken away by centralising business rates. "

But it depends who's in control of spending it, Suffolk County Council is very top heavy and a lot of funding disappears on managers and executives rather than on services. Council tax is higher than ever, services and infrastructure are getting worse year on year. I think if more of these decisions are to be made at local level the structure within the Council needs to change to one that isn't quite as money hungry and wasteful

Can see by past years how much money is wasted that could have been used on local priorities

Can see this as being a waste of money

Central Government are not equipped enough to tailor funding to local need

Central government have no idea of the nuances required to run individual local services. Yes, we can compare with our statistical neighbours, but works in place A perfectly, would be a nightmare for place B. We need to change our ring fenced budgets, with some departments wasting money towards the end of the financial year so as not to get a smaller budget the next year. Leaving other departments, important ones at that, scrambling for funding.

Central government have no idea of the nuances required to run individual local services. Yes, we can compare with our statistical neighbours, but works in place A perfectly, would be a nightmare for place B. We need to change our ring fenced budgets, with some departments wasting money towards the end of the financial year so as not to get a smaller budget the next year. Leaving other departments, important ones at that, scrambling for funding.

Central government should be providing the same services across the country

Clearly devolution can only be worthwhile and effective if there's sufficient funding to enable it to have any real legs. I consider that £16 million spread over 30 years is not really sufficient given the serious decline in the government grant. To my mind, what is really happening here is merely the partial restoration of the previous level of government grant. There's much to be done and accordingly a more realistic funding stream would be £25 million per annum.

Clearly it's important to have access to funding that can be directed locally. But it's hard to assign the highest answer here with little idea where it would be directed.

Concerned about who exactly will be negotiating with third parties and businesses, how to spend the money, and on what, and whether they're going to be totally objective, with the necessary knowledge, experience and thorough understanding of the priorities. Plus the ability for the intricacies of Contracts, and discerning about quality of services receiving these precious 'pegged' funds.

Concerned regarding the distribution of this fund. Politics should not play a part. Wealthy areas 'hogging' the funds.

Conflating remodelling of a democratic model with a speculative comment about remittance of monies is poor logic. These monies (if obtained) would be spent in urban centres to the detriment of other areas.

Conservatives have proved they don't know the best way to spend money, locally or nationally. We may as well throw 480 million into the river lark

Control of the investment is important but I have zero belief that local councillors are competent enough to manage this.

Control over which of their friends gets the contract more like.

Control would be local

Cost of the proposed devolution settlement creating another tier of local government.

Could be targeted to where it is most effective.

Council is not able to manage current budget nevermind more money. This won't benefit the people at all.

Councils seem to be poor when it comes to making commercial decisions. Just look at Thurrock, Croydon, Northampton etc etc

Current funding is mis-spent. SEND, Highways north-east of county - examples

Deals over this long time period are meaningless it needs to be at most 10 years fund with option talks for more after 30 years is only make it sound like bigger figure than real 16m a year which seems not much at all sure get far more on grants or should explain how much on maverage you get on this to compare

"Decisions for this sort of investment should be debated and made locally. We are too centrally governed in this country.

"

Decisions relating to local matters would be decided by local people instead of remote Whitehall civil servants

Decisions taken locally ought to be better informed

Decisions will be made by local people who understand local needs and the local area

Depends if it's extra money, or money taken from elsewhere. If it's extra, it's welcome.

Depends on Council's priorities

Depends on SCC priorities for the funding.

Depends on what you mean by 'Local Priorities'. Most of Sudbury were in opposition to planned car park charges, but you just ignored the residents & businesses and stormed ahead. You have lost the public's support and trust

Depends on whether this is new money or replaces same amount of central funding. Even if the same, it's better that decisions for allocation are taken locally not centrally.

Depends what it's spent on. I'd like to see rural bus services supported. Also more health clinics - I note there is no mention of community health services in the document

Depends what money is spent on. Our roadsides are overgrown, Road signs cannot be read. Potholes everywhere. Would be ok if money was spent on these important things.

Depends where the fund is spent and on what services

"Devaluation over time will erode the payments. They need to have built in protection against inflation.

Once devolution comes in, national government can wipe their hands of responsibility.

SCCs are already in debt. I understand that would not be wiped out to give a clean slate before devolution.

As someone on FB pointed out, if the elected mayor was from one party and the council majority from another, there could be stalemate. Just look at what happens in the USA"

Devolution & funding yes...Elected Mayors no. Local govt should not be in the hands of an individual or individual party. Local politicians should govern together in the interests of the people. Too much party politics.

Devolution does not work. The funds get lost in opaque processes and unaccountability. Wales and Scotland have been a disaster for the ordinary citizen.

Devolution has been a failure across the country.

Devolution has not been a success elsewhere in the U.K. both at national or local level. The funding is never sufficient or sustainable and often mispent.

DEVOLUTION HAS WORKED IN OTHER AREAS. WANT SUFFOLK TO BE ABLE TO REPRESENT ITSELF ESPECIALLY TO CHALLENGE SOME OF THE THREATS THE COUNTY FACES AND TO SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURE THAT IS IMPORTANT FOR US

Devolution in Suffolk means Tory control. Not in the county's best interests

"Devolution is just adding a further layer of complexity and cost to an already dysfunctional government process.

UK is smaller than a US state yet has multiple layers of government. Let's have a national government that works for the whole country. Target investment not to the richest but the

poorest areas and keep doing so until the living standards of the poorest areas match those of London and the South-East then stop and evaluate."

Devolution without funding is of little use

Devolution has worked well in the uk

Different areas have different needs and the government seem to generally blanket funding across counties rather than focus on specific needs. The local councils know the areas they are in control of and can prioritise better

Direct investment in our county is vital. How can we ensure the incumbent council will ensure we get best value?

Do not trust suffolk county council as they waste so much money on their own pay, buying building not in our county and consultations that go no further and on things we the people of suffolk do not want. a total waste of money. Do no I would not trust them with even more money to be wasted

Doesn't make up for defunding and money will go to cronies

Don't think council has expertise to manage such a change

"Don't think County Council is competent enough to deal with this

"

Don't trust Suffolk council to use the money in an appropriate way. Look at how Suffolk has been letting down our SEND children. SCC need to be accountable to the Government as well as the people.

Don't think an elected mayor for suffolk is the right thing for Ipswich as I think the town would be ignored and left behind.

Don't trust that the money will be spent where its needed

East of England do not get enough funding and this is showing in the lack of attainment of our young people and the lack of investment in key areas such as Ipswich, School buildings, road network and public sector services

"Enable neglect of infrastructure to be repaired and ensure sufficient infrastructure is in place and adequate for dealing with the large growth in population

"

"Except I'll be dead by then but my grandchildren won't

However will there be any money left in 10 years because the fat cats always get it all"

Experience shows that local councils are v poor at choosing and managing investment money. You'd inevitably fritter it away or lose it like some other notable disasters

Fix potholes for a start. Currently SCC are in contravention of their duty under the Highways Act 1980.

for all the reasons you have said

For devolution to be meaningful it would have to come with an associated budget sufficient to deliver against strategic priorities

For reasons in your explanatory

"For Suffolk to take control of its funding entirely best suits its needs. Funding might, under the current system, be put in place in areas that its not strictly necessary, or is put there more than needed whilst other places suffer and are left out.

For Suffolk to prioritise its own values and needs and put this funding where is most useful would be a great way to help boost our own economy and livelihoods."

From history I have no confidence that SCC would spend this either fairly or on projects that matter.

From the deal it seems this isn't all new funding but just a change of responsibility. Clearly it needs to be index linked as inflation is volatile.

Funding would be available and allocated to areas it is needed by an organisation actually based in Suffolk and by people who are directly aware of local needs

Get all the pot holes repaired, filled!

"Given central government regularly changes these types of arrangement,. Note the changes to HS2 recently. I'm not sure it matters. Also what rate of inflation is the amount based on?

"

given cuts to local arts grants, I don't know if SCC are managing well their existing budget; or is it like Birmingham and Nottingham councils? Also if a mayor is elected how good will that mayor be.

Giving SCC £480 million would be a bad idea, they have wasted so much money already on stupid travel schemes that have made the situation so much worse in Ipswich.

Good to allow Suffolk to use funds where needed

Government and civil service dont know what local needs are

Government have underfunded for years. This is only £1.6 million pa. A complete joke

Government spending decisions will change in the future, due to budget restrictions.

Great uncertainty about where this money is to be invested

Have no idea if it would work and presumably it would rely on honest politicians

Having local control of central government funding is critical to ensuring public services deliver on local priorities. Arguments should be made to increase the scope of this Devolution to give more powers of central government funding to local bodies.

Having said I disagree with devolution this cannot be answered. If the answer is no to the first question this question is not relevant



Having worked in a Government Department as a scientist concerned with aspects of agriculture and horticulture before retirement I was that many former colleagues were not really well aware of matters outside London and the Home Counties where they lived. I doubt if much has changed in this respect

Help influence local needs and delivery of specific services

History of SCC spending government money on projects that the funding was not for.

How and who would know the wisest way to use the funding we get

How does the money compare to what has been agreed already?

"How much does Suffolk currently receive from the Government

It does not sound enough money to support our social needs far more will be required where does that money come from"

How much would be new money. Would the government just be moving the same pot of cash around. I struggle to believe this got would give Suffolk extra money.

"How will it be devolved to the 7 LAs?

Having worked in Suffolk local govt their desire/ ability to work in partnership has got a dire track record. I'd rather central govt tell Suffolk how to spend the money to prevent in-fighting and wastage. "

However, £16m per annum is not enough to cover our infrastructure and regeneration needs. We still need access to additional funding opportunities.

However, given passed investment strategy and policies I believe the electorate should have a greater say in how money is spent

However, it must not go to the Towns - it MUST address acute problems in rural small towns and parishes

I am against spending money on changing the system we have to directly elect the leader of the council. The government should give the £16 million a year to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding local authorities have suffered in the last 14 years.

I am not sure if Suffolk County Council can be trusted to invest in the right areas - but I guess they can be trusted no more or less than Government

"I am sceptical of the delivery and continued funding as promised. I would prefer the government funds all councils to provide adequate services.

I do not like this concept of bribery by government and fear greater bureaucracy. "

I believe decisions should be taken at the most local level possible. My only concern is that Suffolk has very diverse areas and there may be practical problems balancing them

I believe that Suffolk County Council working with local partners is best placed to make decisions about investing the fund. The amount represents opportunities that are best known by the local authority.

I believe that the money will not be well spent, and would rather it remained with central government, who are more accountable. Or indeed with the taxpayers in the first place, who are best placed to decide where they want to spend their own money.

I challenge the number stated, I don't think anything like that will be remitted.

I do not agree with the devolution so this question is pointless for me to answer. I answered the first question stating NO to devolution

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not have confidence that a labour controlled county council would make better decisions than a Conservative national government.

I do not have faith in this money being adequately managed

I do not think SCC is competent to control this money

I do not think SCC knows how to properly spend money for best impact

I do not think Suffolk should be in control as it is too small. We need a proper strategy for East Anglia (whether that is Suffolk and Norfolk or the wider area including Cambs and Essex). It is ridiculous to separate out Suffolk

I do not want yet more money spent on salaries for yet another layer of unnecessary bureaucracy. Spend the money on the people

"I don't believe central govt should wash their hands of responsibility and hand it to local councils.

Many councils already nearly bankrupt so needing an extra team of management and accountants plus somewhere for them to work will soon eat up and monies"

"I don't feel you're delivering well against what you do have control over. I would not have confidence in Suffolk County Council having more power.

Public transport option and road traffic are awful

Public services are poorly managed, resourced and funded. Each year you just keep stripping service.

Ipswich town centre is eroding away and nothing is being done.

Local areas are poorly maintained

Gangs hanging around everywhere.

A centre groups of foreigners that have no regard for British way of life or just common manners

Education poorly funded and supported.

Have can trust you can do anything positive when everything just feels like a failure at the moment "

I don't think the council can manage their budget now let alone being given more money to waste!

I don't trust local politicians to use this wisely

I don't trust SCC to listen to local people, they don't know what we want because they very rarely talk to us

I don't trust Suffolk County Council to manage anything let alone something of this size.

I don't want councils to have any more power than they have . Birmingham. Croydon. Thurrock as examples.

I don't belief Suffolk County Council are a strong enough body to spend the money wisely.

I don't believe that Suffolk Councils have the expertise to control this investment.

I don't feel £16m per year is a particularly large figure. Most would probably be spent on consultants with little delivered

I don't feel that SCC would be able to use this money correctly. I am worried they will waste it and still be unable to do the basic functions such as adequate send provision, roads, adult and childrens services etc. They need to do these basics right first, before they are trusted with more money

I don't have any confidence in the council to spend this money wisely. I don't have any confidence in the government spending it wisely either but less so in Suffolk county council.

I don't have much faith in Suffolk County Council as it is. Remote and mostly avoiding doing anything much that I am interested in.

I don't know who would make the decisions and what oversight would be in place. If it's managed locally the knowledge of local needs would make it more relevant. I hope

I don't know who wrote this survey but it is HIGHLY manipulative - perhaps you should have sought the advice of professionals.

I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

I don't think much spending undertaken in Suffolk is elective, it's largely focused on core services.

I don't think SCC has the intellectual capacity to spend it wisely

I don't think SCC have investment expertise to make this good value.

I don't think the money would be used wisely.

I dont trust councillors to invest money wisley.

I don't trust our local council to provide this

I don't want a mayor

I don't want devolution

I doubt I will ever see any of this money so it doesn't matter to me. I think the most intelligent and loving people should be in charge of that money, are they at government or council? I don't know. Will getting in charge of that money help lower cost of houses? Stop rents going up? Probably not. I get the feeling people have given up and are not having children hence the birth rates so the government is having to import people to top up the factories? I don't know what's going on anymore.

I fail to see how it will be put to good use fairly

I fundamentally disagree with the policy of devolution of government, including other parts of the UK. Devolution facilitates the disaggregation of national policy based on party manifesto published prior to a general election. It also facilitates different services and priorities around the country as a whole. This is divisive. As a nation, we should expect the same standards of services, education, health and infrastructure, wherever you live. Devolution breaks up the nation and discourages social cohesion.

I guess it would mean having more control on where investment is needed in the County however, my worry is around the decision making process and how this would be agreed.

"I have little faith in the abilities of any of the governing bodies.

I think the principle is excellent - local people in a governing role should know what local people want - but the reality is that the people in charge are often incompetent and power mad and don't necessarily want to deliver what local people actually want and are not sufficiently skilled or principled to do so, so the money is spent even less efficiently than it would be if controlled by central government using basic but sound principles. "

I have long believed that local people should have more control over local issues. This sort of funding will hopefully improve that

"I have no confidence that this investment would be used sensibly and proportionately to Suffolk's needs.

Put very simply, we need investment in roads, policing, and sewage and water infrastructure. Far too many houses are being built for the existing systems

"

I have no faith that SCC are able to manage this well. The cabinet and the LA officers make terrible decisions about spend, underdeliver on vital services, and support development that the county residents actively and loudly protest against (e.g. new developments in areas where they shouldn't be / pushing for Suffolk to be a 'leader in the green industrial revolution' / supporting initiatives that benefit members rather than what benefits the climate - to name a few).

I have no interest in devolution for Suffolk and no amount of money on offer would convince me otherwise

I have seen these promises before, just vote for this and you can have that (once you vote after taking the carrot the funds and promises never appear)

I am concerned that Suffolk County Council has not demonstrated enough knowledge to fully understand local needs

I imagine this money will be swallowed up to pay for something else

I just don't trust suffok county council to use it wisely

I live in Halesworth it often feels like we are not part of planning in Suffolk now made worse by the new electoral constituency

I strongly disagree with devolution for Suffolk

I suspect the money will end up being spent to raise the profile of County Councillors rather than where it is really needed

I think giving councils absolute control will not work as they mis manage our money all the time . I pay over 1,000 a year and I just get my bins emptied ! Cuts everywhere else !

I think it is important for local council to have powers to improve the area ,as long as those working there know the area well, know what they are doing and avoid cumbersome bureaucracy which causes delay and wastes resources

I think it will help target support or need in areas our rural communities but using local knowledge. It would enable them to invest in the county.

I think the elected representatives, together with advice from local government officers, are best placed to make decisions about Suffolk.

I think the Government has been poor with its investment strategy and I would like to see more support for local businesses particularly at this crucial time for the economy and employment generally. All dependent on a good business case if course

i think this is a key benefit for being able to better plan out projects and consider the future of Suffolk in the longer term.

I think we will lose out in the long term as the money grant will lose value

"I wholeheartedly believe that the provision of a £480 million investment fund over 30 years is a pivotal aspect of the proposed deal. This fund represents not only a substantial financial resource but, more importantly, it signifies a shift towards empowering local communities and authorities to determine their own development trajectories.

This level of control allows us to make informed decisions that are tailored to address the specific needs and aspirations of Suffolk County.

Furthermore, this fund offers a unique opportunity to foster economic growth, enhance infrastructure, and improve our residents overall quality of life. By collaborating with local partners, we can ensure that these investments yield tangible benefits for our community."

I work in education and have worked with other devolved areas and have seen it successfully work for upskilling specific skills for the area

I worry about how capable the local government are at managing such a budget after multiple failed Ofsted reports concerning the support of SEND in Suffolk. Will it actually go to the areas that need it most.

I would hope that with SCC gaining control of this funding they would know how best to use it in response to local issues better than that of the government.

i would prefer the government to retain control - I have no faith in the existing county council to spend money wisely

I would strongly support the redirection of these funds, inter alia, towards the provision of regular and bus/mini-bus services around the villages and to Bury St E either free or at nominal cost.

I wouldn't trust Suffolk council to run this. Leave it as it is

I wouldn't trust you lot £4.80 let alone £480m!

I wouldn't trust SCC with that amount of money, they continually waste money on bad decisions already.

I'm a bit worried about the fact that it is not index linked so the mayor would need to have plans for growth to fill the decline

I'm sceptical about another layer of government which may, in the future, evolve into something like the Scottish and Welsh assemblies or into something like the city mayors administrations. It always leads to overspending, especially when the office is inevitably granted powers to borrow. That could mean huge debts for the people of Suffolk created by local politicians who will come and go and have no interest in maintaining control as has happened in other councils across the country.

I've seen this work in Cambridgeshire

I'd like to see the investment funding local priorities in a way with a focus that would not be possible or practical from a central government perspective. I'm very keen to see what SCC can do with the fund with an in-depth understanding of the opportunities and struggles across the county, and I believe that the people of Suffolk will see more meaningful and impactful change than they otherwise would.

If it is going to be used in the right way, to develop more environmentally friendly homes and buildings, to encourage high street shops, to put in effective flood defences.

If it is spent correctly

if local counselling and decision makers can be trusted

If money spent wisely

If monies are transferred from Whitehall you forgo national joined up thinking and create even more Quangos as if we do not have enough already as some body has to run the system which is extra manpower and an empire for somebody

If the amount devalues and doesn't rise with inflation, the council won't be able to fulfil the commitments it has been elected on. It must be properly funded

If the money is available, why does it matter if we are devolved or not.... we need the money in either case.

If this money is available for investing in the region, it should not be on the proviso we vote for devolution.

If this money is spent how it is intended and not wasted. The area outside the town hall was a complete waste of money, non functional. How about moving the market to the indoor area (Debenhams store) and encouraging healthy lifestyle

If you are going to invest in Green initiatives you can have whatever, go and save the planet, ITS YOUR JOB

If you look at what some of the other areas have done with this type of funding then they are putting it into really interesting initiatives that aim to improve the the quality of life for residents. Local control of such funding enables more targeted spend of money to meet local needs in a way that isn't really possible when done at a national level where spend has to be more about national priorities and done in a set way. This type of funding could mean more innovative approaches to meet local needs.

I don't trust you. SCC took Sure Start away from Suffolk. Government will change and priorities - you won't get the money. Large sums like this are meaningless to residents. Where are the buses? They are gone

Is this actual 'new' money to Suffolk or just carved off other budgets (education, LEP, police). If its new, then how will the government afford this? If it is not 'new' then what will be the impact on existing services?

I'm 82 so unlikely to last 30+years!

I'm hesitant because Suffolk is a divided county - the countryside is staunchly conservative, backward thinking and tends towards climate change denial, while the urban parts have different views and needs. From my experience with county councillors they actively block anything they see as benefitting Ipswich in particular, but urban areas in general. Handing over control of more money to these people would not benefit the county as a whole.

I'm worried the funds will be misused and spent in areas that do not help the residents within the county

Important but nowhere near enough money, which as you say will devalue with time. Sold as a good idea, as were Academies in schools and that didn't work out either. In fact it was an unmitigated disaster.

Important not to give it to Suffolk councillors with no experience of handling this vast amount of money. Clearly the Council is more interested in money than the council tax payers.

improves wealth generation

improving rural bus services would be great

In Brandon we are needing a new cemetery, very urgently, The infrastructure has been very under funded for several years, this would be a step in the right direction. Schools are in need of financial buffers, and all ages I feel would benefit from this idea.

In context it's nothing much

In general I think this is a bad idea. Open to mismanagement and don't see that the funds would be allocated fairly.

In principle I like the idea of local determination of expenditure but £16m pa that is not index linked over 30 years is paltry - its not enough and I suspect you will find we are excluded from other bidding processes over the years.

In the current climate, the Council needs all the money it can get. But I would like to think every effort will be made to involve local people in identifying the local priorities against which the money will be spent.

In the great scheme of thing it is a small amount on money for a political vanity project

In the scheme of thing this is a drop in the ocean.

In theory an excellent idea

In theory, this is a good idea. In practise, most of the local services that I think poorly executed are run by Suffolk council (not Ipswich). I therefore have no faith that these funds won't be wasted.

Increased bus routes within rural areas would aid productivity

Increased responsibility over budget control and service allocations has both positives and negatives but if managed effectively could be a benefit to the people, businesses, and communities of Suffolk. However, I don't believe the value negotiated is sufficient at just a 2% increase to this year's budget, a budget in which the council are proposing £65m in savings and raising council tax by the maximum permitted (4.99%). Therefore, the impact of such a nominal increase to annual budgets will do little more than plug the gap in the short-term, or in the best case, support increased maintenance and service efficiencies rather than infrastructure investment and improvement, and operational growth as intended. And should a devolution settlement lead to fewer opportunities to secure larger investments to support this through bids/grant funding etc, then this could lead to a decline in such improvement opportunities. This would be compounded in a future where inflation may be higher as the proposed settlement is neither inflation-linked or proportionate to the annual budget. The outcome of increased control over budget allocations may also result in inter-departmental in-fighting and exacerbate siloed working conditions further diminishing the authority's ability to realise the full potential of a devolution deal.

Inflation will affect the amount and it will only decrease. Central Government are transferring responsibility for some services and will turn their back on them if the funding proves to insufficient.

Inflation will go up under a labour government thereby reducing the value by 25%

Inflation will limit this and 480m is not going to be inflation proofed.



Inflation, school transport for children with SEND, and looking after children in care are the main factors for SCC forecasting to spend £22.3m over its £688.1m budget for the year 2023. School transport for send and children in care are 'factors' that directly impact me. 16 million in these terms does not even cover recent over spends! Decreasing fund with inflation just sounds like another political spin on a lose-lose situation

Information about these “deals” would need to be made available to local people and transparency should be of paramount importance.

Infrastructure and transport and rural disadvantage being addressed are important to me as well as affordable housing and renewable energy in rural communities

Infrastructure such as roads, footpaths and cycle lanes as well as good low cost transport are important to me.

Initially very important , but £16 million's not going to be worth a lot in 30 years time. An inflation linked fund for a shorter period would be more beneficial

Insufficient sum to make much difference over 30 years

Ipswich deserves devolution

Ipswich has long been crying out for investment in key areas, I understand that this is only one section of the county, however - the council managing this funding means that it can go to areas that locals want improvements, and not just where national governance THINKS money should be spent

Ipswich will be ignored and not benefit just as it doesn't now.

Irrelevant amount of money.

is that up front or split over 30 years ? Is it index linked? Is it that and no more? Can it be withdrawn after some years? £480m over 30 years is nothing

Is the £480 million a replacement for existing funding or new funding on top of what already exists? Also the fund is not index linked so it will lose value over the 30 years.

Is this money on top of the money from central government? Would accepting this deal mean the council couldn't bid for other pots of money for projects? Your list of examples doesn't include one of the most important things which needs funding - adult social care.

It actually does not sound like very much per annum and with no inflationary increase it seems it's just the uk government trying to save money again.

It adds another layer of decision making and continues decentralisation of responsibilities and money.

it allows local council to place local people / council to have more of a say and funding to the local area (Haverhill)

It appears to allow the public to have more of a say on what this money should be spent on. Recently, it may be best put into the highways (potholes, drainage, transport links etc.) as this has been a key issue recently.

It could help build a lot of the things Suffolk needs like new roads, bridges and new waste sites

It depends how well it is utilised. It could be wasted on ill thought-through schemes.

It depends what the costs cover, as a resident in a village we have issues with speeding, cars being hit all the time but no CCTV and HGVs coming through who shouldn't. Instead the council bought themselves 4 brand new electric volvos... is this was the budget will be spent on? Whoes going to be governing the budget?

It doesn't amount to that much relative to the county council annual budget.

It doesn't mean anything without an understanding of the amount in the context of the size of the rest of the budget or an increase in overall funding

It doesn't seem right that we get £16 million over 30 years which decreases in value if inflation increases - this causes me concern. However I feel as if we need to be sitting at the table in order to be able to renegotiate, rather than saying no because of this.

It gives some security and the ability to make longer-term decisions. I would have liked to see a form of index-linking to this. I have two concerns; first I am not 100% confident that SCC will make a better job than Central Government and secondly, as and when we see changes in control of the Council that we see the longer-term needs of the County take precedence over party politics

It gives Suffolk the opportunity to direct investment and match funding to our economic priorities.

it has already been seen in other councils in the UK that any money will be wasted on pet projects and when it runs out other services will be cut to make up for it.

it is 480 million we won't get without this deal

It is a concern that the money is not index linked and its value will go down in real terms.

It is a drop in the ocean for what needs to be done to improve many areas in Suffolk. A better deal should be looked into.

It is a stepping stone to greater devolution in the area - I think we should have more control over funding received from government.

It is a tiny amount of money over 30 years when not linked to inflation.

It is a very poor deal with no guarantee

It is a very small amount, and in any case, a why should we believe a thirty year promise will be kept? It's not serious.

It is better for funds to be available locally to invest in local ideas, rather than having to go to Central Government to "ask" for funding.

It is extremely important but I not believe that the deal should be accepted i.e. no devolution.

"It is important as if no managed appropriately could be spent on a number of worthless projects.

Spending needs to be on projects that will improve Suffolk, the employment, financial status and welfare of those in Suffolk and prepare Suffolk for the future - infrastructure to help with green tech.

"

It is important as there needs to be more consultation on what is vitally needed

It is important that finance is allocated to areas of importance/need that are specific to Suffolk and its communities

It is important the the funding is in suffolk I just don't trust suffolk county council to manage it. It should be with the districts

It is important. However SCC have proven to squander money and should not be given more to use as their own personal piggy bank! Also, it decreases with inflation, a grant should be a grant!

It is not a huge amount of money compared with SCC budget

It is only £16m a year and this is insignificant compared to the overall shortfall across the rest of the County Council.

It is too easy for a national government to starve local government of funds and then blame local government for the failures. That happens enough already and devolving more funds and responsibilities makes that even more likely.

"It is very easy - give stupid people a budget and they will simply [REDACTED] money away as they have done in Mid-Suffolk and many other councils. Most of the County Councillors (and officers) are not financially literate enough to run a wheel stall! 😬"

And, FYI, yes I have stood against some of them in the past!"

it is very important as long as it is used effectively

it is very important for SCC and the other Local Authorities to have more control over services that are provided to residents and businesses of the county, but this sum isn't enough to make a substantial difference and it should be index linked, so that it doesn't decrease with inflation

It is very important for the county but, don't think giving the council full control would be wise.

It is very plain for all to see that devolution for Scotland and Wales isn't working. Why would Suffolk be any different?

It may not be that much money in real terms and it could be "passing the buck." ie things go wrong and the council is blamed rather than the government

It rather depends who controls it and whether you spend it wisely but on face value it would be very good for Suffolk.

It represents so little money per person that changing the entirety of Suffolk's governance structure for it is laughable. The government's obsession with creating "jobs for politicians" and pretending that these people will have more democratic legitimacy than 75 elected councillors from across Suffolk is maddening. £16M a year isn't even £22 per person extra per year? What a pointless amount of money to rip apart the constitution for, just so you can pretend that Government (which will be changing shortly) will care any more or less about Suffolk.

It sounds a lot of money but break it down per year. Suffolk will be the loser

It sounds like a lot of money but over 30 years and with inflation it will not go far. We are better advised to stick with government funding rather than trying to decide ourselves what to do. We may not have good people in local government deciding where this money will go - too many vested interests

It takes decades to get some infrastructure approved and built. Let local people have more control over what they deem important and cut the time wasted waiting for our priorities to be met.

It thinks it's really important that local money and decisions about that money are held locally. So that delivery can be specific to Suffolk, but also accountability specific to Suffolk.

It very much depends on the management of these funds. Aren't there a number of councils within Suffolk who are in debt? Will funds just repay this and mismanagement continue? MidSuffolk is the only council with funds. If it is a Conservative led council you've not done well so far.

It will be mispent & wasted by idiots on useless projects

It will be wasted by SCC the same as council tax. SCC has too many managers as it is. Everyone will say they should use it for this and that and not delve deeper. Example pot holes not filled properly so has to be redone increasing the cost because it was not done correctly the first time.

It will depend how it is used.

It will give SCC greater control, and make accountability better.

It will improve lives across Suffolk

It will not be spent wisely and inflation makes this pretty small change to cover the increased bureaucracy and well paid management roles that will inevitably come with devolution.

It will open opportunity for the kids, people and allow allocations to the community. Allow IBC to run IPS service that supports the community. Also out reaching program for int on important too

It will run out long before 30 long years.

It won't be enough! It's only about 2% of the existing budget!

It would allow County Council's who live and work in Suffolk to decide what is best for the County

It would allow decisions to be made locally for the benefit of local people

"It would be much harder to obtain this amount of money from Westminster.

ie 'local' money for local priorities is much more effective & efficient."

It would be simply wasted. The council is a money pit loaded with spreadsheet jockeys and career bureaucrats.

It would be superb to see funding made available for our communities to invest and create opportunity for those closest to them. Any funding decisions made at the highest level of government by definition are abstracted away from the actual people they affect. Their decisions are made based on aggregates, not real people. By devolving power to our

communities, local people who are present in the communities are best placed to make decisions about funding allocation, instead of unattached politicians, who stand many degrees separated from the people whose lives their decisions affect.

It would depend who is spending the money

It would enable more local control in response to local needs and priorities

It would lead to an exacerbation of the "postcode lottery" for access to services. I believe that services should be delivered equally across the country.

it would look at the local community needs and fulfil those

It would mean that the money could be spent where it is really needed in Suffolk and not where Suffolk are 'told' to spend it.

It would provide new financing opportunities for projects in the county, but I worry that there will be no long-term vision to ensure the money is spent efficiently

It's a bribe made to make us feel as if we are getting something for nothing. It's peanuts in the grand scheme of things £16m pa

It's a massive sum to and to handle it wisely in the best interests of Suffolk will likely lead to faction and division. Taken over 30 years it's an annual drop in the ocean per annum for Suffolk. It would need to be managed well from day one to ensure its growth. Do we honestly believe we can all be on the same page and have a plan from day one?

It's all a bit vague

It's basic bribery to get people to agree with it.

It's important if it does go ahead but it's just a BAD idea

It's important to receive money to enable the execution of the policies and services. However £16m seems far too low to be effective

It's not a lot of money and looks like a Tory give with one hand take with the other. I don't trust it.

It's not that much money really, split between 750k people over 30 years

It's one of the reasons why I am against devolution, as it would just end up with £480 million being squandered, and paying for more ineffectual bureaucracy.

It's so dependent on who makes the decisions within the council

It's very important but I and so many others have little faith in the current leadership of SCC to do the right thing for Ipswich

It's not that much and it's not inflation protected

It's a pittance in relation to the needs of the county. Typical of the utter meanness of this government!

It's a pittance. And the directly elected leader boondoggle is absurd

It's a small amount of money overall, and will rapidly shrink because it's not index-linked. True devolution would transfer much more cash and significantly greater revenue-raising powers to local authorities

It's a small sum. Is it inflation proofed? Market towns unlikely to see any of it.

It's a tiny proportion of your budget - £16m a year and staying static when your budget is £750m a year and is likely to increase with inflation. It's not worth the price for introducing a potentially disastrous new leadership model.

It's more important to look after the repair work of ya tenant's than other things , but I shld have had all repairs done but haven't been done

It's not enough and inflation will destroy it further.

It's not nearly enough, and this process is part of an inadequate back-filling exercise promoted by the British government in lieu of Tony Blair's disastrous provincial devolution bill which was designed to exclude England from that devolution settlement in preference to Scotland, N Ireland & Wales. The 'provinces' enjoy more funding per capita than England despite England's position as the engine room and paymaster of the Union.

It's not new money, it's reallocated money, so I can't see what would change

It's only important if the money is distributed fairly across zsuffolk, particularly in the West

It's only important if you actually use the money to improve the services we need, such as the usual but especially in SEND

It's very important to be able to find out where the tax money needs to be spent from the people that have paid it. This system will only work if local councils stop wasting money, the system of devolved powers has great potential, but spending money on things for vertu signalling exercises and ridiculous net zero ideology will not go down well. Ask the local tax payers what their priorities are, spend there first.

jSuffolk council waste enough money without given more to waste

Just another junket not providing value and no overall national

"Just as the roads in the country are in an appalling state so are a lot of Suffolk roads! One could probably spend most of that £480 million on Suffolk roads alone!

So if one went along with this would there be any more funds once this has been spent to rebuild/refurbish/renew and IMPROVE our roads?"

Keeping residents in Suffolk to support local business & not needing to travel further afield due to lack of shops, business etc.

Keeps the decisions as close to the local issues as possible . Decisions made by people who are invested in their local communities

Let's be real here, 16 million a year would be [REDACTED] up the wall doing things that have no impact on anyone. We are lacking services already. Maybe it's a good idea to look at current services and fixing them instead of trying to create more problems.

Let's face it, it's not going to benefit the residents of Suffolk so it's not really a sensible question. The money will go to consults and to businesses with the right connections and we won't see any chances of improvements.

Living in Lowestoft we see limited investment from SCC as it is, I have no reason to suppose that mindset will change and the major part of any funding would continue to be focussed on Ipswich and surrounds. There would be no benefit to North East Suffolk who seem not to exist to SCC

Local authorities should be able to make their own decision about investment but there have been cases where bad decisions have been made and money lost. Care would need to be taken to ensure any investments are safe.

Local authorities will spend whatever you give them

Local Authority on the ground to make decisions on priorities

Local CCs could not be relied on to produce local requirements. Local CCs do not have the knowledge or experience to invest such a sum.

local communities and the people have a good understanding of what is needed in their local area

Local Control for local needs

Local control over the investment fund in principle is very important. How important it is to me personally depends on the decision making process to how it will be spent. In the grand scheme of things £16 million a year isn't a huge amount of money so I would like to see it being used innovatively to support residents of Suffolk who need it most. A great opportunity for Suffolk

Local control without the complexity ( and distractions) of Westminster

Local council wastes millions anyway so can't be trusted with 30 years of cash! If invested will be of no value to the public!

Local councillors are a joke

Local councillors understand local needs

local councils know how best to spend money in their areas rather than at national level

Local decision-making is very important, as long as the national imperative to address the climate emergency is at the fore-front of all options considered

local decisions are more effective BUT I am concerned a stable money supply would encourage reckless/corrupt investments, which has practically bankrupted some councils, with no obvious punishment for doing so

Local government has a far better idea about the priorities in its region than central government in Westminster.

Local government is better placed to understand local priorities not central government

Local infrastructure such as roads is in a very poor state. If local funding was more readily available it is to be hoped that many things could be improved, not least social care.

Local issues and the potential for codesign of solutions are key to success

Local knowledge is paramount for decision making and prioritizing.

Local knowledge of how best to spend the money would be good. I would expect that to feed into any spending either from national or local government.

Local knowledge will be really helpful, but I am nervous regarding how well the money will be spent if not managed efficiently and fairly.

Local leaders are best placed to set the priorities for funding and investment. A bottom-up approach would be likely to achieve better outcomes for residents for the local area than the current top-down one. However, it would be of the utmost importance for decision to be made in partnership with others and not solely by the County Council in isolation. Ideally funding priorities would be co-produced with residents representative of the whole Suffolk population.

Local people are in a much better position to identify local needs. and to tailor investment accordingly.

Local people know better than Whitehall.

local people know what is best for the county not whitehall

local people know what local people want in terms of infrastructure etc.

Local people know where best to spend this money to improve their area.

local people should be best placed to know where best to put funding, at least you would hope so

local people should know better how to allocate funds than civil servants in Whitehall

Local politicians cannot be trusted to make best use of funding.

Local representatives are better informed on where the money is best spent

Local services should be properly funded this is an opportunity to do that

Local solutions are often offered by local businesses and this funding could help to finance accepted solutions.

locally decided solutions are best

Locally elected leaders representing local people are better placed to make funding decisions than central government.

Locally elected people will get to decide on the best ways to spend the funding for the benefit of Suffolk residents

Look at what has been achieved in Greater Manchester. Rural areas like Suffolk have always been forgotten by all governments, especially the Tories. They're actually doing some good here.

Lower council tax. Cut waste. You don't need more money.

Lower council tax. Do less. Cut services. Sack people.

Major funds will go to big towns and smaller areas will get nothing



Make the trains less

mayors and development corps and freeport - you will be handing this money to big buisness and loosing your jobs - actually read the levelling up bill please...

Members of the public must be allowed to have a say in priorities for the spending of this budget. Government must not be too dictatorial in Suffolk's spending plans. Suffolk decisions must include in all decisions protection of the environment

Misleading question. It's about scc ability to manage this money and responsibility which is important and in my view scc is unable to manage current issues, to compound this with a relative fall in revenue due to inflation this situation would only get worse.

Money is always important as SCC is under great strain

Money is needed for the council to operate;

Money to fund local priorities is good but my support of devolution is more that I hope for an increase in local autonomy in general and long-term, hopefully someday with very minimal input from Westminster, this should just be a starting point to more independent powers

More devolution is better democracy and often more informed, owned and shared decisons.

More investment and more local decision making can only be a good thing for Suffolk.

More investment and predictable investment is very useful. So long as it's for genuine new investment and not used as an excuse to cut normal services funding.

More local control is better, but only if it is to find more progressive ideas. Otherwise, it would be the same as we have now.

more local decisions for greater impact on local people. If it doesn't work over time? We then vote out those local representatives

More money spent locally would be great, but I do not have much faith that it would be used responsibly by the council.

More opportunities for the council to squander tax payers money on rubbish ideas!!!

More opportunities for the local area to set its own priorities

More red tape.

More wasted money on ill advised schemes. The council is in place to provide services not as a body to invest in schemes.

Much better to make big spending decisions at a local level. However I'm concerned that the funding should be index linked to inflation over such a long period.

My concern is around how the money would be invested to ensure that it keeps pace with inflation but is also invested responsibly as some other LAs have invested in risky schemes which have not paid out, leaving the residents and service users losing out.

N/A. I disagree with Devolution

Need good finance managers or we could end up making poor investments

Need to ensure that the right decisions are made and that the right people represent Suffolk, and at the moment doesn't appear to be the case. Ipswich as the county town, biggest contributor to the Suffolk economy would need its own devolution pot.

Needs control but by the right people who are held personally accountable for success or failure. And not just by elections

New money is always of benefit but I am not so sure you could manage this based on recent performances. In some area you are not meeting your Statutory duties eg Youth. It is not even a feature, there is funding (not lots) but you say you put it in schools. Read the Statutory Duty this cannot happen. Then we move to SEND and education. Then older people's care. Yes, more money is good but will you be really using it wisely? Who will scrutinise you and what does devolution look like? Is it like schools becoming Academies, they add another layer of management and you become autonomous?

No

No

No

No devolution

no enough money

No I do not agree.

No information provided about downside...and requires too much trust in local politicians

No money is unwelcome, but £480mn over 30 years is chicken feed compared to the challenges. So I can't say it's 'very' important.

No to devolution full stop!!!!

No trust in SCC

Not a lot of money in the greater scheme of things

Not convinced that SCC can manage funds

Not convinced this will make the county any better off than if the funding was routed through Central Government instead.

Not enough information the description is very generalised! How does this compare with current funding for these things and how is it currently devolved?

Not linked to inflation - fund value will have substantially decreased by the end of the 30 year period.

not linked to inflation & doesn't cover cutbacks already having to be made. Is only targeted at areas where council is given greater control. What happens with a change of government and revised government spending? Possible carrot only.

not really new money and annual amount reduces in value over time

"Not so much when you average over the years, is it guaranteed not to disappear with changes in government?"

Would I trust SCC with this fund - I think not."

"Not sure how the allocation of this funding would realistically reach through the community  
"

Not sure I trust SCC to manage any extra funding well.

Not that parish councillors will be greatly overwhelmed with funds it is of great importance for our local residents to access transport from all areas of our parishes at an affordable cost. Along with maintaining a good standard to Community related activities and areas to all areas of our parishes especially to those that have been left behind for many many years such as Eriswell parish . The prime example of a forgotten disjointed three phase village affected by none tax paying residents as is also the case for many of the surrounding villages

Not very much money in the scheme of things

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the Council are capable of managing this money properly.

Obviously after 30 years the sum won't be worth it's initial value

Odd question. Of course it's important if devolution goes ahead. The important part is what it would be invested in and the transparency to people. The currently transparency of SCC spending decisions is abysmal.

Of course additional money is positive but it's not always spent as residents would like, they invest in areas which are of no concern to other aspects of the County and there are usually some criteria and not flexibility.

On the surface it appears attractive but I fear it will not be utilised effectively with over management and decreasing value over time

One system is probably easier than having 2 tiers of government if get it right

Only if Ipswich isn't being strangled by Suffolk County Council. Currently I feel like Suffolk county council does not operate in Ipswich's interest and thus holds the town back.

Only if its spent wisely and not squandered like a lot of the money for the county seems to be

Only if the money is invested in new roads as a priority Ipswich needs a Northern Bypass without delay, the A12 duelled all the way through Suffolk and the A140 duelled. The council have overseen 40 years of total paralysis, no major road infrastructure being built since the Orwell bridge, which is disgraceful. Norfolk seem to be able to build roads, why not Suffolk?

Only important if consultation was carried out with residents and businesses etc.

Ordinary people will see no benefit

Other County councils that have already devolved are now in debt due to poor decisions and bad investment. I am already seeing wasteful investments that haven't been fruitful on returns e.g. Bury St Edmunds post office, vacant shops not been filled. How will receiving £480 million which could deflate in value be better if poor investments are made and over spending?

Our area desperately needs upgrading, our town is growing vastly and the infrastructure cannot cope.

Our local priorities may not match wider priorities and they should reflect our community wishes.

Our son has been badly let down by SCC as he attends Warren school which has been failing for years and SCC turned a blind eye. I think we need to be accountable to Government not be allowed to make our own decisions as SCC staff are under huge pressure as it is

Over 30 years is not going to make a scrap of difference.

Peanuts in the overall budget

People in charge not capable of such responsible

Per year, it's a relatively small amount of money in exchange for being asked to do rather a lot of things; because it's not index linked, the value will be minimal by the end of the 30 years. Given that SCC is already under financial pressure, is taking on extra services/roles when these are unfunded over the long-term, a good idea? Will it leave a legacy of problems for the future?

Perhaps the A14 repairs might be finished before 2034?

please concentrate on local communities and voluntary sector. There is more to Suffolk than SEND.

Plus it will open up opportunities to bid for other funding and a level 4 devolution deal.

Poor services are not going to improve by more funding. Efficient and effective management of services is needed. It will just mean more jobs, costing more long term with year in year out guaranteed increases in salaries. SCC have little idea how unhappy residents are with their services. Listening to residents will help instead of putting out surveys and doing what you always intended to anyway.

Power and money go together therefore the people who pay tax should have a say in where the money is spent

Priorities should be locally determined

priority can be given to the area's/services that need the most, plus opportunity can be given to area's that may not normally be considered

Probably get taken up with pay rises and jobs for the boys and girls

Problem is if economic factors work differently in Suffolk compared with other places.

Projects benefiting the local area, tailored to local needs can only improve things in many ways. As used to be the case with LEAs and CCs before central government and privatisation took control.

Proper devolution should include local management of funds as local people know local needs.

Properly managed the funds must be applied to benefit the County as a whole, not just Ipswich or Bury St Edmunds, to include rural development and working peoples' homes close to their workplace.

"Provide better employment opportunities in Suffolk.

Fix the roads, particularly the abominable A140.

Campaign strongly against the proposed imposition of 50ft high pylons across the county!"

provided the councillors act in the interests of the County , control of local expenditure is boon.

Providing the money is spent wisely. Not on useless projects like the centre of Ipswich. Agree transport infrastructure needs more investment.

Question doesn't make sense but there shouldn't be a devolution

question the decision making of local councillors and concerned at the amount o funding being proposed for what is a long term budget

really important if the drawdown from this fund is front loaded/ taken as early as possible

Scary as SCC services are horrendous and so much money is wasted due to incompetence

SCC already waste money with bad decisions.

SCC cannot control effectively the funds it currently controls . Give them more control and more funds = even more waste of money and more ' jobs for the boys ' .

SCC cannot currently manage services with the funds allocated, they would simply waste any more given.

SCC does not have the imaginative leadership or resources to facilitate long term investment decisions that would benefit the residents of Suffolk.

SCC doesn't control their budget particularly well in some areas at the moment. I would prefer a central oversight. I worry that the money will be used for yet more senior management posts

SCC has historically been poor at spending (the botched Upper Orwell Crossing for example). I am not sure how placing more power and money in one person's hands will resolve this

SCC has shown a disregard for democratic process. It creates ideas it's self which it thinks are relevant often ignoring local opinion or misrepresenting it. This has been seen with its closing roads, cycle routes, pushing local communities. Meanwhile Suffolk infrastructure is lagging other parts of southern england

SCC has shown ineptitude in all areas to date. Why devolve and allow SCC even more scope for ineptitude and poor-decision making?

"SCC have a poor history of spending wisely.

"

SCC have consistently failed to manage finances efficiently

SCC have missed numerous chances for funding 3 bridges comes to mind. The cost of electing a mayor we don't want us not justifiable

SCC is an inefficient blob run by vested interests whose only interest is lining their own pockets. A more dishonest, disagreeable, wasteful bunch of paper pushers you could never wish to meet. This consultation is a sham based upon lies and scum looking for an opportunity to do less, spend more and feather their own nests.

SCC is poorly run and would waste money

SCC not able to manage simple tasks, like road repairs

SCC performance is poor in general. Giving them more funding and responsibilities would mean further performance losses

SCC should know what is needed locally by asking local population

SCC understand the local need and where best to distribute funds

SCC would be incapable of managing it.

Seeing the budgetary hole that SCC are in, I'm not convinced that they can be trusted with extra money!

Self sufficiency is very important. Devolution will lead to ability to make decisions in the field of education, health care, road and transport and policing reforms.

Should be managed by the central government...

"Should improve public infrastructure and public transport for our learners and communities.

Would support local businesses"

Small amount of money for a large and complicated county

Small amount over long period. But better something than nothing.

So far the Council has received government funding for Highways repairs but has reallocated it to other projects. Outsourcing highway maintenance has resulted in degradation of the county's roads. There is a lack of faith that any funding would be spent improving needed services

So much funding is wasted. Wouldn't have any trust in who or what gets the money. Nothing in rural areas. I think money would only be spent in Ipswich and Felixstowe

so our roads can be made safer, schools improved, hospitals and health care, needs improving so does our elderly care, spend any money to spare on these please

So this question is. The way it's been written is it's already been accepted. Get conservatives out.

Some areas have more needs in certain sectors and would be able to deliver funding to target area of need.

Some towns in Suffolk are run down and need prioritising. Much of each year's fund could be allocated to the strategic planning and development of specific areas (like Ipswich).

Sounds great on paper but the reality is different. There is no course for redress when residents don't agree with decisions made by those in power.

Sounds too nebulous

Spending on local priorities is likely to be better targeted if it is devolved.

Subject to external controls of some kind. The Consultation Document makes an oblique reference to leveraging this money. That - of course - is the road to bankruptcy.

Sudbury needs a western bypass and redevelopment of the town centre

Sufficient funding should be available to all councils without condition

Suffolk C C track record!

Suffolk can get same investment advisors as Whitehall for the annuity side, and take a longer view to planning and prioritise where to actually spend those funds for county's well being. Indeed regeneration of Ipswich port, Felixstowe etc could become economically positive if done right. Assumes we elect competent councillors with integrity which is a big assumption

"Suffolk CC. Has lost its way. 1stly. WHY do you ALLOW SCC workers to use SCC work transport to use for getting. Too & from work

All your subsidiaries Havbury etc do the same. Do ALL the staff at SCC get an allowance to drive to there place of work at the TAX PAYERS expense. Thousands could be saved not just on fuel on Insurance as well. Ie. " commuting " is an extra expense on the insurance"

Suffolk city council can't come what they've got now.

Suffolk council is a shambles and is not capable of making even more decisions than it currently does. It fails on almost everything it currently has responsibility for. The county is poorly served by the council

Suffolk Council leaders have to remember that the county isn't just about Ipswich. Or Bury st Edmunds. There are other towns that need help. Brandon, Newmarket, Lakenheath.

Suffolk council makes wrong investment choices.

Suffolk County Council are incompetent and incapable of managing this sum of money - they would waste it.

suffolk County council are not capable of using investment correctly or wisely.

Suffolk county council deliberately holds back Ipswich in any way it can. Giving you more money will only exacerbate the situation

"Suffolk County Council have made no clear manifesto for how this money is to be invested, only vague statements such as ""This could help us to create new jobs, offer

local business support and invest in infrastructure."" But it is clear that the council will not decide how to spend the money until after we've agreed to the deal. This is like voting for a party that only published their manifesto after you've cast for vote for them. "

"Suffolk county council have neither the expertise, experience to manage such funds and spend it on local projects effectively.

Would be a travesty to give SCC the opportunity to go bankrupt like many other councils."

Suffolk County Council is Conservative-led. The next government will be Labour-led. Any decisions on devolution should wait until after their policies on spending are introduced.

Suffolk County Council should not have control of this money.

"Suffolk County Council will NEVER secure a major infrastructure success for Ipswich.

Ipswich city status never supported by Suffolk county and districts three TIMES! Ipswich unitary blocked by Suffolk twice.

Ipswich Northern Bypass blocked by Suffolk County Council's sham consultation.

Ipswich Orwell Crossings squandered by Suffolk County Council. "

Suffolk County Council would have a better idea of what needs to be invested in our area.

Suffolk County Councils have a very poor record in fundings management. A complete overhaul in the way local services are funded and managed is needed. Devolution will only make this problem worse. Priorities are a good place to start.

Suffolk county has one of the worst records in the country for providing public education, health care, recycling, affordable housing. They would waste this money.

Suffolk does not need a devolution controlled by Tories. Tories must go... Forever. Ipswich unitary maybe.

Suffolk has its own issues where the lives of residents could be improved, I think, and more control by a council that listens, works out priorities and fulfills needs in the short, medium and especially the longer term could be a big step forward.

Suffolk infrastructure needs improvement plus bus services to encourage best use of energy

Suffolk is often overlooked by government, general feeling of lack of power or representation

Suffolk is struggling on its public transport section especially in regards to special needs. As a indie creator, easier access to things such as free bus travel would be fantastic as I do not drive and as someone with Dyspraxia could potentially struggle with this.

Suffolk needs fairer funding from government we seem to be forgotten by London

Suffolk needs to be independent from the Government Treasurers as each county has its own problems and priorities!!!

Suffolk needs to control it's own destiny

Suffolk people would have greater say and control of their everyday lives.

"Suffolk roads need better looking after so if this money helped this I would support

I do think Farmers need to be allowed to keep their land and keep Suffolk Farms thriving not more ugly homes

Also very old Suffolk property owners need help to maintain them to be able to help globally

We cannot manage without oil "

Ten years rather thirty

Terrible idea. You cannot run the council now. Given more money you will spend it on hairbrained ideas

That amount over 30 years not much. Ability to raise its own funds necessary except some services such as childcare should receive government funding.



That is a lot of money. Looking at the way SCC wastes money and is incompetent in the way services are run now, they must not be allowed to have control of this.

That's not enough money!!!!

The £16m per annum fund is new money, although this would add only 2.1% to the SCC budget. So, there needs to be much greater benefits than just this fund to justify supporting the devolution deal. But the fund is significant, because it enables the SCC directly elected leader autonomously to exercise new functions, with personal accountability to the electorate, to designate a Development Area and then to set up a Development Corporation. This important aspect of the deal has not been highlighted in the consultation document.

"The £480m over 30 years is not inflation-indexed so by the end of that time its value will have considerably eroded.

Whilst any additional revenue is in theory welcome I feel this is 'giving with one hand and taking away with the other' given the government is more interested in cutting taxes and reducing funding for services."

The additional funding is nice although needs to be directed effectively and not add new layers of jobs for the boys. Suffolk is a rural region needing significant investment in transport, jobs and education.

The amount being devolved is miniscule re total public spending in Suffolk. It will cost (in particular opportunity time costs re consultation, discourse, elections etc.) for a slender (given scale) & contestable (central Govt simply abdicating responsibility?) benefit. It is a gimmick that detracts from debating the real serious systemic crisis in LA funding.

The amount is so small will have limited impact / funding needs to be focused on adult services and so this can be properly funded nationally

"The amount of money is insignificant on an annual basis.

Not worth disruption for so little change"

The amount of money is negligible and would make minimal difference

The amount of money on offer is too small to be worthwhile, £16m is less than £24 per person, it isn't index linked, inflation will weaken it further. The idea we need to place the governance of the County Council at risk for such a small amount of money is not a great idea. There is no guarantee of any 4th deal with a Government that will not exist in 6 months. Even if it is used to borrow against, this will just end up weakening the money available for future DELs plans and ideas. A new level of leadership is not needed for £16m - its tiny compared to the current SCC budget.

the amount spread over 30 years is pitiful

The amount these days is very small and will decrease in value year in year out, I also don't like the way SCC always run things and think that North Suffolk especially Lowestoft is neglected.

The area needs more funding.

The consistent failure of local and national politicians to provide the services that the population needs leads me to believe that another layer of government will do nothing for the people of this county or the country. The best failing examples I can think of are Scotland and Wales

"The consultation information is deliberately misleading, in our opinion. While the direct election of the Leader is mentioned several times, and comparison is made with metro-mayors, there is no clear acknowledgement that the directly-elected Leader is unlikely to command the majority of the votes that are cast in the Leadership election, unlike the position of metro-mayors using the Supplementary Vote which has been arbitrarily swept away by the present government (a decision which incidentally flew in the face of the electoral system agreed by the populations of London, Manchester etc in their referendums, referendums which in our case we will not get).

The three-minute explainer video, and to a large extent the more comprehensive consultation document, speaks of giving "the County Council greater decision-making powers" and that more decisions will be "taken locally", without explaining that actually the decision-making powers will be given to, and exercised by, the Leader and not by the County Council as a whole. Phrases such as "will enable Suffolk" rather than "will enable the directly-elected Leader" create a false sense of empowerment for the public.

Much is made of the promised £480 million, but very little mention is made of the fact that this is just £16 million per year, and no mention is made of the fact that this currently represents less than 3% of the total County Council budget, and will become progressively less in real terms as a result of inflation. This is a very poor deal for Suffolk. £16 million a year - not linked to inflation - is poor recompense for in excess of £100 million a year in central government funding which has been progressively cut from the County Council budget. The proposed 'new funding for Suffolk' gives us back £1 for every £6 that has been cut, and will not be enough to make any substantial difference to the deteriorating public services provided in Suffolk. What is proposed here is only 25% of the amount SCC has made in "savings" to its budget this year alone. We need a proper funding settlement for Suffolk, not a sticking plaster.

Our view is that in the absence of any meaningful public engagement, or honesty about the implications of the deal, there is not a case for moving to legislation in the autumn of 2024, and any such move is likely to fail for lack of public support.

"

The control of that investment in the immediate future should generate better and more suited opportunities to the local residents and business in Suffolk, that in turn would be expected to regenerate funding that benefit future investment and opportunities.

The council are closer to local issues and know better what needs funding

The Council complains every year it has no money, here is some more.

The Council has no focused intentions for this fund. There is no clarity on how this will be offset by reduced funding from Central Government. This does not look like 'new money'. In 30 years this will likely be a fraction of a percent of the Council's overall budget per current funding model.

The council has shown no ability in making best use of the current funding arrangement. Giving you more money, will only mean a greater degree of money wasted, and important issues being left unaddressed.

"The Council have wasted millions over the years. Don't see any reason they won't spend this extra money wisely.

"

The council will have a slightly better understanding where and how much funding is needed in each area of the county. Providing that area bias is not a thing and isn't concentrated in either urban or rural areas.

The council will waste and squander it.as they already do

The council would simply employ advisors and consultants and would waste the funding on unnecessary projects

the county council can act on local issues rather than the national government telling them what to do from london

The county needs the extra investment and control over his this money is spent

The fact this fund would decrease in value if inflation went up is concerning

The final deal should give consideration for increasing this figure. £16m per year is nowhere near enough to invest in the schemes required to prepare Suffolk for the latter part of 21st Century

"The fund equates to £16M per year

Its not being provided at day 1 so no interest can be gained from the full amount.

Its also not inflation linked and could easily be stop be the government"

The fund is not a lump sum but annual sum and not index linked. It is far from clear that this is new monies and how exactly a mayor will control its spend.

The fund is only as good as the politicians administering it. The current council do not instil any faith that they will do this effectively or democratically.

The fund should be spent on improving the nations roads and fixing potholes. Also need to improve bus network

"The fund won't be protected from inflation so could, potentially, almost disappear.

Equally, over the years SCC have taken some horrific funding decisions and cost us residents either directly or by stealth."

The funding is not inflation linked so the actual value of that funding will change. I also question the capability of local elected people and their staff to deliver true change linked to 'value for money'

The funding is very important however £16mil is barely anything on a yearly basis to make any real difference. Could spend that each year on doing extra pothole fixing and still wouldn't make a dent in the all. Plus I don't trust SCC to spend the monies wisely,

The funds will be able to help local issues and priorities

The government are not experts about all the areas of the UK. But with this comes responsibility and potentially becoming even more the scapegoat.

The government should give this money to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding of local authorities over the last 14 years. Don't waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The investment is important but I don't trust SCC to invest it wisely in services. The people of Suffolk will lose out if SCC have control of it.

The investment is vital, but Suffolk County Council is unfit to control it

The investment should be now. Suffolk should spend what Suffolk gets from council tax etc. look after us first... most of us won't be around in 30 years

The level of funding is good, but is it really enough to make the kind of difference that we all really want to see? Having a mix of capital investment and subsidising other services such as bus travel may require significantly more investment that is available under the Deal. Does this potentially limit the opportunity to leverage further government investment for major projects or investments for example?

The local council have made some bad decisions in the past - the Cornhill in Ipswich had millions spent on some monolith design which was then ripped out. it is good for them to have the power to make SENSIBLE decisions.

The local government is in the hands of one party permanently so any decisions will be made in the interests of that party only.

The money would help local charities, the veterans, homeless etc but there is also scope for the local council to abuse the money

The money can be targeted at the issues that matter to local people who know the area.

The money is important in so far as it's usefulness in implicating global goals that do not represent the well-being of British people.

The money will be wasted on vanity projects , and the important statement is that the amount would go down when inflation goes up , so it would never be £480 million anyway , this figure is a red herring designed to make it look more rosy for the electorate.

The money would be directly there for use, local people with knowledge of the area would then hopefully use it for the right needs of everyone in Suffolk

The money would not otherwise be forthcoming

The money would support all kinds of services that we all use and it would be madness not to go for it.

The more "local" the distributions of any funds, the more likely they'll be most appropriately used.

The people of Suffolk should have a say as to how money for their area is spent

the people who live on Suffolk know what we need rather than being told what we need

The potential for locally controlled investment was clearly demonstrated by Joseph Chamberlain in 19th century Birmingham. Control of this fund might enable Suffolk to emulate this.

The presentation of this question is disingenuous. £480m is of course a lot of money but over 30 years, £16m per year represents only just over 2% of the current annual budget. And, as the amount is fixed and not index linked, that already small percentage will fall as years go by.

The principle is great, my issue is who decides what are priorities and the monies being allocated populist woke projects for minority interest groups rather than majority backed projects

The problem is the council can't be trusted with the resources they have now. They never listen to the locals and do what they want not what the residents want. Look at the Cornhill revamp. What a waste of money that was and didn't bring in extra trade as they were told it would by listening to an outsider. Plus who ever signed the project off as safe should be sacked as it clearly wasn't. If i built a dangerous structure it wouldn't get signed off and i'd be in court if anyone was hurt using it. Then there's the planters blocking roads which cause more congestion and pollution as vehicles now have to travel further to get around the blocked roads. So if you're driving further to avoid them you're causing more pollution not less. The cycle lanes are a joke and a waste of money just like the one on Colchester Rd in Ipswich that cyclists wouldn't use as they were too dangerous. Plus it narrowed the road so much that when an Ambulance came down Colchester Rd the traffic couldn't pull over far enough to let the Ambulance down the middle of the road. There's so many things the council are involved in that don't work just like the Travel Ipswich scheme which made traffic worse around the town. And don't blame Highways as it has to be all approved by the council. Norwich Rd is disgusting and so run down. The list goes on and on. So giving them more money and power will just add to these stupid ideas they've had and nothing will change for the better. Talk is cheap with this lot.

The public sector needs to be reduced. It is now too large.

The reason that the government is proposing deals like this is so they can not only discard responsibility but also financially as they are not tied to inflation. This is not a good deal for Suffolk and will at any rate likely change with a new government. It is interesting that Having lived in Suffolk all my life, I only learnt of this proposal and survey via the BBC.

The successful allocation of these funds requires effective collaboration and strategic planning among local partners. Ensuring that the investments are managed efficiently and transparently is crucial for realising the potential benefits. And I don't believe that there would be the efficient and effective structure, oversight and governance to ensure that the funds are used optimally.

The sum of money is relatively small and I have no faith in local councillors to have more responsibility for services. Many of these are already poorly run, such as Highways.

The sum of money stated is going to be insufficient to do what is stated. £16m per year is peanuts.

"The town centre is becoming a ghost town, most shops have left Ipswich and investment needs to be made to reduce rent costs for shops so more business can open.

The increase in closed shops is causing more loitering and gang behaviour due to bored youths also. "

The trains and buses are late while all the rivers are full of [REDACTED]. It would be nice to get some cash to sort that out

The UK, and in particular England, has the most centralised system of government of any western European country. Central Government has too much control over all aspects of local government. If local government is to truly be able to deliver local priorities then it needs meaningful and substantial control over its own actions.

The value of the funds can decrease and there's no guarantee it will be used wisely and not wasted

The value will drop with inflation over 30 years

The whole concept of devolution is flawed, based on the County Council's appalling record across many of its key responsibilities.

There is a significant difference between what local residents consider local priorities compared to local political groups. So please actively seek the wider view from residents on what these are. Currently, roads are awful, healthcare is terrible, and some school buildings are in a ridiculous state..... but not all of these are reflected in local political priorities

there is an assumption that Suffolk would be better at spending this money than the UK. I'm not 100% sure that is true

There is no evidence being presented that this is "new" money. There is not a detailed risk analysis. The current central government has consistently added responsibility but cut funding to LA's. Clearly there is a risk in taking on even more responsibility when the next few years will see incredible pressure on public spending. Your 'sales brochure' is woefully lacking on the risks.

There is no evidence that any layer of government is capable of spending public money well

"There is nothing to suggest another layer of local government bureaucracy will do anything except swallow most of the £480 million, with little to show for it.

Less government, not more please."

There is still a massive gap in Suffolk in the property market. One that needs to be filled with affordable housing, not the so called affordable houses we see on modern estates that cost 250k plus.

There is too much bureaucracy in a multi tier system. Cost savings and checks and balances to ensure that district views are maintained should be possible.

There will still be funds to run the county either way. There will be another layer of staff to pay

There's no point having devolution with no money to support it. So money is vital. But this is a pathetic amount spread over so many years. It's really not taking devolution seriously.

they have messed Suffolk up God knows what they would do with full control ,not to be trusted.

They would waste the money just like they do with their funding now!!

Thinking of the dreadful state of our roads and infrastructure and the inability of Suffolk County Council to deal with the problem, I dread to think how the county council and an elected leader

would foul up spending so much extra cash. I would support the concept if the county council demonstrated an ability to act responsibly on behalf of residents. Sadly, the county council is not up to the job. Look at the pathetic state of our roads, the shoddy state of the countryside with fallen trees an unsightly eyesore on grass verges, and the many complaints about SEND in Suffolk schools. Suffolk cannot be trusted to spend extra money wisely.

"This 480m should be coming to the county anyway. Who gets to waste it for us isn't important.

Developers will make a metric buttload of money from brownfield sites anyway we shouldn't be subsidising them. The way to make brownfield sites more attractive is to stop them spoiling greenfield sites"

This amount is insufficient to overhaul our county infrastructure . Should you accept it it would be used by a Tory government to cap any further contribution and as the County is now it will have insufficient funding available. In other words its a con.

this amount is not really enough given the state of local infrastructure. East Anglia has been ignored by the Government

This amount is such a small proportion of the amount of funding that could make a difference and deflect from potential other sources of funding

"This amount of money is tiny in terms of 'infrastructure' .

Free bus passes already available to over 65s.

Local business support, might help a little, perhaps, but again small fry .

The Green Party have taken control on some councils, have no idea of how to run a county and will likely waste it on some of their pet projects "

This budget is wholly inadequate, it will not have any impact

This could be used to improve rail links & infrastructure for starters rather than build roads.

This depends on the degree to which Suffolk residents are given the opportunity to feed back on proposed use of funding.

This depends very much on the results of both elections

This doesn't sound like a lot of money over 30 years given the cost of infrastructure projects or cost of public sector investment

This fund will go to developers who will destroy the natural beauty of the Suffolk countryside by covering it with concrete and housing.

This funding does not address the actual structural issues affecting people living in Suffolk. The disbenefits and inefficiencies of two tier system with D &Bs will remain. The non contiguous boundaries with Health and NHS services will not be addressed and so genuine localism cannot prosper.

This in a large part what the deal hinges on - should be index linked. In 35 years it will be worth £8M

This investment fund is unlikely to be targeted in key areas concerning the nation such as upgrading infrastructure which many local councils appear to disagree with upgrading in a desire to keep local aesthetic and prevent house building which is damaging to the economy, the value of this fund is likely to halve over the next 30 years with a cpih over the past 30 years having resulted in prices doubling in that time period. The impact of the aging population in suffolk means councils are unlikely to engage in economically beneficial long term projects such as solar power most likely favouring short term non beneficial cultural projects where a more centralised government would be more interested in the long term investment in the country, devolution for a county like suffolk is likely to result in a poorer more regionally unequal part of the country.

This is a drop in the ocean compared to the amount required to bring services back up to an acceptable standard

This is a fraction of what will be needed now and in the future. 30 years is a long time in inflation and this is a carrot-dangling red herring

This is a large amount and it is right that locally elected representatives decide the projects to be invested in and to prioritise them rather than central government .

This is a loaded question. Just ask me if I want it to happen,

This is a rounding error on the public sector spend here in Suffolk. It's peanuts and you know it. Given the population of Suffolk, it's £21 per person per year. If the Treasury and DLUHC want devolution, this is an insult to the people of Suffolk. It will barely cover the cost of having the election for Mayor. IF there was genuine devolution, it wouldn't be on the basis of a County Council model; it would be handing the whole of Government budget to the Suffolk Public Sector Leaders Group and letting them choose how to spend it, with directly elected SPSLG Mayor. Not this hybrid rubbish.

This is a significant fund but unfortunately the incompetence of those in positions of responsibility would mean this would in all likelihood be squandered

This is a small amount of money in real terms and not worth the sacrifice to our democracy. We cannot guarantee 30 years of funding. It isnt increased with inflation. Its frankly a pathetic amount of money

This is a tiny amount of taxpayers money spread thinly over several services over many years, making little difference to any once inflation and cost increases have reduced it to barely nothing. This is just a 'land grab' by the SCC and the unnecessary expense of a useless and divisive Mayors Office.

This is a very bad idea, giving such large amounts to inexperience volunteers looks like a disaster waiting to happen

This is all moot - the government will veto when it wishes, and local government may waste the millions on half-baked schemes like the LEP fiasco.

This is assuming that you have agreed with the premise that Suffolk CC get the authority to control this money. I am not convinced that the right people will represent the people of Suffolk.



This is important but cannot come at the expense of local opinion about the changes of governance required as a result. Suffolk County Council should commercialise and use its finances more efficiently.

This is important to make sure Suffolk has the investment needed to thrive and help the local communities out.

This is not a huge amount spread over 30 years especially as it is not index linked.

"This is not a large sum of money over 30 years, is it?"

It could be affected by a change of government. It seems to be a political move."

This is not enough to manage the future infrastructure needs for Suffolk

This is obviously the main marketing "carrot" but that's not actually that much each year and in taking it what are the consequences. What funding would be rule our selves out of? For context gullwing bridge in Lowestoft cost £145.8million, the scrapped upper orwell £139 million but we still spent £8 million, James Hehir building (uos) cost £21 million. How much will infrastructure for garden suburb cost? I'm not sure we are mature enough to manage this money/changes.

This is problematic in that £480 million is peanuts when you take into consideration the state of the roads, lack of facilities for children, and the cost of social care. The road signs, for example are in an almost unreadable state in many areas .

This is the £16M a year. Not enough to make it viable unless hardly anything is devolved. £16m is not enough to fix the roads let alone anything else and in 30 years what will £16 m really be worth?

This is very little money over the time period given. I would be concerned about who the 'partners' would be, and worry about the political motivations of both SCC and the unelected partners in making decisions that were right for the people of Suffolk. Suffolk is a diverse county, and some communities would not be served well. This is not a good, ethical, or democratic idea.

This looks like a very bad deal over 30 years.

This money could and should be efficiently used to raise prosperity in Suffolk to give its residence greater opportunities and a higher standard of living

This money is not index linked and not renegotiated. It makes Suffolk á business trying to invest funds for the future. I don't like this at all

This money will be generally wasted with little consideration for what the money should be spent on

This money would be more than welcome but it is also true that each year the council voted to give itself an above inflation (and above average) pay rise straight off the bat. That soaks up a lot of money for no value. Given Suffolk's esoteric mindset, there are also issues around what any Suffolk councillor sees as a priority as compared to actual reality.

This potential new money could be used to improve the facilities available in Suffolk - whether transports, town centres, roads, schools etc.

This question is an assumed done deal. So, I don't agree with the Devolution project anyway. I do not trust Suffolk County Council and the 'lead' to manage the budget adequately as well as any devolved policies. This is because THE SCC have an already record of failing to consult the members of the public plus make sanguine decisions. Consultation has been abysmal so far!!!!

This question is disingenuous and has been phrased in a leading fashion.

This question is not relevant for me, as I don't approve of the devolution deal. Don't trust Suffolk county council to make the correct decisions in favour of the people who need the most.

This question is totally biased towards the deal that SCC want...

This seems to be the most significant driver for promoting devolution but there must be a clear link to community engagement on the way the fund is used/invested

This sounds like a large amount of money but it is not index linked so does not take into account the effect of inflation and is likely to be changed under a new government in any case. This is not the right time to do this

This statement isn't solid and seems a little shady..Suffolk County Council, working with local partners, to decide how best to invest this money but!.. This cannot be pushed through as I see unbalanced scales and deception in this, just my opinion as you asked.

This sum is not very much over 30 years taking in inflation , population growth. Various Governments coming into power , emergencies. Analyse the figures in a professional way with experts .Then present to us rate payers .

This Tory government will not actually deliver the promised net increase in funding

This whole idea is a sop to detract from the undermining and starvation of funds by central government of local government. This is 'The Emperors new Clothes' another drain on public services when money is diverted to from the coal face .

This will have little impact on my life in Suffolk. It is a tiny portion of the annual amount needed to improve services significantly for residents.

This would be an excellent opportunity to bring Suffolk up to date with better public transport links with electric vehicles and cycle paths. This would help the county meet its climate change obligations and encourage people to be more active.

This would give far more local control over a this funding

"To be honest, I have seen some shocking use of monies from the local council in Bury St Edmunds.

From a cycle lane that Noone was interested in to lack of pothole repairs over the last two years.

Recently a plan for housing and a bypass near Westley was rejected.

We do not have the infrastructure to benefit the community.

This is just creating a large group of high paid pen pushers with a steady high income to 2030.

If you can't spend our monies properly in the first place, why invest further.

You wouldn't continue to ask the same poorly experienced barista to make the same shocking cup of coffee for a continuously rising price would you! "

To enable SCC to provide local solutions that work best for Suffolk.

To help services which are currently underfunded now.

Too small a sum to make a difference.

Use of public transport to and from our office is important. We would also benefit commercially from the opportunity to be involved in the infrastructure investment projects as we offer relevant professional services.

Using local expertise to ensure maximum value is being obtained via this route

V imp to focus local resources on local priorities

Very concerned at the proportion which will go on increased staffing and increases in remuneration.

Very important as it can be used to increase funding for local amenities surrounding health. For example, increased gym services ran by borough council, swimming facilities, green spaces such as parks, wildlife areas etc. It can also be used to develop little hubs around the town for retails, restaurants, cafes, bars, should have the areas around them developed and invested in to produce these little hubs.

Very important because asking for control is asking for devolution i.e. means that we get the money – this is not money that government would have spent on our behalf.

Very important because how would this money be allocated, would this amount be enough to satisfy the demands of suffolks needs, for example road repairs are and associated works if Done PROPERLY will severely drain the pot on it's own.

very important fund ne business or who want start a business and help economy create new work places etc

Very important that scc don't get control over this money

Very important that Suffolk County Council NEVER gains any more control of anything

Very important that the next Labour Government has control over these areas and the funding

We all know funds are rarely spent where they are needed, budget surpluses are dispised of on projects that benefit very few

We don't get investment in infrastructure in Suffolk, we're finally getting something - why on earth would crazy local politicians reject it.

We have a centralised government who are bad enough we don't want councillors to essentially to form another group of paid representatives

We have seen devolution in other areas of the country and sadly powers and money haven't come to fruition. Yes it would give people of Suffolk a voice but seems to me another layer of bureaucracy and red tape. Look at the PCC office. Turnouts low, and a PCC whose primary focus is on rural crime as opposed to the significant issues and crime facing less affluent areas and urbanised areas

We need a local organisation with direct access to Suffolk people and first hand knowledge of Suffolk to know how to improve this county and maintain good standards of public services, infrastructure and quality of life.

We need a lot more than £16 million per year to fix all of our broken infrastructure and services

We need better infrastructure. All these new houses being built is putting pressure on the roads. Need to invest in Ipswich town centre too. It is awful.

we need less government not more. Less government = less money wasted on politicians

We need more control over how funding is spent, coupled with an ability to deliver and be able to take a longer term view independent of central government party politics. Whether £16m pa is enough to make a difference is another question

We need more funding for local policing priorities

We need more money to stop all the cuts

We need smaller government, not more government. Seeing Scotland and Wales fills me with dread at the very thought of devolution, of any kind.

We need to hold central government responsible for infrastructure not local representatives. They are more in the open and accountable. Also £480m is not as much as it sounds when it is not inflation protected.

We need to improve local infrastructure

We need to invest in infrastructure, local business and green initiatives.

We will be stitched up

We will get investment from HMG, whether or not we "devolve"

we would be able to decide where the funds best met the needs of the residents of Suffolk

We would want to see this investment used to align with the economic growth for Suffolk and would want to make sure the new Suffolk Business Board are fully engaged with decision making in relation to this fund. There will be competing priorities for this fund but the ability to plan over a longer period of time will be welcomed by us all

Well obviously the extra cash is good (if it is extra). However I do not trust our local council to spend it wisely. There is no transparency or accountability in our local councils.

West Suffolk should receive an equal share

What is the cost to the Rate payers?

When you live in an area, you know first hand the realities / challenges of that area. It is also much easier to listen to other local people in order to meet their needs.

Where does it come from and why can't we have it without devolution.

Where has the number come from? What is the current cost and what does the projected investment mean in terms of potential need?

While I have little idea how much of a boost it would be (in comparison to current funding), it's clear to me that local investment in public services and such desperately need extra funding, as I have noticed that many services are only available on paper, with lengthy waiting times, nonexistent (or very distant) facilities, and many projects announced that go nowhere or take a very long time to actually implement.

While I support a form of devolution - this is at wrong level. Ipswich should become a unitary authority with extended boundaries. A mere £16m a year will not address the transport infrastructure around Ipswich and do nothing for the need for a northern bypass. Devolution at County level will do little to address the needs of the urban center.

While I'm in favour of councils being in control of a fund to manage their investments, £480 million over 30 years is a laughable sum. This is not going to cover what the council intends to do with it, and the people of Suffolk are going to pay the price when the money runs out.

While investing in the proposed areas is important, it doesn't mention any help for the homeless or low income households.

While it is good to have control of what we spend this money on, we need to spend it wisely e.g. with real attention paid to local priorities and not some councillors pet project

While it would be important to have control of this money, I'm concerned that it is not indexed linked so its value will decline. Secondly I can find no information about whether the figure is considered to be adequate for Suffolk's needs

While this is a pathetically small amount of money which diminishes over time as it is not inflation linked, the ability to use it for investment is of importance, provided of course that it is 'new' money and not just existing funding repackaged.

Whilst currently the national government is adamant on cutting bus services everywhere, it would be extremely beneficial to use devolved powers and funding to support existing bus routes with more efficiency, comfort and frequency e.g. Felixstowe to Woodbridge, where the latest train back to Felixstowe is just after 5. This would surely boost local economic growth by being able to be in either town for longer and spending more money e.g. at the pub. Also creating bus shelters at bus stops without them would make the experience better, but due to the lack of financial gain from that (it's only social gain really) these types of projects don't get supported by a government located in London

"Whilst funding local priorities, devolution should cover all of the East of England. Break it down to the 9 regions as each area can be broken down into the different counties within.

Each county will have to liaise with neighbouring counties on some matter like flooding & transport for example

"

Who knows who will be running the council over 30 years

"Who pays employees administering fund? I don't think fund is going to go far even with 2% inflation.

I don't think a 4th tier of local government is a clever idea!

"

Why? I disagree with devolution, full stop

Will be worth next to nothing at the end of 30 years

Will decrease in importance as time passes

Will it be done fairly across the county?

With particular focus on public transport and social care, you do so much as a county council and its important you are given the devolved powers to spend funds for the people of Suffolk. I feel central government has very little understanding of the needs of rural communities and we've been completely overlooked in the levelling up agenda. So, yes, let's give our elected County Councillors / Mayor the power to make changes for the benefit of our beautiful county.

With privilege comes responsibility and considerable skill is required to manage this funding. Look what happened to Thurrock and Southend when they branched out from Essex

"With rising costs and inflation, the sixteen million pounds a year over the next thirty years, is a very small amount of money.

When this money runs out, the burden will fall once again on the council tax payers.

"

Without Devolution, the money would otherwise be forthcoming

Without it there isn't much benefit in the deal

Without some understanding as to how proportionately funds would be used across the County, it is just numbers

Would allow local priority too be made which will be different from Westminster priority

Wouldn't trust SCC to manage anything

Wouldn't it encourage councillors to corrupt by putting the money into privately owned areas

Yes I agree that this is important, but I see no details as to how this is actually going to be managed. I do not see details on the controls in place to ensure that the money is not wasted on initiatives that do not deliver any real value. I also want to understand what other councils have gone down this route and what results they are seeing. I do not want to be another Birmingham. I do not trust the existing councillors to use this money properly

Yet another layer of bureaucracy and inefficient public sector penpushers wasting taxpayer cash. We need less government, not more. Look at the disastrous results caused by having mayors in large cities and commissioners in control, of police funds. Huge waste of money and unjustifiable extra costs with huge losses to the productive part of the organisation

You can't control the funds you currently have, you don't need more

"You can't run the services you are responsible for at an acceptable level at the moment.

There is no way you should be trusted to take on further responsibilities."

You can't spend the money you already have wisely

You cannot control what you get now

You can't be trusted to use the existing funds you get to benefit the public.

You couldn't be trusted to invest or spend this money wisely. I have no faith in your financial capabilities. Money would be wasted on the wrong areas. You already do it know !

You do not say what money Suffolk gets from central government at the moment.

You don't spend the money wisely now, so why have more to throw away on your silly ideas?

You should already have access to funds, is this funding a financial benefit for handing power to another company?

You will squander the money, pay your staff too much and eventually go bankrupt like other mega councils

You will waste it all, the only thing you lot are good at is filling your own pockets

You will waste it on DEI and overpriced consultants.. stop building cardboard houses, taking away our fields and destroying our way of life will the criminals and ██████████ you have filled Suffolk with

You'd need to explain what you were going to do with the money, and how it would affect gov. Funding in the future

Your record of sensible budgetting is poor and SCC should not be allowed to have further budget control in the mentioned important areas

**Q6. If the deal were to go through, how would you like Suffolk County Council to spend this £480 million investment fund? For example, elsewhere, this has included offering local business support, investing in infrastructure and helping people access free bus travel.**

£16 million a year for the whole of Suffolk makes it very limiting. Be worth nothing in a few years time. Allocate it to those areas of out towns that you do a bad job now of cleaning, our bus stations.

£16m a year is not a vast sum. Granted, it could make a small difference here and there but it's not much more than the equivalent of 40 new houses being built to restock affordable homes.

£16m is not going to go far. There are so many potential priorities. I have no strong views on this.

"£21 per head per annum isn't enough to do any of those things. Spend it on roads maintenance (which you do absolutely ██████████ all of) or give it to childrens centres (which you've slashed to the bone).

Or use it to ensure more houses are built - generating more council tax for you all."

£480 million over 30 years is only £16 million per year, which is minimal, considering the cost for adult and children care and SEND etc. But the £16 could not adequately spread the spend

across local business, infrastructure, public services and amenities, sustainable initiatives and accessible transport.

"1) Access to free bus travel for young people especially those going to college, apprenticeships etc

2) Improved rural transport provision - again, especially for young people trying to access further learning.

3) Providing grants to help communities carry out works to become more resilient to flooding and adapt to the climate crisis.

"

"1) Improvement of the roads, dealing with potholes

2) removing litter, cleaning up the streets

3) helping the homeless people who have taken to setting up tents around the city

4) investing in promising local businesses

5) supporting local policing, healthcare workers "

16m/year for 30 years all on improving cycling, walking, and urban mobility via highway design transformation and prioritisation.

480 million is not much to enhance or make much of a difference.

A better bus network. Fixing the poor state of roads. Please do not use this to fund reduced speed limits and area wide road closure schemes.

A comprehensive bus system. Its no good having free bus passes if the system is only partial. For example you cant get a direct bus from Haverhill to West Suffolk Hospital

A good start would be getting roads fixed, getting local services vmback on track, taking care of elderly and infim people, and basically putting suffolk first rather than suffolk group holdings and executives

A northern by pass for Ipswich. Schools to receive the same level of funding per capita as other parts of the country. An overhaul of council tax bands which would increase income. Many residents are living in Band E and F properties following enormous extensions and only paying Band C and D. This is unjust.

A robust strong monitoring as money is being wasted in most other departments

A sizeable chunk of the funding should go towards much needed investment in infrastructure. For instance, there has been discussions on upgrading the rail link to Peterborough and still nothing has happened. There have been promises to introduce hourly services between the Ipswich to Peterborough railway line, but nothing has materialised for decades. We also, finally and urgently, need a northern Ipswich bypass. Why can Norfolk County Council get road schemes through their business cases and gain supporting funding from the government, but Suffolk County Council Executive struggles to get any plans off the drawing board.



A volunteer/ seconded Fund Management committee should decide, based on afforsaid local knowledge using a value for the county be that health, welfare, wellbeing, employment opportunities whatever

"a) I would like to know how 'partners' are chosen and whether the chosen partners for project work to spend the budget can be consulted down to Parish level ( provided PCCs also consult adequately.

b) I would like to know how or whether members of the public can be elected members for decision-making on the budget allocation

c) I would like less money WASTED on hedge and verge cutting; I would like greater investment and(expert advice for consultation for greening Suffolk) ; I would like more money and incentives given to Suffolk farmers for sustainable and green farming; I would like greater investment in local bus transportation- even if voluntary communities are encouraged to support this. ; I would like building and development (Renewable & housing) to be used on Brownfield sites; I would like policies to protect Suffolk hinterlands and coastal areas ; like ban on hunting; would like public-elected communities to be invested in and involved in countryside and wildlife restoration; I would like policies that support localism for smaller community food retail. "

Access to better bus travel and encouraging provision and uptake of non-carbon emitting travel, home heating and insulation to reduce overall carbon footprint. Pushing back on the quasi-urbanisation of East Suffolk by Sizewell C and Friston sub-station plus access by heavy lorries.

Accessing any sort of bus travel which could be described as a service would be a great, as all our buses come from Norfolk and are run by their decisions. People are leaving the village as we have no service, yet we have a number of visitor attractions which people have to drive to as the buses do not stop. I noted previously that funding went to Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds and other "pet" areas, rather than the rural areas which need funding too.

Acting to support High Street economic activity

Addressing the social and welfare needs, and education needs of the population to redress many years of under funding

"adequate free bus travel would enable young people

in remote villages to get to work, at present impossible without a car which they can't afford."

Adult and child social care

Adult care

Adult care and road infrastructure

Affordable housing - a proper rating system including the strategic redevelopment of town centres

Affordable housing and infrastructure. Green deals for solar would also be popular.

"Affordable housing that is eco friendly from the start (solar panels, swift boxes etc), more cycle lanes and more investment in public transport, while discouraging individual car use to reduce congestion and improve air quality.

More free bus travel would be great."

Affordable travel, regeneration of community estates, arts, education & relative skills for the area.

Again a question which does not tell the person reading it that it is not a lump sum.

Again SCC have wasted millions on failed projects. The waste of filling potholes over and over again is further evidence of money not being spent properly

Ah, buses. Bury St Edmunds needs bus services which would serve the requirements of the population. As it stands, we have a thready service from Monday to Friday, slightly less on a Saturday, and none on a Sunday. Oh and I forgot to mention, they start well into the morning, and finish very early in the evening. As for inter-city bus services, they barely exist.

"All derelict buildings, boarded up buildings to be renovated before more new housing is agreed too - this town (Ipswich) looks poor no matter which area you approach from.

Free travel for old as well as young.

Community education offered- free or subsidies (Fen Land District council do an excellent job of this) this stops isolation for unemployed or older - learn a new skill, craft etc

Some money could be spent on trade apprenticeship where the renovations of council property/land are happening.

Think about sustainability of projects rather than having to revisit 5 years later "

all of the above

All of the above

"All of the above Inc improving Road quality to make cycling safer.

Improve shocking rural bus services that lowest income citizens rely upon students, disabled and elderly

Means tested support for entrepreneurs/ small businesses "

all of the above plus a more efficient process for social care for both children with learning needs and adults who need social care

"All of the above

Also to support local arts."

All the above

All the above (local business support, investing in infrastructure and helping people access free bus travel), plus Apprenticeships and Transport initiatives, planning reform?

all the above also green spaces and wildlife

All three, an holistic approach is needed. Can't separate business, infrastructure and mobility. Free bus travel would be quite attractive in terms of reduced traffic, more money in pocket to bring to business and business development

Allocations should be distributed across key service areas with proportions weighted by levels of service/needs. This would negate internal bidding. The allocations should then be ring-

fenced for service improvements, operational growth, research and innovation, business case development, and/or infrastructure delivery. As an example, in transport, funding could be directed to enable delivery of Local Transport Plan projects (e.g., LCWIPs, BSIPs, etc).

Amount is a pittance. Would not even fix the potholes

An annual inclusive event to determine spend against an agreed framework - not everything can happen at once and it might be a mix of one big thing one year and collection of small seeding - type things the next - key is to be brave/bold !

An improvement in rural bus services , especially in the evenings and at weekends. It doesn't have to be free.

An overall infrastructure plan is important with so much house building going on. Many factors need to be addressed.

And herein lies the problem. As private citizens, businesses, voluntary organisations and charities we all believe we know the answer to how the money should be spent. Therefore when the money isn't spent on 'your cause' it will cause resentment and division.

Any additional funds should be used on adult services which is grossly underfunded

Any bus service in parts of Suffolk would be appreciated, doesn't have to be free but that would be a bonus! Currently, there are areas of Suffolk that have no public bus service at all and this impacts all aspects of people's lives both young and old, and encourages more car use than needed - doesn't promote the green county pledge.

Any where but Ipswich people live 40/60 miles from Ipswich and get little support

"Anything green, the best way to increase the standard of living is to have segregated bike paths and permanently pedestrianised areas

The reading supports this concept of urban planning. Regeneration of brownfield sites and conservation of Greenfield sites is best for carbon reduction, or you could buy Anglian water and just be a hero.

If you are deciding between traffic lights and roundabouts it's roundabouts every time

Oh and if you want a megaproject it's half the cost of 1 HS2 tunnel to build 3 tunnels to connect Felixstowe and Harwich, 1 for cars 1 for trains and an emergency escape tunnel for those 2 that is wide enough for cyclists and if you only charged the vehicles £4 to cross it would pay itself off in sub 5 years likely closer to 2.3 years, it is unlikely you would have funding for this but it makes you a lot of money if you own it and not China or Saudi or some investment firm.

Bus travel is reasonably priced when compared to rail travel but bus travel is too slow, bus lanes need to be commonplace and separate from cyclists."

Apprenticeships for GP and dental health staff.

Arts and culture

As above

As general fund to allow SCC to meet its statutory obligations

"As I said previously, I have no faith that the council will spend this money wisely.

Roads, public services, education, town centres, transport all need investment and I really cannot see the council managing this devolution effectively "

As in the above

As it currently is as there is already a deficit & so I don't believe there is in real terms any 'extra' spending

As said before, it doesn't sound like very much per annum. There are so many areas that need improvement - schools, roads, loads. What we don't need is money spent on devolution.

as stated already

As the bus service has been badly hit in recent years offering free bus travel seems like a trivial gesture. Invest the money in things that matter to people like improving the terrible state of the roads, pavements and signs in Suffolk.

Attract businesses to a "tech park" like Reading - businesses such as Google, Amazon, Oracle, Microsoft, etc.

Background infrastructure such as building new main roads, that connect Suffolk with the national network.

Bad idea as we end up with people dealing with the budget who just waste the funds and line there back pockets

Based on Suffolk Councils record its highly unlikely much of this would find its way to address their many and persistent failings.

Benefiting local tax payers, especially those who are isolated. Improving life for all residents - from education to health care. Landscaping and general council services

Better bus services for rural community's

Better bus services to rural communities - not necessarily free

Better bus services. Local town councils etc to decide what parking fees are best suited to their town not a blanket coverage imposed by Suffolk County Council which is detrimental to the town centre surviving

Better buses

Better car parking in local towns, good rural bus transport. Maintaining community buildings, schools etc. overhauling the road system both urban and rural. Looking at a northern bypass for Ipswich.

Better care of infrastructure, particularly roads. Better speed limits on single track roads. Better transport from rural areas to local towns, local and larger medical services and dental services.

Better early intervention public services to prevent escalation to higher social or health care need. For example, more public health schemes, better early help services for families and children in schools.

Better infrastructure

Better infrastructure, especially where there has been excessive building, Bramford and Great Blakenham for example. Better bus services for villages.

Better local transport, mitigation of flood risks due to climate change, retro-fitting of housing stock to reduce energy usage.

Better mental health care for children. More support for SEND.

Better opportunities for young adults, tailored workforce, invest in greener transport, and CPO the brownfield site between the waterfront and town centre!

better public transport

Better public transport routes for all town's and villages not necessarily free as people would be willing to pay just to have a service.

Better Public Transport, easily accessible jobs for people with difficulties.

Better rail connections/reinstating lost rail connections and public transport schemes, like Trams and guided busways.

"Better road systems, more housing and roads will be insufficient. Improve rural services which don't run 7 days a week and not enough through the day. We have to pick our son up in the next village so he doesn't have to wait around in Ipswich. "

"better rural bus services

devolve the money down to the districts and boroughs and parish councils

isupport local energy projects

support small businesses and local highstreets

"

better rural services and services to specific large employers to try and get cars off the already crowded roads. Years ago housing was strategically placed next to employment centres but this type of planning ceased 30 years ago.

"Better support for the older frail members of our society with social care.

Ensuring that our road network is kept in better condition.

Improving public transport for rural villages and small towns."

Borrow over 30 years and spend it all asap to beat inflation ...

Brandon needs a new cemetery, as we are more diverse in different cultures. Some religions believe in burial not cremation. And somewhere for youngsters to be buried, so loved one's can visit.

Bring back the high streets

Bringing back the Ipswich market and reducing rates for businesses or bringing in grant schemes for new start ups wanting to set up in town; bringing in community hubs in town where people work together, more evening classes, more young and old initiatives to inspire, more art funding, occupying the antisocial people or trying to inspire them into something / making them feel they have a future; free parking on certain days of the week to encourage people back into town, encourage businesses to allow workers to take a day a year minimum to volunteer locally; help with CVs; language cafes; etc.

Budget is insufficient to have any impact

Build More SEN school's and more SEN service's and more support for children with SEN and more support for parents and carers of SEN children

Building more houses in places other than suffolk.

Building up that funding for local services and increasing their capacity

Buisness help yes but not free bus that should be more buses including the mini buses for outlying areas

bus bus bus bus bus bus bus bus busses!

Bus services in West Suffolk

Bus services need improving and fares lowered. I would like to see the return of adult education classes in Ipswich, for enhancement of peoples lives and skills. I think greater control over the type of shops which are opening up is necessary, such as fronts for under the counter goods and sweet shops targetting vapes at children. Our roads are also dire, with potholes causing damage to cars.

Bus services that encourage people to use for work and leisure to reduce car use because a good alternative. Services that connect with train stations too.

Bus travel - highways maintenance - encouraging neighbourhoods to look after there own space

Bus travel in suffolk is appalling, however in suffolk this isnt explicitly a priority in suffolk with it having one of the highest quantities of car ownerships as a region, alleviating soaring housing prices in suffolk should be more of a priority with average house prices increasing by over 16%, the council should attempt to merge the construction of council housing and private housing in an attempt to prevent localised inequality and deprivation which would be effective in lowering housing prices and keeping crime low, investment in infrastructure in suffolk is of key importance, roads lack quality and size, within rural suffolk this has created great danger with the size of vehicles and agricultural equipment often being transported around roads that are far too small whilst still being within the legal restrictions for road travel, the a14 is somewhat appalling with regular accidents causing huge blockages, this is damaging to the economy in suffolk and the country with both felixstowe and lowestoft using these roads as gateways into the broader country, these constant blockages damage productivity in suffolk with people

unable to get to work this is incredibly damaging. Main targets in suffolk should be infrastructure and housing.

Bus travel that truly links to create an effective rural service across Suffolk.

Bus travel, school transport, better mental health support in schools

Buses and EV charging

Buses unavailable so no point in free travel. £16 m per year won't go far. Is there a carry-over facility

Business and infrastructure investment

Business support and pump-priming infrastructure improvements.

Business support, better communications.

Business support, infrastructure, public transport

Business support, more help for homeless and better care services to the elderly

Business, jobs, transport and ambition!

By actually listening to the people of Suffolk, rather than following their own agenda which does not provide the real services needed

By investing in hospitals, care homes and an efficient police force

Capital investment in infrastructure would seem most important - giving a permanent legacy from the fund.

Care and bus services

Carefully

Cease the run down conditions of the roads. It is embarrassing to be associated with as visitors see this the minute that they step over the border into Suffolk.

"Cheap train fair

Cheaper bus fair

More route and more frequent times

Investment back in the town centre bury and Norwich still have decent retail shops, bars and cafes and social scenes.

Stop letting out of touch people make decisions.

Investment into public services. When are we as country or county going to do more grow our workforce for the NHS or local services!!!! Stop relying on an agency and private sector.

And care and support the elderly. "

Chiefly in infrastructure, a sector in which this region has been sorely ignored for too many decades while pumping £bns in Scotland, Wales & N Ireland, and even into places like Ireland & Spain through the EU. English and German taxes have largely rebuilt Irish and Spanish infrastructure in the last 30 years.

"Child Serbs

"

Children's and adult social care should take a priority

"Cleaner Rivers!

Better transportation

Better recycling

Roads

Safeguarding children

"

Climate change and climate resilience

Climate change, Education, Business, social care

Community care, community recreation. Bring the sports center facility back . Allow in the hub of people to work together

Community resources for adult social care potentially preventing people from needing to enter into the system if they are able to receive support from a local level.

Community support services, bus travel, maintenance of roads and pavements, adult social care.

"Conflating remodelling of a democratic model with a speculative comment about remittance of monies is poor logic. These monies (if obtained) would be spent in urban centres to the detriment of other areas.

Sustainable holistic transport, better planning controls and better schools and SEND Provision is badly needed

"

Continuous cycle lanes. No commercial planning approval without Solar panel roofs. No further building on agricultural land

Core service provision.

Council houses



creation and maintenance of green spaces in urban areas, environmental improvement (especially litter and dog refuse!), improving public transport links.

"Definitely better infrastructure, such as repairing roads.

Better NHS/Police staffing.

Free transport for over 60s as in London.

Better bus service to rural/semi rural areas."

Definitely highways infrastructure as well as as CYP as these are two areas that have come under big pressures lately.

Definitely infrastructure, more transport for people living in villages and access to free bus travel.

Definitely Infrastructure.

Definitely investing in services that will bring business to the area also Ipswich Town Centre is a complete eyesore!! Run down shops and businesses, the loss of the high street as the general public are spending their monies in other places such as Colchester and Bury St Edmunds

"Definitely on transport - towns are fairly ok, but the rural services are horrendous leaving a lot of people without means of travelling. This in turn can reduce their access to community, activities, food choices etc, ultimately leading to possible isolate, poor mental health (which in turn costs more to provide support).

Adult education is another area that would benefit from providing courses relevant to this local area.

This could be provided to the job opportunities available, and also around the level of ability for those wanting to access the education.

Suffolk is an increasingly diverse place, though with some pockets that are still very much white English. The educational courses wanted, and levels needed, are likely to vary widely across the county. Local tailoring could potentially help with ensuring the correct courses are available to people, rather than courses that have been deemed appropriate by a central service such as the Dept of Education.

Increasing support for local businesses would be fabulous. I live in the Ipswich area, and often think how disappointing it is the town centre has become a ghost/clone town. There is so much potential to encourage local business, to have locals open their own shops to sell the wide variety of products people make within the council, from farm produce, veg, honey, eggs etc, to items such as candles, soaps, toiletries, clothing, furniture, art, crafts etc. There is so much talent within Suffolk, and whilst online purchasing is good, having places where people can see the items in person will likely increase sales and create more jobs through higher profits etc."

Definitely the ROADS and then care at home simply because the elderly have paid into these governments all their lives!

Depends on other funding streams inc Council Tax. There appears to be much duplication of effort/waste across SCC and other agencies in some areas - public services need to be more joined up.

Depends where the priorities are.

"Develop and improve public transport access and ease of use,

Improve active transport infrastructure (Walking, cycling etc)

Invest in affordable, social housing. Ensure rents are affordable and not a business opportunity for wealthy landlords."

"Developing brownfield sites for redevelopment.

Investment in younger people - help them travel to learning etc

"

Developing Suffolk as an outstanding area of scientific research and development, with big investments in education and transport links to Cambridge, London and Norwich.

Developing the sustainable infrastructure necessary to coping with the climate emergency - for example but not limited to: non-fossil fuel public transport that meets residents' needs, comprehensive EV charging facilities, safe walking/cycling routes that connect villages with towns, fitting adequate insulation to homes, local sustainable energy production, etc etc

"Development and improvement of public transport are vital to reduce dependence on private vehicles. Support for appropriate local businesses also important to provide employment and training for young people.

"

Development of towns to become more modernised and increased investment in the police force.

Devolution is a bad idea.

Devolution to SCC must NOT happen . They already waste too much of the funds we have to provide them with !!!.

Devolve the decision to the really local councils, they know what local people want

"Disability inclusion

Free parking

Pothole repair

"

Do not wish it to go through

Doctors, roads and social care

Don't do it

Don't give it to them in the first place. They will just fritter it away on useless 'projects' and employ another head a department with his/her team of minions.

Don't saddle us with more debt.

Don't spend it, it will only be used to the depriment of Ipswich and its residents

Don't. It's a bad deal for Suffolk.

Don't agree with the proposal.

Dont devolve

Don't know yet where problem areas would be.

don't spend it on handouts and support to private business. They should function on capitalist principles. I have seen with your woke expenditure on flood/irrigation schemes how much money is wasted for no gain from dishonest projects .

Don't think this has been properly been worked out and will require a lot of adjustment to get it to get it to work

dredging of more streams/rivers, more investment into schools, better roads.

Drs Surgeries - the present ones are overflowing with patients and the public are not getting the right kind of care from their surgeries. Building homes for local workers and not aimed at Commuters. Suffolk workers first and foremost.

Each spending decision must include a consideration for the natural environment and for Suffolk in particular. There could be many opportunities to improve policies for people's lives and our environment

Educating and encouraging residents of Suffolk to appreciate and understand the spending priorities for devolved services leading to co-operative communicative supportive safe communities, who work with each other improve all aspects of life in Suffolk

education

Education

Education

"Education ( new schools, SEND services/ schools, Technical training, Children services / centers to improve social skills early development including those with SEND, enhanced library services with greater premises and free training for those that qualify) In turn wide spectrum training for professionals in the sector.

Further support for parks and recreation to invite developers to invest in multi faceted entertaining areas available throughout the year.

Support for coastal towns that relay completely on the summer trade to survive throughout winter, so they can have a sustainable way forward that would work all year around. This will bring prosperity to those areas.

Invest in infrastructure for future proofing to be present in all developments. Re-align policy with this concept so it becomes a 'must have' rather than a 'nice to have'.

To re-think transport services. Invest in electric / green fuel fleets.

Small towns and villages to become more self sufficient to minimize the need for frequent long distance travel.

Support the creation of industrial / business areas to encourage economical growth. "

"Education and mental health

"

Education and SEND. Recreational areas and activities for young people.

Education and supporting businesses to evolve with the use of technology.

Education and training initiatives, focussed by local business collaboration in order to develop home grown talent and skills that feed into economic development and life chances for young (and later life) learners.

"Education for special needs.

"

Education Road maintenance

Education without propaganda and travel infrastructure so the residents of Suffolk can better themselves.

"Education

Roads

Infrastructure "

Education, roads, bringing employment to the area for young people

Elect a more representative SCC taking the too long control from Conservative members.

Enable a means of financial borrowing which will result in lower interest rates which will assist in reducing costs for all developments and improve a high number of financial investments

Enabling people to access transport and other infrastructure services when in disadvantaged positions. Revitalising high streets. Improving infrastructure in Ipswich to avoid or reduce gridlock in events of Orwell Bridge closure.

"Enabling the use of brown field sites for development to mitigate further loss of green spaces.

To invest in the rural communities of the county."

Enabling work - eg infrastructure, skills training, transport, power supplies - anything that unblocks the potential of economic growth and improved outcomes for people.

Encourage and support independent SMEs to bring vibrancy and creativity into our towns by providing staged rent subsidies and cheaper parking. Support access to rural communities with better public transport. Make our towns safer and cleaner.

"Encourage small local businesses to town centres to provide a range of goods/services, and to become an

- attraction to the high street. Better access to town centres, Provide convenient, reliable and regular school transport which would also benefit the wider community. "

Encouraging local businesses by taking a small share in them, not a controlling share but big enough to have knowledge and input into what was going on. Could use recently retired local business men.

Encouraging the use of public transport by lower fares and more rural routes and better frequency. Also investment in safer cycling routes separate to roads.

Ensuring adequate provision of education and social services for SEND families, including respite care, family support, services for educational establishments and transport.

Ensuring the roads are kept up to a decent standard. Ensuring families in poverty are able to feed their children. Ensuring local schools can actually provide proper physical education. I see a consistent theme across local schooling where children are not educated on the power of physical education. It breeds good physical and mental health. Which in turn helps deliver cost savings to our local NHS and mental well being facilities. Our children will be more inclined to have the mental strength to go out to work and be more confident as they reach higher education age to go into higher education and working age which will help deliver growth back into our local coffers. I want to see plans in place for this

Entirely on measures to reduce Carbon Emissions. So far SCC is not walking its talk re Climate Emergency when it comes to broad policy for Suffolk (just some minor measures re its own operational emissions). Such investment must ensure the emissions reduction of each project is properly estimated & its delivery independently measured (not the usual spin / greenwash)

Entrepreneur fund - something to get small businesses started up and running, especially in the tech and ai world; infrastructure improvements - active travel to rail or similar. Community funds that could be applied to by parish's for park equipment, traffic calming, etc.

Environment

Establish a cultural centre in Lowestoft to regenerate the town and repatriate the stolen local records to that centre from the hole in Ipswich

Even today the service we get from West Suffolk council leaves a lot to be desired. The £480M would likely be throwing good money after bad.

Exactly as above

"Exercise facilities (gyms, swimming, etc)

Green spaces (parks, rivers etc)

Local retail businesses in specific areas that are free from anti social behaviour

"

Extended bus routes, improved social care

"Farming Support

Suffolk listed buildings owners helped to maintain the properties

Rural roads looked after better

Dentists NHS

"

Fill all the potholes in the roads, free bus passes for all at 60 years old, improve river and sea water quality. Lower small shop rates.

Fill in the pot holes we are getting like a third world country.

Fill in the potholes on pavements

"Filling in pot holes - priority

Increased investment in public transport

More parks and green spaces

Proper funding for schools and transport."

Filling in potholes and shorting up river banks

Filling the potholes rather than sweeping roads

"First look at all your Statutory duties and check they are being met. Ensure especially in matters pertaining to youth you are sat at the table. You are currently missing - Essex, Cambs, Norfolk are there, where are you?

Check your Statutory Duties are met first, then look at how you fund some of your teams. Older care, highways, early help, there is much work to be done on what you already have in place before the improvements. "

Fix the basics - roads, schools, buses. Dont waste on DEI until basics are done

Fix the potholes! Get rid of loads of traffic lights! Open up the roads that have been closed off. Put back junctions like Defoe Road the way they were! Provide off street parking in residential areas

Fix the potholes, remove cycle lanes from roads, dual the A12 from Lowestoft to Ipswich, Bring a records office back to Lowestoft

Fix the road system

Fix the roads with proper resurfacing rather than patching that lasts 5 minutes. Help schools that are desperate for funds. Support social care.

Fix the roads with proper resurfacing rather than the cheap patching that only lasts 5 minutes. Help schools that are desperate for funds. Support social care

Fix the roads. Subsidise bus routes.

"Fix the roads.

Carry out remediation on brownfield sites to stop slapping building all through the countryside.

"

Fixing all the roads and potholes quickly, they are a danger to life, especially for motorcyclists., also a northern bypass for Ipswich. Buses up to midnight from Ipswich to rural areas.

Fixing existing infrastructure and not waste on ten year plans that are never realised

Fixing pot holes, ensuring we keep the £2 bus fare cap

"Fixing potholes, and similar road repairs.

"

fixing potholes, more police presence in populated areas to make women feel safer

Fixing the [REDACTED] roads might be a good start. I really couldn't care less about buses. Maybe try and fix the hospital that is falling down, or the pot holes the size of dinner plates, the homeless who are suffering in various ways. First time buyers who can barely afford to live, the elderly who cannot get an appointment for the doctors or access care, the police who cannot effectively do their jobs because they are so horrifically understaffed. Suffolk has so many issues that need addressing first before you consider offering an oyster style bus pass system. Your priorities are in the wrong place.

fixing the phone signal around the howard estate

Fixing the potholes.

Fixing the roads across suffolk. Definitely not on any stupid "green" schemes or schemes that the public never asked for.

Fixing the roads and pavements etc

Fixing the roads for to make them more safe for petrol and diesel cars to use, and fire extinguishers for the EV ones.

Fixing the roads properly not wasting money doing potholes over and over again

Fixing up all the roads would be a starter. sorting out buses to rural areas especially where you have planted huge amounts of new houses with no way for them to get to work. Sorting out the water and sewage systems for the places you have stuck all this housing.

Focus on real infrastructure investment rather than the politically expedient sound bites. I.E. roadways, waterways, rail links affordable housing!

"focus on town centres to address long term neglect and support for business growth (need jobs, not just houses).

Address rural isolation - not just with free buses, but making sure services are provided where people live "

For a play are for children, in every areas new housing is being built

For goodness sake do you not spend enough Taxpayers money already, more than time to draw your horns in and cut costs across the whole of Suffolk, ditch all vanity projects and propping up decaying services and town centres.

"FOR MAINTAINING THE WEST SUFFOLK RECORD OFFICE IN RAINGATE STREET IN BURY ST EDMUNDS, AND THE RECORD OFFICE IN THE CENTRAL LIBRARY IN LOWESTOFT. WE HAVE AN INCREDIBLE RANGE OF HISTORIC DOCUMENTS AND ARCHIVES WHICH NEED TO BE KEPT WHERE LOCAL PEOPLE CAN EASILY SEE THEM.

There should also be funding for libraries.

Heritage. Conserving historic buildings, including Suffolk's many beautiful historic churches.

Improving museum services.

Promoting archaeology. Setting up more nature reserves."

"For starters we need better public transport to help the environment, people who this is the only way to travel to work, school, town etc. We also need a better system of reducing the amount of empty lorries on the road.

We should also be investing in our town & village centres by reducing business rates to encourage growth rather than seeing the decay caused by online shopping, artificial intelligence and out of town retail parks."

Forget FREE bus travel. We need reliable and roadworthy buses for which the public must be willing to pay and abandon cars.

Forget the buses, hopeless. Reinvigorate our road network and surfaces.

Free bus or supported bus travel

Free bus travel

Free bus travel

Free bus travel and active transport measures

Free bus travel and maintenance of free car parking

"Free bus travel and more accessible bus services would be highly important to me. It would be valuable to me to see more bus routes across the city of Ipswich as well as county-wide. I appreciate the bus routes already available from Ipswich to Felixstowe and Aldeburgh, and would consider more trips as a tourist around the county if there were better bus access across Suffolk - e.g. to Sutton Hoo. Trains are incredibly unreliable and expensive right now, and I find a lot of value in bus routes, and think that more accessible bus routes would make a lot of difference to my enjoyment of the county, as well as those who cannot drive but still want to enjoy days out around the county.

I also believe more can be done to support the libraries. I moved to Suffolk to take on a library job, and having applied and interviewed for multiple library positions around the country, I believe that a lot more has been done with public services through funding in other parts of the country that Suffolk libraries could follow and benefit from - more funding for staffing to make



the libraries more efficient, more groups for socialising, which in turn benefits the local community and individuals' mental health and support systems, more activities for children throughout the holidays, and also the training and awareness of the safe space for all vulnerable peoples that the library provides. "

Free bus travel for children and old people it is very important. Waterways and coastal areas cleaning and sea defence/ protection. New and improved roads.

Free bus travel for rural villages sounds great but I'm sure the greater populations opinion would be great full for the transport service to start with as many routs and stops have been removed from service leaving some of our most vulnerable and younger residents stranded.

Free bus travel helps keep people socially active as well as other practical functions. Business support and infrastructure is very important and I agree with those stated uses.

Free bus travel is only of benefit to individuals - not the greater good of Suffolk. £16million a year will not go very far at all. Is this extra funding or a trade off for something else? Road surfaces, and litter, and anti social behaviours are really bad in some places, business are leaving in droves and high streets are becoming ghost towns - we really need incentives for businesses to return to our high streets and to clean them up and make them feel safe and inviting again

Free bus travel is pointless when the buses are so few and far between. Roads certainly need to be better taken care of and as for local business support where would this be directed, to small businesses or those with 5 or more employees where there is already adequate help from business organisations and government. If you want to help small business a cut in business rates would be better.

Free bus travel won't help - people will choose their car over a bus 9/10. Make using the car more difficult or introduce car clubs/ride sharing and better active travel infrastructure. Supporting small independent businesses would be good too, there are far too many large businesses and far too few smaller ones.

free bus travel would be great in order to make a greener county - and also help out local residents who are still struggling with a rise in the cost of living/austerity made worse by the Tories. I would like to see infrastructure and services improved to better the safety of towns such as Ipswich and Stowmarket - both of which have seen a rise in sexual assaults/rapes recently. Money to charities to help support victims of those crimes would also be beneficial. Helping out local independent businesses would also seek to revive Ipswich's high street which is dying unfortunately.

"Free bus travel would greatly help reduce car traffic and use. Ipswich was not designed for the amount of cars on the road and parked outside houses.

There are so many cars on the roads that children are scared to ride bikes on them. "

Free bus travel would probably help stimulate business.

Free bus travel, improving the streets and safety of Suffolk.

Free bus travel, infrastructure

Free bus travel, investment in education (e.g. scholarships at the university), encourage businesses into Ipswich Town Centre

Free bus travel, more on SEND and carer facilities, Sure Start, mending potholes, improving schools infrastructure

Free bus travel/improving public transport, better access to support services.

Free car parking, effective speed limits which are enforced, access to open spaces and affordable housing.

Free or discounted public transport, particularly to connect villages and give easier access to education. At the moment there's a lot available educationally in West Suffolk which is expensive to access from the coast. Supporting local businesses is a great idea too.

Free parking in Sudbury, Hadleigh and anywhere else they are going to make us pay to park. Also investment in Belle Vue Park in Sudbury seeing as it was left to get so bad so they could sell off the house that was gifted to Sudbury even though no one in Sudbury wanted it to be sold off!

Free parking in town. Fixing the roads so our cars are not damaged just trying to get to work. Make buses and trains more regular and affordable.

Free parking, free bus service, major investment in towns and villages to help revive local businesses.

Free public transport, better policing, better healthcare

Free re-training and opportunities for people to develop their skills for employment.

Free travel for U21

From previous experience No council has the necessary aptitude to manage any greater powers or finances

"Fulfil existing responsibilities better.

Show more empathy and acknowledge ratepayers's legitimate expectations."

Funding for early-stage businesses, offering business support and grant funding. Support for education leavers to access the workforce. Improving access to training and creating a skills strategy to bring more people into training/retraining. Investing in more public spaces, like open areas or water for people to use. Improve health options for people to exercise more. Allow more brown field development for housing and businesses and reduce green field sites from being developed. Support/improve telephone connectivity across the county, and especially in urban areas. Support and encourage more creativity and innovation in the education and workforce and brings more private investors into the county.

Funding for pre school children nursery places. Care in the community for the elderly. Potholes. Helping local businesses.

Funding for training

Funding for youth groups - need to help support young people to have a safe space. Helping out with local business especially in Ipswich.

Funding Mental Health services in Suffolk, affordable housing

Funding school places for children with special educational needs.

"General support for the counties towns. Revitalisation of the town centres across the county is becoming critical.

Failing that, fix the roads. Potholes are becoming dangerous."

Get a better planning department and sack mark russell

Give it back to central government.

Give it back to tax payers by reducing the ridiculously high council tax.

Give rural areas the same level of care as towns. Our roads are not gritted to the same extent, we have to pay presept to get grass cut. Parish councils in rural areas need more funds to even up

"Give us road surfaces. At the moment we are driving around frantically trying to avoid massive potholes, with very little space in-between. We need decent roads, as for most people outside of Ipswich, bus services are dreadful, and evening services are nonexistent

"

Giving all voluntary organisations opportunities to bid on projects, the same as others, and konsult with the local people in each hand Suffolk town, as what is right for Bury St Edmunds is not necessarily right for Lowestoft

Giving protection to areas such as Framlingham Castle, Abbey Gardens and Belle View Park by preventing private ownership. Outside of that more support for local businesses and help to remove the constant price risings of landlords.

"Go back to basics and level up access to transport, infrastructure such as medical care and internet.

Business people maybe can run their own businesses if the infrastructure is 8n place as opposed to being given advice by people who don't run businesses. "

Good idea

Grants for locals starting new businesses in the area.

Grants to help with the cost of Insulation and other proven Environmentally beneficial improvements to homes and business to prevent us all wasting so much money on Energy and increased greenhouse emissions.

"Greater accessibility for disabled people including improved car parking and more car parking options for disabled people.

Improvements to adult social care,

Public transport services to villages "

Green accessible spaces/wildlife, sustainable travel, new crossing/bypass to help Ipswich when Orwell bridge is closed, activities/areas (spaces that can be used for young people/adults to come together). More public bins/waste collection.

Green infrastructure projects and better public transport

Green infrastructure, travel and net zero initiatives. Dedicated cycle networks. Improved rural public transport. Increase in train frequency on rural lines. Improved safety around town centres, parks, etc. Enforcement of parking restrictions.

"Green initiatives - solar panel grants, EV rental service. Fighting pylons, the future of Suffolk is not 'paving over it'.

"

Green initiatives and social care. The climate crisis demands we do all we can to reduce our impact on the planet. Social care demands will only increase in future. We must prepare so that we as a society can cope with the increased demands.

"Green initiatives.

Priority spending on OAPs.

Regeneration of town centres that focuses on safety, pleasant cafe society, mix of independent and high street chain shops, and sufficient free or low cost parking.

"

growing the economy and work across all public sector partners and agencies

Halesworth has lagged behind for years needs a new economic plan

Having access to free travel would encourage visitors and locals to visit towns and areas, which might increase revenue. Housing and social spaces for younger residents. Projects could include safety on our streets/online security for all generations.

Having seen how many councils have gone bust because of poor financial management why would I want you to control those fund.

health ans social care, schools, small bussiness, local road

Healthcare services

Help fill high street with business or activities

"Help in bringing forward housing sites and developing a strategic framework for this

Coordinated public transport network"

Help isolated villages with public transport and housing

"Help local businesses, small high Street ones in particular.

Alternatively, oras well as, help the poorest in the county, eg with a credit to council tax bills."

help sturt ups or give grants for new business that can reduce unemployment create new workplaces lift up economy

Help the smaller towns, free buses are good, but it would be better to have a bus service to start with. Roads are appalling in the towns west of Bury. You must remember suffolk isn't just about Ipswich and Bury

Help with infrastructure in rural areas and provide integrated transport system similar to Manchester. Also underwrite the building of more doctors surgeries in rural areas.

Helping local business, regeneration in deprived areas and improving local services. Infrastructure and roads.

Helping people access free bus travel

Helping people live net zero lives

Helping people of suffolk from Borth to death

Helping police tackle shoplifting instead of pointing speed cameras at drivers in areas not accident hot spots this would help bring the cost of living down. Flytipping urban and rural needs sorting.

Helping provide greed of subsidised public transport especially for more rural areas, supporting local smaller businesses, and encouraging more community schemes, particularly for young disadvantaged people.

Helping small business growth, improving transport.

"Helping the homeless

Supporting small businesses

Investing in infrastructure

Repairing potholes

Subsidised free bus travel "

Helping the poor and repairing infrastructure of this sad county!

"Helping to re-generate the High Streets by reducing or not charging for parking

Subsidised rural public transport, initiatives to support availability of socially rented housing and make rented housing in general more affordable

"

Helping unfrustrated

Helping veterans, helping children with a lack of support for anxiety issues and lack of SEND for those that need it but have failed to be diagnosed

Helping vulnerable people in the community, keeping the County tidy, Road maintenance and growth with new Business's. But how with £16 million a year. The Government are fobbing us off yet again. You can tell locally we're strapped for cash, just driving around Suffolk.

Here's an idea...I'd like you to use the funds you already have, to provide the education that our SEND children are legally entitled to, instead of wasting those funds defending Tribunals that parents are forced to pursue and you almost always lose. This is a frequent false economy and delay tactic used by scc and it's costing those children their education

Highways - sorting out roads. Libraries, building back communities

"highways infrastructure where i live is beginning to suffer with the expansion of building locally.

CYP and ACS continue to need funding. Dental services are poor in many areas (in terms of waiting lists/ availability of services - schemes to encourage these perhaps?)

public transport.

Green future projects/ arts & culture "

Highways need more money, many of the roads are bad, drains and gutters not maintained, pavements uneven. In light of the recent dreadful weather, more support for areas that were flooded.

Highways, roads, street lights, traffic lights

Hold Citizens Assemblies with expert witnesses to help residents guide decisions about priorities.

Honestly

House the homeless fix roads properly and give us value for money

Houseing

Housing regeneration. Additional affordable housing. Active travel interventions. Education. Subsidised public transport.

Housing support for carers to live in or near the places that need their skills. More eco carriers to move people & goods around without clogging the local areas with cars.

How about repairing the appalling state of the roads.

How about repairing the roads getting some dentists and GPs and a new hospital.

How is free bus travel an investment. Record on investments to date is not good. Get the basics right first such as roads before considering spending elsewhere.

"I a dream world

Regular reliable reasonable bus travel

A flat road surface

Police presence ( not just watching vehicles)"

I agree strongly with devolution, but don't have the experience or the data to comment on where to spend the money. Certainly local bus services are crucial for older people with not much money (ie poorer older/ people)

I believe that the money would be wasted.

I believe this fund should contribute to an increase in public transportation investment.

I By cancelling the whole stupid facade

I disagree with Devolution

I do ' NOT ' want the deal to go through !.

I do not agree with devolution

I do not agree with this devolution deal

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not trust SCC to have this level of responsibility

I do not want a devolved Suffolk as I don't think you would use the money as we would want at all pointless question!

I do not want SCC to have a penny of this money. Goodness knows what they would waste it on.

I do not want SCC to have more control ! .

I do not want the deal

I do not want the deal - it should all stay with central government!

I do not want the deal to go through

I do not want the deal to go through.

I do not want the deal to go through. The question predeposes the answer

I do not want this

I do not wish the deal to go through.

I don't agree with the deal

I don't believe they have the ability to control it ever

I don't know

I don't see this question as relevant as I don't wish devolution to go through the Suffolk County Council to have this funding

I don't support devolution

I don't think that SSC are capable of managing this. Funds will be soaked up by overpaid leaders

I don't think the council should have thus money.

I don't think this deal should go through. Suffolk council cannot be trusted. You spent wasteful amounts of money on things residents don't want or need (low neighbourhood zones, causing increase in traffic. You don't repair pot holes in timely fashion. Spend money on wasteful things). We don't want 'free bus travel you're not here to subsidise travel. Who thought of that?

I don't want devolution

I don't want devolution in Suffolk

I don't want devolution to happen so this is a loaded question. I don't believe you as a governing body can be trusted

I don't want it to go through

"I don't want SCC look at the wasted opportunities and millions over the last 2 & 1/2 years since the release of the Lincolnshire Report and your supposed improvement plan since then.

That went well! "

I don't want the deal that go through.

I don't want the deal to go through. It's a bad deal, and SCC is incapable or managing the money anyway.

I don't know. I expect the people that I vote for to seek specialist advice and then decide for me where money is best spent . If I don't like it, I will speak to my county councillor .

I dont think it should. But if it did reinstate housing related support to provide support to the most vulnerable people in the area. Invest in our roads. Stop paying the leaders of the council an overinflated salary.

I don't think SCC should be in control, rather an independent body should distribute across districts and boroughs for effective funding which is truly local.

I don't think that the council is capable of spending this amount of money wisely. It will be frittered away on more useless schemes in the same way that Suffolk County Council have been doing all along. I have no confidence in the caliber of the people making decisions within Suffolk County Council.

I don't think these are the priorities for Suffolk. We need money to support the services we have already and to protect the rural areas of Suffolk from being built on. This proposal mentions nothing about the services SCC offers now or how they will be affected by this.

I don't think this is a viable plan and is wide open to abuse and would have an increased risk of embezzlement.

I don't trust SCC to spend this and hope it never materilises.

I dont want it thank you. The question is forcing me to 'go along with it'. Using the Mayor of London senario as an example he overruled the elected government with his own agenda. Disastorous! I dont even agree with Scotland, Wales & N.Ireland devolution. No joined up thinking, post code lottery

I don't want it to go ahead, £480 is not enough

I don't want suffolk county council to undergo devolution

I don't want the deal

I dont want the deal to go through

I don't want the deal to go through

I don't want the deal to go through, but assuming it does I would like to see invested in infrastructure, and supporting local business which in Sudbury has taken a massive blow with the introduction of parking charges.

I don't want the deal to go through, it is a bad deal which due to inflation and a lack of yearly funding increases will leave Suffolk with a lack of funding and a financial crisis.

I don't want this deal to go through... divide Suffolk up into east, west and mid and let each area decide



I have little faith that SCC would adequately manage devolution and this budget, as such, am not supportive of this approach

I have no faith that any money will be spent wisely or on the subjects mentioned. I suspect there will be another tenure of local government which will be well funded, without achieving any useful output. As such, I think it is irrelevant where this money would be allocated to, it will have a little or no positive impact on the people of Suffolk, aside for those working directly for the County Council, their families and business associates.

I have no opinion on this because I do not want this to go through. It will simply be another way of blowing money because it will almost certainly bring in a new layer of management and will not result in £16M per annum extra being spent.

I have no option as this would be ignored anyway, plus I do not wish devolution to happen at all.

I hope it doesn't go through as Suffolk County Council can't manage to the budget it currently has, let alone an additional £480 million.

"I hope the deal does not go through, my tax pounds will be wasted on the sick lame and lazy.

I want the money to stay with central Govt.

"

I hope this doesn't go through

I hope you don't get it because I don't want a mayor

I really don't think SCC should have access to these funds, at all.

I think environmental education and sustainable travel, educating schools and community about sustainability important

I think every penny will need to pay off the current capital budget which is nearly about to sink the entire authority. I certainly don't want the Directly Elected Leader to borrow more money against it, which taxpayers will end up having to foot the bill for.

I think it needs to be a combination of investing in local business support that would kick start or regenerate areas which would then be self supporting including infrastructure.

I think local business support, particularly in businesses which address the climate emergency, would be useful. It would also be useful to invest in schemes to make insulation of the housing stock a priority, which would help with levelling up.

I think spending should directly benefit people in Suffolk; particularly addressing areas which have been cut in recent years such as Early Years childcare provision, facilities for young people and countryside bus routes.

I think that Suffolk devolution is an extremely bad idea and scc would only waste this money and ignore what the residents want so there is no point in stating what I think it could be spent on.

I think the main focus of this spending should be focused on climate change and tackling the challenges particularly regarding cars and road use by improving public transport and creating

behavioral change, pedestrianising more roads closing roads near schools and focusing on the 15 minute city model.

I think you should sort your company out and not try to devolve it so that you can change terms. You are managing public money and you should do that properly.

I very much hope you do lots of work to mitigate the effects of the climate crisis - better transport, flood defences, heat pump grants etc.

I would agree with local business support, infrastructure investment and public transport assistance as with else where. I would be keen to see existing programs and groups that have proven successful in boosting the local economy or improving the welfare of the people be prioritised to expand on proven track records.

I would devolve to a more local level

I would expect them to waste it.

I would invest the money in mental health and I would like to see more education in on the job learning

I would like full consultation with all stakeholders including residents. An example of good use of funding would be to keep the Record Offices open in Bury St Edmunds and Lowestoft.

"I would like it spent on public services including the roads / frequent reliable bus service

Not better paid jobs made up to monitor the spending and larger pension contributions "

"I would like it to be spent as efficiently as possible on the things that are needed to maintain the highest living standards for all across the county.

No one thing should be prioritised - each aspect of need should be considered. "

I would like it to improve support for early years ie bring back more Sure start type centres. Make sure that SEND provision is done properly and vulnerable children with special needs don't have to travel many miles to school.

I would like it to not be wasted, why should anyone get free bus travel

I would like more investment in local people, adult education, free travel (not just buses, electric buses for rural areas?). More job training/opportunities for young people - vocational not just academic.

I would like SCC to work with local residents and businesses to ensure it is spent on priorities and allocated fairly. The Suffolk infrastructure for children, marginalised communities and social care has to be a priority.

I would like the 480 million to be spent on helping people access to free bus travel and to invest in the local infrastructure so that the business has the right support to provide the necessary skills and knowledge to benefit the right areas that need it the most

"I would like the investment fund to have most impact to your 'everyday resident'. However this is spent, impact is key. Free bus travel would unlock more opportunities for our residents.

"

I would like this money to be invested in the people that really need it.

I would like this money to help people who are in employment receive help. Far too much cash goes on people who already receive help - benefits people (free food at school/trips, older people,( free travel)

I would like to see investment in public transport and infrastructure. New roads are not the answer to our County's transport issues - rather, improved access to public transport and sustainable transport infrastructure. It is vital to protect the environment (and this can be done without necessarily having a negative effect on the economy).

I would like to see it used to address factors that affect people quality of life and their chances in life. So I would like to see it being spent on things like education, SEND support, mental health services and addressing the root causes of poverty.

I would like to see Suffolk divided into East and West again. This is the only way west Suffolk will get equal services. I would like to see SCC working more with villages in west Suffolk particularly on environmental issues, public transport and infrastructure

I would like to see the roads being fixed, I would like to see parking being made free on our high streets so that we can reinvigorate shops so the high street can compete with industrial estates. I would like to see business rates being massively dropped so that retailers can afford to exist. I would like to see more local infrastructure projects, such as modifying road layouts so that congestion can be eased, the more people can move around freely the more likely they will be to visit places, the more likely they will be to spend money in shops. These kinds of changes are very simple but only result in net positive outcomes. I don't think we need free bus travel, what you need is an affordable service which is reliable. Care for the elderly is incredibly important, I would like to see investment in new ventures that will benefit us all. I think the council should have their own care network under the NHS umbrella, to be able to provide community care for people who need it, this kind of system would also help in reducing the amount of private care firms which massively profit off of the elderly and infirm with diabolically high care costs, yet pay their staff incredibly poorly. There's much more but that will do for now.

I would like to see this money put towards investments into education and especially special needs education. Suffolk is one of the worst performing councils in the entire country when it comes to SEN and this extra funding could be used for more opportunities for children with SEN and their parents.

I would need more information on areas of greatest need to help me make an informed decision

I would not like SCC anywhere need this. They need to concentrate on and show they can manage and run the services they are currently responsible for before being even considering taking on more responsibilities.

I would not like the 'deal' to go through. Describing the scheme as a "deal" makes it sound very underhanded and dodgy, something Arthur Daley would have dreamt up.

I would not trust them to spend it in any meaningful way.

I would rather the council invested more of the money to help tackle the cost of living crisis. The government are clearly corrupt, incompetent and have no experience in the real world so it would be down to the council to show them what real leaders are.

I would say it would be better to invest in infrastructure. Public buildings and transport mainly

"I would suggest prioritising things like Free School meals or free nursery places. Suffolk has a super aging population - support is needed to make it easier to have a young family in this county. That will also increase workforce participation.

Other alternatives are changing business rates for locally based businesses - supporting local job creators over national chains. The jobs tend to be more interesting in local companies and the benefit stays in the county. "

I would want it to be spent on necessary services and infrastructure to improve the whole of Suffolk not just the East and Ipswich like it does currently. All areas of Suffolk oay in but only a few get the benefit

I would want them to deal with homelessness and replacing NSFT. This organisation does not provide what it should for anyone including Suffolk mental health services.

I wouldn't trust the current council so I hope the deal does not go through.

I wouldn't wish for the deal to go through. I wouldn't want Suffolk County Council to have any more control over budgets/additional budget, as experience over the last 7+ years shows me that the Council does not prioritise spend in the right areas.

I'd need to know more about the range of areas that could be given support

"I'd rather central govt set Suffolk priorities due to continual infighting between LAs.

Or apathy re partnership working e.g. Mid Suffolk Local Strategic Partnership work was a bolt on to a job. The LSP didn't achieve anything, in my opinion. Whereas the then Suffolk Coastal and Waveney LSPs did due to the workforce structure and ability. "

"I'm sure you will find imaginative solutions on which to waste the money, None of which will ever help those who actually need it.

Small lobby groups linked to the council and this campaign will waste it all"

I am particularly keen on the use of brownfield sites for housing and reusing land rather than the further destruction of greenfield sites, if unsuitable for housing brownfield sites could be used for green energy such as smaller windfarms and solar. I want to all that is possible not to further destroy Suffolk's coastline such as the appalling Friston proposal.

I'd like it to be used to fix the housing issue.

If it goes through which I hope it won't

If it has to be administered by SCC let it be spent on repairing the appalling road network.

If possible I would like to see some of the money improve public transport by extending it into evenings and Sundays. A major incentive for many people to have a car is because otherwise it

is difficult and expensive to go anywhere in the evenings or on a Sunday. Also there are many places difficult to reach at all without one's own transport.

If the deal goes through I would like the money spent solely on robust repair of potholes and regular maintenance of all SCC drains, roadside ditches and under road culverts, in order to greatly reduce surface water flooding.

iiinfrastructure

Improve all infrastructure, plus housing for local workforce, transport, health facilities more localised, education aimed at skill deficiencies for Suffolk youth.

Improve connectivity around the county - road conditions, EV charging facilities, regular bus services with incentives, commit to clean air zones in main towns of Suffolk.

Improve local roads. Social care and education and police service

Improve local transport & infrastructure

Improve public transport and the state of all roads.

Improve public transport opportunities.

Improve public transport, even in Ipswich it's awful unless you live on one of the handful of major routes

Improve public transport, frequency, area of coverage, keep the fares low/ free where appropriate and introduce incentives to discourage people from using their car, particularly for short, local journeys. Support active journeys by continuing to maintain rights of way and making safe routes for cyclists and walkers and secure places to lock cycles. Reinstate funding for arts and heritage organisations. Support local business and opportunities for young people to find employment/training and to support those returning to employment or wishing to develop at any stage of their working life. Tackle housing inequity, support housing development at affordable prices to allow local people to stay in the area and prevent landlords from charging excessive rents, not maintaining properties and evicting tenants. Initiatives to develop support for libraries which are a valuable resource for communities and all ages. Invest in early years provision.

Improve public transport, stop massive House building projects without supporting infrastructure, use more brownfield sites. Public services and infrastructure should be in place before 1 property is built.

"Improve Road infrastructure - Bye passes on A12 Wickham Market to Saxmundham stretch

Improve internet access/speed

"

Improve road infrastructure in and around Lowestoft. Local people are fed up with the length of time it can take to cross town 10 mins or 40 mins depending on time of day and traffic levels. Even with the new bridge opening soon, locals still expect travel problems to continue.

Improve road maintenance and broadband and telecommunications in rural areas

Improve road standards and public transport

Improve roads - currently poorly repaired, wasting public money, flooding issues and roadside maintenance and public transport.

Improve roads, rivers, and transport

Improve SEND support. Adult Social Care restore arts grants restore rural transport

Improve sustainable transport and rural transport infrastructure by implementing the existing LCWIP projects as a minimum. Retrofitting all local authority housing to protect tenants, providing support for housing associations and homeowners to do the same. Supporting town centres by addressing business rates. Encourage more people to walk or cycle to the town centre by building on the 15min town concept. Support local businesses and maximise benefits associated with Freeport East.

"Improve the environment

Better cycling infrastructure

Free bus travel for anyone over 60"

Improve the infrastructure

Improve transport links to country areas

"Improve transport links

Road maintenance

"

Improve travel and communication. The roads are a disaster and no mobile phone signal apart from major towns. Improve health provision to ensure more doctors appointments.

Improved access to bus travel, free for elderly and those on benefits; access to NHS dentists; fixing potholes; SEND funding; regeneration of Stowmarket & Ipswich; library services including IT hubs for those currently without access or ability to use IT.

Improved and cheaper public transport links, particularly for rural communities

Improved bus services, particularly in the Lowestoft area. Buses that run later than 5.30pm.

Improved infrastructure, including road maintenance and better traffic control in small towns. Improved public transport links to smaller towns. Supporting local manufacturing and farming.

Improved public transport

Improved public transport, electric vehicles, cycle path network, resurfacing roads, flood defences and water management spring to mind

Improved rail links

Improved road and rail infrastructure. Support for SMEs.

Improved road network and environmental protection

Improved social care support. Investment in Sudbury. Improvement of roads infrastructure. Improved bus service particularly for rural areas. More affordable housing. Training for young people and adults linked to business needs.

improved sustainable travel in rural areas, investment in walking and cycling using public rights of way and wider Suffolk such as Lowestoft and not just in Ipswich and Bury

Improved transport infrastructure, green energy, electrification of all rail lines, EV charging infrastructure. Access to high quality affordable child care. Access to health care & sporting facilities.

Improved transport, protection from housing development, environmental protection and improvement, schools

Improvement of public footpaths are as important as road potholes

"Improvement to Highways.

"

Improvement to rural transport links

Improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure and investing in how to keep people more physically active across the County

Improving all facets of infrastructure across the county to enable a more inclusive community and potential for distributed economic growth

Improving availability and reducing cost of local transport to end rural isolation, improve access to services especially medical facilities. Spending to reduce the impact of transport induced climate change.

Improving bus stops by creating shelters in stops where there aren't any, and renovating existing ones in town centres to be more accommodating e.g. with benches, roofs, bins, some sort of shields from the weather. Later bus services between Felixstowe and Woodbridge. Creating litter collection groups, especially targeting roadsides. Connecting existing cycle lanes to make it safer to do something as simple as travel to work. Also investing in green corridors in highstreets

"Improving estates everywhere looks so run down.

We try very hard to keep our area clean and tidy. Cutting grass and verges and have done for years.

"

"Improving frequency of public transport services from Ipswich's neighbouring towns to Ipswich town centre.

Reducing traffic congestion.

Increased career opportunities for young people - young people tend to move to London, Manchester, Birmingham etc due to more opportunities for apprenticeships and training schemes"

Improving Highways infrastructure and social care. Bring Highways maintenance back in house.

Improving infrastructure in and around Ipswich.

Improving Infrastructure. At least some needs to be put towards road maintenance

Improving Ipswich town centre, schools and road works

"Improving local schools funding - send offer.

Providing things for older children to do.

"

Improving local transport infrastructure such as walking and cycling routes

Improving maintenance of local roads and a joined up approach to roadworks between utility companies. A consistent approach to car parking payments across the county; including free car parking in small market towns. Better bus services in rural areas which includes routes to health hubs / hospitals at weekends. Regeneration of brown fields sites in towns and less development of green field areas in the countryside.

Improving our roads and public transport

Improving our transport infrastructure road and rail

Improving public roads and decreasing traffic during rush hour. Putting more money into Suffolk Fire.

Improving public services and infrastructure

Improving public transport and accessibility of it has to be a priority given climate change. Creating cycling infrastructure and safe walking routes especially routes to schools. This will benefit tourism and health and even poverty. I think support for reinstatement of citizens advice bureaux that have been lost from small towns. We used to fund fortnightly surgeries in some libraries. Also we need to help the mental health of young people and support families: they are the future. If that's not done it will affect everything: ill health and burden on NHS, crime, and general wellbeing.

Improving public transport and infrastructure links to promote sustainable travel, active lifestyles and reduce congestion on our roads. Additional training/apprenticeship opportunities for school leavers, with additional support for those who don't achieve such high grades at GCSE and leave school with fewer qualifications. Increase funding to police to reduce crime.

Improving public transport and supporting local businesses in Suffolk

Improving public transport in rural areas

"Improving public transport links and services. Getting away from reliance on cars for work, getting to school, leisure activities.

Improving support for children and families, especially early years education and childcare.

"



Improving public transport through supporting funding for better connections, extended operating hours and fares initiatives

Improving public transport, particularly for the middling size towns.

Improving recycling services and fixing potholes

Improving road infrastructure and speeding up cross-Suffolk journeys.

Improving road quality and reviving Ipswiches dead high street by way of helping lower rent costs so that smaller businesses can actually operate profitably.

"Improving roads in rural areas that have been damaged by the volume of traffic due to works on A14 must be a priority

Improving bus travel - no point having bus pass if no buses "

Improving SEN Provision and highways maintenance as both are currently in an unacceptable state

"Improving sustainable and active travel, eg walking and cycling

Protecting the countryside and improving access to it

Investing in infrastructure, especially roads and footpaths

"

Improving the bus network, the bus service is much better Proper support for cycling. Working with the train network to have a connective service. Working with the police to imp

Improving the facilities for young people so they want to stay, work & live in Suffolk.

Improving the highways. Helping businesses to grow, and cutting where possible council staffing .

Improving the state of the roads, not on green issues.

Improving use and ease of public transport

In absolutely everything simply put.

in all the towns you forget about. Suffolk is more than just Ipswich. You are obsessed with it and forget the small towns.

"In an honest and equitable fashion for the benefit of the communities that they serve.

Different communities have different needs."

"In answer to the question, I would say investing in infrastructure but with the following caveat:

This needs careful consideration and should not be decided upon as part of a populist vote on a questionnaire. Rather than introducing new headline items, it should be used to improve the

systems currently in place and bring them up to a decent standard. What is the point of free bus travel when SEND provision in Suffolk is appalling. Why build an iconic bridge when the rest of the road network is plagued with structural and drainage problems. £480M is not enough to make good the current problems let alone pay for a vanity project on top."

In equal proportions based on number of citizens in each district.

In infrastructure, particularly roads

In Ipswich, the place is a mess.

"In order of priority:

Investment in Infrastructure

Investment in Education

Supporting local businesses and the commerce of the County

Investment in sustainability and carbon neutral energy generation

"

In Sudbury. Our councillor said it could help with the tip here which needs updating or a new location

Increase bus routes and frequency, road re-surfacing, new leisure centre in BSE.

"Increase employment opportunities.

Upgrade/improve road safety and transport links.

Subsidise/improve public transport in rural areas.

Improve health/dental care.

Improve educational opportunities.

"

Increase existing levels of support for the county's businesses, communities and residents to reduce their carbon emissions. E.g., support to insulate homes and install low carbon heating systems in homes, business premises and community facilities. Initiatives to improve biodiversity in communities. More support for vulnerable residents during extreme weather events e.g., heatwaves, flooding, cold snaps

Increase in Law enforcement

"Increase police personnel

Fixing potholes "

Increased investment in public transport & infrastructure, e.g. expansion of bus, train routes & opening of new ones, more investment in bike lanes

Increased public transport coverage and increasing the sustainability of that public transport.

"Increased use of green energy (solar initiatives etc)

Improved public transport availability to villages"

Increasing agricultural resources and services to fund into the production of a more eco friendly approach to plastics.

Infrastructure, especially state of roads, more traffic free link routes for cyclists, walkers, equestrians etc. Affordable housing in rural areas as well as towns

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

infrastructure

Infrastructure

infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure

Infrastructure - roads and buildings and not waste any on useless surveys and consultants prolonging action for years.

Infrastructure - the county is behind the curve nationally with the all important A14 not fit for purpose. Multiple examples of gridlock when the Orwell bridge closes or an accident on the A14 which impacts severely business and port of Felixstowe. This should be focused on making the road network fit for a 21st century. That should seriously start on alternative options to what happens when the bridge closes? Bypass ? Tunnel? etc.

Infrastructure & county facilities inc education

Infrastructure and business facilities

Infrastructure and deals to tempt businesses to open in Suffolk, especially Ipswich town centre

Infrastructure and education

infrastructure and free bus travel

Infrastructure and free bus travel

"Infrastructure and free travel

Fix the pot holes, improve bus routes and services. Expand council public transport so private companies cannot charge expensive fares and therefore encourage use of public transport for commuting.

Invest in public services such as libraries."

Infrastructure and healthcare locally.

Infrastructure and improved transport provision and availability

Infrastructure and improvements to our towns. Better public transport. Improvement to our roads.

infrastructure and improvements to public transport

Infrastructure and improving social care

Infrastructure and public transport

Infrastructure and small businesses

Infrastructure and swimming pools.

Infrastructure and town centres.

Infrastructure and transport

**INFRASTRUCTURE BUT CHALLENGE THE INDUSTRIALISATION OF OUR BIGGEST ASSET - OUR COUNTRYSIDE LOCAL BUSINESS SUPPORT**

Infrastructure certainly, but generally ensuring that services keep pace with the rise in population.

infrastructure especially roads

"Infrastructure especially the very poor state of the roads.

bus services that actually help people -example there is a very limited to no bus service serving young people trying to access suffolk new college rural.

"

Infrastructure for rural communities and improving the main highway links

"Infrastructure has to be priority... done with sensitivity and integrity so not short term or politically focused but really focusing on the people of Suffolk.

Training for councillors to ensure know what doing....and right people in right post. "

Infrastructure improvements and town regeneration.

Infrastructure improvements, elderly people services and consideration to people who cannot use modern technologies.

Infrastructure investment

Infrastructure investment

Infrastructure investment such as Northern bypass for Ipswich.

"infrastructure investment

small business support and incentives

used in community projects

used in an environmental agenda that could encompass all other aspects above as well"

Infrastructure investment, to reduce flooding.

Infrastructure is a big one, the roads in Suffolk are really awful, we need affordable housing for purchase and for renting, the smaller villages need support in being able to access the larger towns and local business offered incentives to open shops within the towns (no more charity shops!). Business rates set to an affordable cost for smaller businesses.

Infrastructure is a huge issue with more and more people living in the area. Schools, GP and hospital access alongside nursery placements and road structures - a Northern bypass is key for Ipswich as when the Orwell Bridge is shut the town becomes gridlocked losing millions for local businesses.

Infrastructure is crucial due to poor transport links in the county. More police on our streets and greater provision for SEND students should be a consideration

Infrastructure is important , but the lack of funding for social care is a priority

Infrastructure is vital. A quality integrated plan for various types of infrastructure is needed for the wellbeing of all sectors of the local society.

"Infrastructure is vital. Road repairs vital too

"

Infrastructure just encase the planning and council have forgotten what that is it's roads, doctors, is that free nys travel in towns? Or are villages being considered I wonder

Infrastructure mainly. The county is relatively rural so services and businesses tend to concentrate in the towns, leaving nearly barren hinterlands in between. Need to improve overall connectivity across the county.

Infrastructure needs ie. Potholes, improved public transport

Infrastructure particularly local buses. Our village has one per day. The roads are awful and our local authority are so strapped for cash

Infrastructure particularly the communication network (road)

Infrastructure- roads and travel particularly in rural areas

Infrastructure to Ipswich. An area this council ignores

"Infrastructure to support public low cost transport particularly in rural areas.

Public safety in collaboration with Police

Support to community projects and charities"

Infrastructure upgrades - new highway improvements and junction upgrades. Carriageway and drainage system repairs and upgrades

Infrastructure would be a benefit for all including residents, business and those that come from other locations.

infrastructure, arts, leisure and green travel solutions

infrastructure, cheaper public transport

Infrastructure, education and redevelopment of towns such as Lowestoft and support jobs in the region.

Infrastructure, environmental issues, regeneration, subsidised or free transport

Infrastructure, especially active transport would be my personal investment favourite but there are many others.

Infrastructure, especially public transport, which should be owned by the public, rather than private entities. The same should also be true in regards to water companies.

Infrastructure, free bus travel, libraries, community groups, this could be rather a long list. I'm not so sure about the local business support as this may involve vested interest and opportunities for fingers in the till.

Infrastructure, improved social services

Infrastructure, infrastructure, infrastructure. Current infrastructure of Suffolk not fit for purpose. Ipswich infrastructure not fit for purpose.

Infrastructure, public transport and housing and children and young people services

Infrastructure, rail fare subsidies

Infrastructure, roads and trains

Infrastructure, schools, green solutions

infrastructure, transport, skills, housing land for business development

Infrastructure.

Infrastructure. Better bus services in country areas

infrastructure. Development of SEND services. Improve adult social care.

Infrastructure. Road improvement across the county.

Infrastructure. Road's especially prioritising rural areas

Infrastructure. Services for young people, education support and development.

"Infrastructure: Copdock interchange e.g.

NOT free bus travel.

Inspiring younger people to get in to business and have a 5 year ( if required) support plan

Increasing housing options for younger people to be able to leave home and set up house before they are 40 yrs old. "

Infrastructure. Better services for older people. Maintenance of roads

Infrastructure so that the town centre is once more a thriving one so that people want to come to Ipswich to live and work because it is a wonderful place and not just because it is affordable.

Infrastructure like road conditions and a free bus for over 60s in the villages as the elderly need it more.

initially to prioritise projects on supporting local business and infrastructure improvements

Integrated public transport for rural areas

Integrated transport system linking council owned and run buses with the rail infrastructure.

Integrating the social services with other statutory providers including NHS to provide a more seamless service i.e. not having to tell my story multiple times and re-register for social care, health, and council tax etc. consolidate some resource by spending the same money on HR or education for example, but in one place so that there is less duplication

integrated public transport. Arts facilities.

Into quality public services such as transport, infrastructure maintenance such as roads, cleanliness. Solve homelessness as was available during covid, essentially. Bring back the market square in Ipswich, as it used to look much better and I believe it now deters from local produce in favour of the high street.

Invest 100% of it in the County, with zero money for property speculation or dodgy building projects. Think seriously about what to do with Ipswich, which has become a 3rd tier [REDACTED] relative to Norwich, Colchester, Cambridge and Bury. We need to make people proud of Suffolk again!

Invest in business support activities that will open up new opportunities for jobs.

"Invest in franchising local bus services/DRT services for local people.

Invest in children's centres for local communities again."

Invest in highways and roads and also housing

Invest in infrastructure

Invest in infrastructure - improve the roads and fund social care.

Invest in infrastructure & business.

Invest in Ipswich

Invest in local business, transport links and innovative economic growth opportunities

Invest in local transport and reliable energy. Retaining and returning to our rural way of life eg halving the size of lorries allowed on rural roads. Protecting nature. We don't need more growth.

Invest in making our public spaces more pedestrian friendly. Every town and village in Suffolk suffers from a glut of cars. That may also be symptomatic of the lack of investment in public transport so plug funds there too. Public transport is freedom, wellbeing, independence and so much more for so many people. Invest there and you'll see reliance on other services come down.

Invest in more workers for Adult Social Care

"Invest in proper infrastructure that reflects the reality of every day life for Suffolk residents

"

"invest in public transport in and out of the county

"

Invest in public transport infrastructure. The Ipswich-Felixstowe rail line should be developed with more stops as an urban passenger network linked to express bus lines to create a truly integrated public transport network. Road building can't solve the Orwell area's transport needs long-term.

Invest in roads, support district councils to maintain free parking which will generate footfall in towns and villages, provide a rurally suitable transport network of buses that prevent isolation etc. However, let me be clear, I do not think scc can do this and devolution is a bad idea.

Invest in skills

Invest in SME, hospitality & tourism sectors & supporting town centres

Invest money in places like Haverhill which have been badly underinvested for years. Not everything has to go to Bury St Edmunds!

Invest safely, offer business support for emerging sectors, build infrastructure including joined up thinking on travel, creating more of a social net for the poorest or most vulnerable

Investing and improving infrastructure

Investing in all measures that help improve the A12 north to Lowestoft and make Lowestoft and north Suffolk more accessible and less economically and socially isolated. Currently there is NO direct bus service from Lowestoft to Ipswich.

Investing in business and infrastructure to generate growth in jobs and businesses and an increase in Business Rates to support wider SCC care and other priorities.

investing in infrastructure

Investing in Infrastructure

investing in infrastructure



Investing in infrastructure

investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure

Investing in infrastructure & helping provide better travel services.

Investing in infrastructure (although not in roads) and not necessarily providing free bus travel but increasing coverage substantially

Investing in infrastructure across the county not just in major towns. Are there other options as to how we can spend this or is it limited, see they're still governing us by stipulating so.

Investing in infrastructure across the county.

Investing in infrastructure and also setting up more bus travel to more isolated communities.

Investing in infrastructure and housing

Investing in infrastructure and local services, so everyone can access locally what they need to, rather than travelling miles

Investing in infrastructure and productivity. Free bus travel would only be worthwhile if there were more buses in Suffolk.

Investing in infrastructure and services such as education and health care

Investing in infrastructure and specifically trying to develop brownfield sites for new homes and business locations - in conjunction with the private sector where possible.

Investing in infrastructure and wholly local businesses. Things that will impact everyone in the areas where changes are made. Not that access to free travel or other support for those in need of them is bad but our council should prioritise making things better for as much of the community as possible first

Investing in infrastructure including building more bike infrastructure in our towns and cities, as well as improving bus services with better coverage and frequency. Also encouraging rail usage by decreasing fares and lobbying for better rail in Suffolk.

Investing in infrastructure investing in education

Investing in infrastructure is a must. Ipswich needs a bypass to house the growing traffic from across the county. This lack of vision when it comes to major roads really really really holds Ipswich and its business back. As a small business owner, it is getting to the point where I will take my business out of Suffolk as traffic being forced into Ipswich where there is issues damages my business in its entirety.

Investing in infrastructure renewal

Investing in infrastructure should be the top priority. The roads are terrible; buses infrequent; towns dilapidated; and digital accessibility poor. Get the infrastructure right and building from that will be quicker and easier.

Investing in infrastructure, access free bus service and increase bus services in country villages.

Investing in infrastructure, helping local businesses, free travel to pensioners, better policing of Suffolk, stopping new builds/housing estates and using existing empty housing and sites in Ipswich and surrounding areas. Provision of cleaning for signs on roads/streets, cleaning of rubbish on streets and roads. Encouraging local people to take a pride in their area.

Investing in infrastructure, improving transport

investing in infrastructure, including roads and improvements to bus services

Investing in infrastructure, more GP, hospital or health center, some decent clothes shop.

Investing in infrastructure, regenerating the towns that need investment such as Ipswich and Stowmarket.

Investing in infrastructure, reimagining and rejuvenating high streets, providing improved public transport to rural areas.

Investing in infrastructure, road maintenance, free bus passes, maintaining grass verges in the towns, parks.

Investing in infrastructure.

Investing in infrastructure.

Investing in infrastructure. New doctors surgeries, better schools and better hospital services.

"Investing in infrastructure. Repair the roads.

Invest in Ipswich infrastructure. "

Investing in infrastructure

"Investing in Ipswich as at "County" town of Suffolk. I appreciate that where other authorities are involved, is sometime harder to implement ideas, without stepping on other peoples toes!

Roads & roadsides are in desperate need of repair/tidying up / cleaned.

Likewise anti-social behaviour and public perception of issues relating to it are a big factor in peoples perception of the area.

"

Investing in libraries, schools, hospitals

"Investing in more continues cycle routes.

County ownership of public travel.

County ownership of social care and schools including Higher education.

Investment in sure start projects including more youth groups to prevent anti social behaviour. "

Investing in nursery provision. Investing in pothole repair. Truly integrated transport that meets the public need.

Investing in our county towns centre.

Investing in public transport and active travel, protecting the environment

Investing in roads and free bus travel for under 25 year olds

Investing in services including travel and support

Investing in strategic infrastructure and strategic transport links

Investing in the already vibrant green industries is vital

investing in the infrastructure build houses on brownfield sites support local business and improve transport links esp increasing bus services and trains put pressure on gov to improve A roads and Ely train station junction

Investing in the right kinds of infrastructure projects, bringing the right kinds of jobs and housing is vital, plus a "proper" bus network to allow people to get to school, work, appointments etc. A rural county needs improved public transport!

Investing in the town centre make it feel like a nice place to visit and walk about. Improve the shopping. Banish chewing gum. outlaw litter and vandalism. Promote green spaces and maintenance of green spaces. Repair the roads to a decent standard.

investing infrastructure

Investing on Infrastructure improving the roads and connectivity between towns being able to offer public transport as a viable alternative to cars

Investment attracting private money and encouraging local shareholding

"investment in business, housing and roads.

Invest in things that can generate income for the community and the county. Give a fish, fed for a day, teach to fish and fed for life."

Investment in infrastructure

"INVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE

PRE-SCHOOL CHILD CARE

SUPPORT FOR ADULT EDUCATION AND CULTURE , THE ARTS

SPORTS FACILITIES FOR 5-18S"

Investment in infrastructure (digital and transport) and skills. We need to improve attractiveness of Suffolk as place to do business

Investment in infrastructure and public services delivery. Businesses should satisfy a public demand and be managed to be commercially viable and not be made profitable by the public purse.

Investment in infrastructure and redevelopment of brownfield sites

Investment in infrastructure and roads.

Investment in infrastructure for example Road Maintenance , school and health service buildings and much needed investment in proper provision for looked after children and vulnerable adults is what is needed to improve life for people in Suffolk.

Investment in infrastructure is a big problem in Suffolk and any additional funding there would be welcome. I think the adult education budget and bus provision are the two most important elements of this, particularly in bolstering rural bus provision.

Investment in infrastructure is critical to ensure Suffolk reaches its full potential as well as investment in skills

Investment in infrastructure such as sewage plants, road quality and social housing.

Investment in infrastructure, resurfacing roads and public transport are desperately needed.

Investment in infrastructure, working with other organisations to produce better overall solutions. Produce unified transport scheme including Oyster type card so don't need to worry who is providing bus service, and allow bus and rail to complement each other

investment in local bus infrastructure, education, fares and service enhancements

Investment in railway services and improved local bus routes. Even more so, funding to fix potholes properly.

Investment in school buildings, targeted initiatives to support the most vulnerable communities with a strong evidence base, support isolation of the elderly. Public health promoting key health message initiatives again with a strong evidence base. Litter reduction and enforcement of littering . Pot hole resolution.

Investment in services that everyone uses but also in the services lacking, SEND especially

Investment in town centres, investment in schools or youth related activities, new road surfaces, improved bus travel for rural communities

"Investment in transport and education infrastructure. Community and youth centres.

"

Investment in Young people , Youth Clubs, Good apprenticeships, money management. The County has neglected young people for too long . Social housing . Supporting the population does not only mean the retired .

Investment may well be considered has hidden money and not spent on the population at all.

Investments to provide the council with more funds in the future. Also assistance to those starting families e.g housing, nurseries, transport.

"Ipswich needs a northern bypass. When the Orwell bridge closes the town is in chaos. It does not need more roads blocked off with planters and cycle lane bollards installed and then uninstalled because it was a stupid idea that didn't work.

It also needs more NHS services and less of an education lottery. Some schools are awesome, others are seriously lacking. There needs to be better governance of these schools.

More focus on green spaces/ country parks etc especially when developers are building new houses. It shouldn't be allowed that developers squeeze as many properties on a plot as possible. It should have a certain amount of public green spaces included as part of the planning and also only allowed if the current infrastructure can support it. "

Ipswich northern bypass

Ipswich Northern Bypass - Critical to future investment in Suffolk as well as the county town of Suffolk

Ipswich northern bypass.

Irrelevant question as I don't trust Suffolk County Council to spend the money on the people who need help the most

It could include help for social services and education BUT must be balanced with some initiatives which generate improved economic conditions for Suffolk to create a virtuous circle that in effect makes the 480 worth far more. We mustn't just spend on short term items cause once cupboard is bare ...

It is simply not enough. Many Suffolk schools need an overhaul, the bus service does not exist. Elderly care needs central government restructure and there are discussions to be had about how health and transport runs in the future. As previously stated this capital sum is insufficient. I would prefer to wait for a new (labour) government and a proper discussion about how the UK funds its public services in the future.

"It is time for Ipswich to have some focus as the County Town of Suffolk and for funds to be spent proportionate to population.

Infrastructure, and specifically a solution to the crippling effects to the national economy of closure to the Orwell Bridge is key."

It means each area should be looked at... free bus travel is OK but for golden generation that have benefited.. look at the working class that are struggling to use public transport due to the costs, reliability and timetables

It needs to be evenly distributed across the County. It also needs to show returns on investment in human, social and fiscal terms.

It needs to be spent to the benefit of everyone not wasted on vanity projects like free transport.

It should be linked to an investment plan about developing especially green business, improving the county's infrastructure, including better transport especially in rural areas, improving social housing and not just unaffordable housing.

It should be used to benefit the community as a whole, and consultation should take place with the public in respect of each and every proposal before a decision is made as to application of any funds

It should have benefits for all residents - infrastructure would meet this but is distinctly unglamorous. I think the council needs to visibly be seen to invest in the county. Core services are incredibly important but often serve a minority of the population directly. I think priority should be given here to very visible but indirect benefits for the whole population.

It shouldn't go through!

It shouldn't happen. Sufficient funding should be available to all councils without prejudice or conditions.

It will probably be absorbed in rising social care costs

"It will probably create more in house jobs and more meetings and larger contributions to staff pensions

"

It works have to be spent on making up the shortfall from central government.

It would be a start if we could have a new leisure centre in abrupt St Edmunds

It would disappear on additional wages and costs of pointless elections

It's a bad deal billions will be required over 30 years and the money should be spent on repairing the underinvestment by the Tories in social structures

"It's not actually a lot of money, so using it to match fund or pump prime other funding already available will have bigger impact.

Support for young people in any form would be my priority."

It's not enough money to make a big difference. But better transport from rural areas to Ipswich hospital is the biggest problem we face. Free transport is not much use if there isn't a reliable or fast service.

It's a case of what we don't want you to spend it on. Like stupid green schemes and closing off roads and crazy 20 mph zones. We need areas opened up to boost local businesses and more free car parking

It's a pittance, maybe keep essential services going another couple of years?

I've said I don't think that money will go far and that I question if its actually a good deal. The way these questions are posed will not get a fair / balanced view on what we think. Its all about the carrot of £480 million according to these questions.

"jobs opportunities and access to transport for young people

new and rural business start up funds"

Just don't waste it

Just fix the dam pot holes

Just having more buses and getting them to run on time more important than being free

Just spend the money on keeping the county clean and the infrastructure in place

KNOWING councils they will waste it should be offered for people to be consulted on spending

Libraries, community centres rather than building roads. Free travel would be good. Make sure you keep your SCC staff rather than getting rid of all the good people.

life skills training e.g. cookery and adult education classes. Support for local businesses and rural services. Additional expansion of wildflower meadows and tree planting in green spaces

Living in rural Suffolk transportation is a real issue. Lack of cycle provision results in danger for cyclists wanting to visit nearby towns.

loaded question

Local archives in west of the county and more public transport in rural areas in the west of the county

"Local business grants and potholes

"

Local business grants, investing in buses for villages

Local business support

Local business support

"local business support - reduced rents to help businesses stay open and reduce shop closures.

Reduced bus fares. investment into more green spaces for children to play/club to attend. "

local business support a must especially for the likes of the town of Stowmarket, more houses being built with lack of or very limited offers in terms of shops , leisure activities for young people.

Local business support and education

Local business support and infrastructure.

Local business support better travel systems

local business support, better university, sport facilities, motorway and improving transport links. "we are forgotten or out of place"

"Local business support, especially in lowering rent costs would be a significant gain for anyone trying to start up businesses in any settlement in the county, especially that in Ipswich where businesses seem to suffer.

Free bus travel would be immensely helpful to those who need it, however the bus systems in place are already starkly better than others around the country. A Suffolk wide run bus service would be more useful though, as currently only Ipswich has their own. To expand further would be great, to maintain the condition and prices of travel, and make the county more travelable

and interconnected by public transport. This would help increase our climate pledges and work towards being the greenest county, also."

"Local business support, improvements to sexual health clinics and access. Improvements to local parks and amenities. Improvements to the town center.

Purchase of parking spaces from national companies to reduce parking costs in town centers so people aren't spending out £8 per day of parking, given the current economic climate, some people can't justify that expense"

Local business support, improving local infrastructure, and building of local small business units to enable small start ups to flourish and get established.

Local business support, investing in affordable housing, improving public transport.

Local business support, investment in infrastructure and the local population.

local businesses and facilities. Roads (condition) are a disgrace. I am against offering free transport as A) distorts actual usage and value for money 2) why should other taxpayers pay for people to take the bus. If people cannot afford the bus, its likely they already receive some form of benefit already 3) will not encourage growth

Local businesses support would be an area of importance, and things to generally support the people of Suffolk more whether it is through things like free transport or improved infrastructure as long as it positively impacts as many people's lives as possible it is beneficial for Suffolk

Local communities, (with local community boards having the power to decide) and on FRONT LINE staff working in SEND as staff are currently carrying caseloads in the several 100's. This has been happening for at least the past 8years with staff replacement recruitment being blocked to save money.

Local funding for local people. It's the only way forward.

Local people should better know what`s required in Suffolk

Local rivers clean up and the maintenance of our roadsides

Local small business support. Protecting natural environment, support environmental groups.

"Local small-vehicle bus services owned and run by council

Council owned and run care homes"

"Local transport Care Homes and associated help for the elderly

Health dentistry and local amenities for all ages

Services provided to be such as transport to be subsidised not necessarily free consistent support for local residents in all areas of life

"

Looking after the elderly and homeless, not illegal immigrants getting free access to our services and homes, more dentists and NHS appointments. Upgrade the roads- they are a disgrace and stop building homes on flood plains or unnecessary monies on net zero!

"Looking at holistic interventions that collectively improve the lives of residents.



Invest in education and skills so people can achieve good jobs.

Support economic growth in key priority areas for suffolk

Support health and wellbeing, this is a huge barrier to success.

Consult and listen to users of services before redesigning. "

Lower council tax

"Lower council tax and collect glass from houses like other authorities e.g epping forest.

Suffolk council being cheap

Cut the grass instead of sticking up feeding the bees boards. Bees need pollen not long grass. "

Lower council tax.

lower housing costs, lower rents, homelessness.

"lowering council tax and make the area safe ..!

and not give it ouut in pay rises to the people who run the counicile and town halls in suffolk"

"Mainaining or developing rural transport. "

Start ups for new businesses especially to empower young entrepreneurs. "

Maintain roads and build a Northern Bypass for Ipswich.

Maintain the road network properly and rejuvenate town centres

Maintaining and improving our highway network. Do not give it away with gimmick such as free bus travel.

Maintaining roads; increased police presence in the community; enforcment of traffic regulations, particularly speeding

Maintaining the roads for a start. Supporting those people who are working hard to make a living. Not wasting money on woke box ticking schemes.

Make cycling safer in rural areas

Make sports facilities affordable and council controlled

"Make sure there's enough GP clinics and hospitals in the county and public transport to them

"

"Making public transport more effective and linked.

Better infrastructure for cycling"

"Making quicker decisions

Transport infrastructure to support in our case enhancement of take up of skills, education and training opportunities - including rail, road and bus

Digital enhancement for rural areas to support skills, education and training

Be bold, decisive and strategic please"

Making Suffolk a green country and keep improving it as a place to live. Investing in electric buses, cycling, rail etc. enhancing our natural environments. Events for residents and tourists like IBC do.

Making sure social care is fit for purpose.

Making the MH issues of our cyp a priority. This involves planning robust ways of holding schools to account for inclusive practice. Also supporting our current NEET cohort with no qualifications and no hope of employment thanks to at least 10 years of damage much of it caused by the education system.

Making traffic flow better (eg removing planters etc installed by council to take away the rights of drivers to use all the roads they have already paid for with their taxes) Also maintaining the roads

Many more local bus services connecting villages to each other as well as to towns especially in the evenings so that access is improved to local amenities.

Medical services, roads, control of welfare payments and policing.

Mend the roads and road signs

Mending potholes

mending potholes and improving pavements

Mending the pot holes in the roads and investing in infrastructure.

Mending the potholes in the roads and investing in infrastructure.

Mending the roads properly and making the county look tidy. Councils should stick to their core remit. Education roads and planning.

Mental health care for under 16s and on SEND.

Mental health care for under 16s, its none existent at the moment, SEND

Money should go to road improvements firstly (northern bypass!), then to Social Care for vulnerable adults and children.

more affordable housing more bus services better pavements these are things that affect the elderly and the young

More buses

"More buses and routes.

Upgrade road infrastructure to cope with all the increased traffic all the new developments are causing. One specific area locally is the Martlesham Heath out of town shopping area. Gets log jammed every day."

More buses and trains and infrastructure and support business development and growth

more buses would be helpful, but with a better system of 'on call buses' rather than expensive vehicles sticking to one or two routes. Also more investment in SEND provision, in schools.

More investment in schools generally.

more frequent, subsidised bus services so that fewer people all drive the same routes when they could be on a bus to reduce carbon emissions.

More Help and support for children and families of Sen need's more SEN school's more money for the Unlimited Activities

"More investment in public transport and roads. Ensuring homes have funding for insulating properties to support climate change.

"

More jobs, renovation of Lowestoft town centre

More local adult learning aimed at local jobs, perhaps with more work experience offered with local employers. Free bus travel for all young people in education 16-18, within a sec radius.

More money for front line services

more money into social care

More money into the roads as there is not a single road that doesn't have some defect, while it's all well and good helping people with bus travel, they can't travel on broken roads

More new Hospitals, walk in health centres, coastal erosion. Road repairs.

More regular & reliable public transport. More Arts funding.

More rural bus services.

"More school transport for ALL children. Especially in rural areas. Further support to help young people into apprenticeships/work so there is investment locally which can the have a positive impact on all our futures. More affordable homes for all.

"

More shared ownership or truly affordable housing for first time buyers. Better mental health services. More funded local events to increase community spirit and opportunities for all.

more support for business and some schemes to stop knife crime, particularly in Ipswich

More support for families. Parenting support groups. As a Homestart volunteer I witness the lack of confidence parents experience with parenting techniques and feeding their children. Young people need access to groups which promote their self confidence to enable to participate in their communities and the workforce.

more support for local businesses and infrastructure is what we need

Much of the Suffolk road network is not fit for purpose and too narrow for commercial vehicles. Road surfacing is very poor. Both are hazardous to cyclists who get a raw deal in Suffolk. Getting people out of their cars means not just public transport but providing the means to cycle safely on dedicated cycle lanes, and not just in the towns but also in rural areas for recreational purposes.

My concern is that this a yet another Conservative party scam, our local people being 'bought' with the promise of riches which many will never see the benefit of.

"My list would be rather long!!

Most important would be:-

- 1.affordable housing. Better access to housing. Better responses from Council/Housing Associations. Eradicate homelessness. NO accommodation for Asylum seekers.
2. Training facilities for young people and all those that wish to re-skill.
3. Fill the pot holes!!
4. Relieve flooding by regular maintenance of water ways, drains and ditches.
5. everything that protects our environment and effective enforcement for those that fail ie litter, fly tipping, river pollution, layby ""toilets"", noise, chemical sprays etc

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE ITEMS THAT I CONSIDER AS LESS IMPORTANT:-

- A) Free bus travel and other bus travel funding (to existing schemes).
- B) anything related to ""Active Britain"" ie cycle lanes.
- C) anything that funds so called ""climate change"".
- D) council ""monuments""

My preference is to have at least one major impact, plus a few small initiatives, not simply a series of small initiatives. For example, the creation of a 100 mile safe cycling route linking towns and villages to attract sustainable tourism, promote public health and give Suffolk a distinct identity. Each year some of the fund can extend the route in conjunction with a co-ordinated approach to road development etc. For example, like the solar panel auction and install process you ran - use the fund to clean up a brownfield site and install wind turbines, solar panels and batteries. With stage 2 being to transfer part-ownership to Suffolk residents (for a fee). The combined cash will grow the facility and reduce residents bills. Other sustainable ideas welcome. Spending this money on more of the same, e.g. more roads would just add to burning the planet.

My top priorities for the council would be investing in and creating new infrastructure, such as better cross-county rail connections/bus connections, as well as investing in local high streets, providing a reason to go into Ipswich, Lowestoft etc, furthermore, I would like to see it help to revive cultural opportunities for everyone, not just those who can afford it and provide opportunities for young people across the county.

N/A

n/a

N/A

N/A see previous answer

Need consultation

Need to a long term plan that has vision and that will make differences for future generations. Offering free bus travel is not visionary, infrastructure needs maintaining - who will pay for that ?

Need to focus on core services first

Needs getting our roads, hedgerows, road signs sorted out. Possibly free bus travel would be good.

New infrastructure

"New infrastructure

New roads - a northern bypass

Support for families and young people "

New roads infrastructure

New ways facility in Newmarket

No

No comment at this time

NO DEAL! Devolution is a trap.

No idea

No it should not. Were it to then this idiotic -put all the money in big towns- city's must stop. Place the money in smaller towns and bring back the power house of British past using small towns and then lessen the amount of travel time and pollution.

No point in free bus travel if no buses running. Again will work in large towns but not suburbs

no to local business support - you are a freeport they get tax free anyway, development corps can compulsory purchase at rock bottom prices - no to roads- schools and hospitals need building

None of these. To fix underfunding where central government then SCC have removed funding such as children services, local bus subsidies and support for residents not in the east of the county.

Nope as it for the council ppl

Northern bypass of Ipswich

"Northern bypass to relieve pressure on Orwell crossing.

Bus services until midnight at weekends."

"Not a penny extra to any council offices.

Spend on Business support, transportation and flood defence."

Not applicable

not enough money

Not free travel - people should pay their way. I would like to see investment in town centres - perhaps reducing business rates to attract businesses other than vape and betting shops. I would also like to see an improvement in the quality of our roads (pot holes!!) and transport links in the west of Suffolk.

Not in any particular order, Local business support, more buses for villages, more support for children with special needs,

Not in favour of devolution.

Not interested

Not interested in you having this money

Not knowing everything that the council has responsibilities for, my 1st thought is for public transport. I love in Ipswich, Norwich road area, and there are no buses into town on a Sunday evening! It is also more expensive to take the bus than park, how does that make sense. We also need the closed park and ride back. If you are running empty double deckers all day of course it's not cost effective, does no one use common sense? My son lives in Manchester, superb transport. Trams, electric buses, trains. All affordable. I would also like to see more adult education by way of evening classes for personal growth and pleasure. The college used to run these from local schools. I did dressmaking and pattern cutting (very useful for altering and repairing clothes), and an art class. Also cheesemaking and bricklaying at Otley. A great loss. We also need more charging points for electric vehicles.

Not on adult or child services

Not on consultants! On the services.

Not on DEI. Fix the potholes, support the elderly and those who need help. Build a northern bypass.

Not on more staff or DEI courses! Spend it on good things - new roads, infrastructure, make it easier for car drivers. We keep getting punished.

Not on pensions and golden handshakes, as appears to normally be what happens with public funding to councils.

not sure

Not to waste it like they have done for the last 20 years

Nothing should be completely free! Support rural transportation and assist business with specific grants for say, export initiatives (exhibitions) or IP protection or tooling costs

Nothing should be free! It has no value if it's free. Careful subsidies yes. Infrastructure a must

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the Council are capable of managing this money properly

Nothing, the council is unable to spend money wisely

Obviously would need to be of benefit to all Suffolk residents/businesses.

"Of course, infrastructure investment, transport, housing etc.

But it still means we're going to be cap in hand to central govt.

"

Offering incentives to support and encourage and lead to the success of small businesses in Ipswich and also to encourage development in run down areas.

offering local business support and providing extra funding to overstretched services

On improved services only, not an increase in employees on massive salaries delivering little. A complete rethink of what you are doing.

On Ipswich and Lowestoft.

On new and improved roads and by passing towns.

on potholes, roads & rural village buses not building, cameras, 15 minute zones or cycle lanes.

On priorities that are agreed with the people of Suffolk through a big engagement consultation. Let's make this something positive to all get behind

On reducing Council tax. Making sure that the town centre doesn't have empty shops, by reducing rents. ensuring grass verges/parks are cut regularly and pot holes are fixed straight away. Etc. Etc. I'm concerned that if devolution goes ahead we have this money services may be worse, as we won't have the backup of the government

On resurfacing all Suffolk roads adding extra public transport on the new roads,

On road, rail, or public transport

On schooling for Suffolk children

On the roads

On the roads. But you won't get any money. The whole thing is a scam.

On the roads. Social care & doctors, dentists

On youth clubs and programmes for the young of Suffolk . Looking after the future population is essential for growth . Us old people have had it good the youngsters are struggling. . Money to business has a habit of taking money from the tax payer and getting lost . Growth depends on the young not people who have controlled Suffolk for so long .

One council deals with everything.

Open more health centres, hospitals, gp

Our public transport system needs a complete rethink. As does our food system. Additionally, an independent review in how our towns and villages access and allocate funding should be considered.

Our road infrastructure is in desperate need of improvement, this should be a top priority.

Our roads are in a state and need major investment

Passing down to local communities and parishes allowing them to manage their own assets.

Personally, I would like this funding to be spent on Suffolk's infrastructure as there are areas such as roads and public transport which could do with improvement across the county.

Please just fill the potholes 8n the roads!

"plus reinstating the cultural budget ?

Investing in environmental projects"

"Police for the town centre - make it a pleasure to shop rather than dodge the beggars, gangs of men, rough sleepers using it as a bedroom -it's not safe

Improving roads around town so we would not have to drive to Bury or Woodbridge"

Police hospital staff increased to both in staffing and funding

Pot holes

Pot holes , better roads sort out the rubbish bury st Edmund's adhd clinic ! More police on streets ,

Pot holes , car parks , getting rid of pointless cycle lanes that start & end abruptly and are never used

Pot holes and free parking

"Pot holes pot holes POT HOLES.

They are a burden to both private and business vehicles.

Costly damage, unnecessary and unacceptable!

Unless of course you've been paid out or have investments withing insurance companies! "

"Pot holes

GP's

Social care"

"Pot holes

Rural bus services

Education"

Potholes

Potholes and bringing outsourced services back under direct employment.

"Potholes! Better roads...

More frequent bus travel, not necessarily free but cheap rates and more accessible for rural areas.



Look after green spaces, side of roads, kerbside, to make the areas prettier. It all looks a mess. Where new developments have started planted trees but not looked after then so they died, but it ticked their box at the time of building the houses. Look after environment and wildlife.

"

potholes, busses, green space, ev chargers, a new recycling centre site in Sudbury!

Potholes, fix the [REDACTED] potholes

Primarily infrastructure, which has historically been neglected.

Primarily, on practical things that show results and value for money (see answers to specific areas below).

prioritisation of infrastructure & support of local business initiatives

Proactively maintain roads and watercourses to prevent flooding on high risk areas like Needham Market and Debenham. Provide flood defenses.

"Proper public transport especially in rural areas

And proper commitment to social care "

properly funded social care and education, prioritising S.E.N.

"Protect our coastline from erosion

Increase free sports opportunities for all

Improve public transport as well as reduce the cost...rural poverty is a real issue and bus services that benefit those on lowest incomes, including students, elderly and disabled have been poor for 30 years

Improve road quality so cycling is safer

Schemes to help entrepreneurs/ small businesses that genuinely need it"

Protecting the local environment.

Protecting wildlife, securing green spaces, improving roads, delivering events in towns to encourage people to shop there instead of online

Protection of the environment and our heritage, cycle ways and trams or Trolleybus services. Parks and open spaces, pedestrian areas, education and youth mental health, adult social care,

Providing a more joined up bus service for EVERY part of Suffolk.

"Providing a reliable bus service throughout the day and evening.

Providing worthwhile cycle lanes (after consultation with cycling groups)."

Providing access to more funded business support - not in the form of grants - many businesses require access to core skills which they cannot afford to recruit, yet could be funded by a variety of business support initiatives.

Providing more support to rural communities such as more bus routes

Providing scholarships for young people to study.

Providing support such as transport and business opportunities to allow local people to live and work in Suffolk

Provision of better facilities for everyone within Suffolk, especially those in employment, especially those at the lower end of end of the wage spectrum. Plenty of support for those unemployed/sick available but little around to help those trying their best but in minimum wage jobs.

Public needs to respond to SCC business plan? Funds not wasted on ridiculous projects.

Public transport

Public transport and access to affordable housing

Public transport - enabling everyone in this predominantly rural county to access it at reasonable cost and in the evenings as well as during the day.

"Public transport

Cycling

Arts"

Public transport and affordable housing to tackle homelessness

Public transport and can it help with trains?

Public transport and investing in infrastructure while preventing the degrading of the countryside and the environment

"Public Transport improvements.

Funding social projects for young people and community outreach. "

Public transport increase and reduction in car use.

public transport primarily, local health and public services, and improvement of long forgotten areas.

"Public transport

High speed fibre broadband internet to homes and council estates with speeds of over 1Gigabytes per second"

"Public transport

Support for green travel - cycles, repairing footpaths, banning pavement parking

Creating thriving and profitable town centres to encourage growth into the area"

"Public transport

The arts"

Public transport, education. Primary healthcare

Public transport, green initiatives, social housing.

Public transport, healthcare support, and the environment

"public transport, some rural communities are utterly isolated

public library service which can play a significant role in community cohesion

housing policy which is not developer led, more social housing

regeneration of town centres"

Public transport, sort the town centre, prioritise free parking, sort out the state of the road surfaces,

Put back funding for the arts

Put it in the council leader's pension fund. It seems like that is where the current council tax goes rather than actually pay for services the residents need.

Putting money into helping local people access to local Homes being built by the council, as I have 1st hand been on the council list and been a resident of my area for many years and the houses were 1st and foremost advertised as homes for people of the village yet not 1 of them went to people from the village as they weren't in the band "A" or as I was quoted do not have children !! Which I see as very wrong, yet they are trying to encourage local young couples to stay in the village yet we can't get any help.

"Putting nature back into our towns and villages - so many new housing/business developments have been put into place over past years that we are loosing pockets of nature which benefit people in many other ways such as for mental health, habitats for animals that are endangered or loosing their homes due to over-building.

Better travel connections

Better maintained footpaths/cycle paths

Better drainage

Better road repair options"

Rebuild the county roads which are in a bad state due to years of lack of investment and temporary repairs.

Rebuilding schools and more bus services

Reduce concil tax,infrastructure development, business support.

Reduce council tax

Reduce council tax for those that pay it!

Reduce council tax. I pay £175 a month for next to nothing in return.

Reduce speed limits. More safe road crossing points. More pavements and off road paths between local villages, resolve dead end footpaths.

"Reduce the cost of public transport for all, it's absurdly high and people who could and would make greener travel choices won't currently as no incentive.

Have a bigger focus on air quality.

Support better placements for people, it's not just about academic education, help people to get on the job experience that doesn't have to be traditional apprenticeships; this enables them to understand the industries they want to work in BEFORE they have to make important educational decisions.

Have an actual (like REAL actual - not political spin) focus on climate change and stop making decisions based on politics (and politicians pockets / business associates / friends) rather than planet. The current administrations focus is all about 'economic growth', and to be honest, seems to put that as priority with climate/habitat/species loss as a secondary consideration. We are destroying our local habitats, our soil quality, and seeing a decline in species, all of which if we continue to abuse, our 'precious' businesses won't thrive anyway."

Reducing crime.

Regenerate town centres to bring in small independent retailers (not barbers or vape shops)

Regenerate town centres, public realm improvements and reduce traffic

Regenerating the empty buildings and bringing more trade to the town. This would improve footfall, restore people's pride in our town, and perhaps ensure that - with fewer rundown areas - there might be less anti-social behaviour.

Regenerating the town centre to reduce the number of empty units and improve the number of people using the town centre.


Regeneration of brownfield sites, local transport infrastructure, funding for youth services including opportunities for active participation in social activities, nursery provision for key workers.

"Regular, reliable & green public transport would cut congestion, potholes & pollution.

Local business support so our town doesn't die.

Support for local communities & green space."

Removing plant pots from roads

, do away with the revenue building suffolk safety cam and parking wardens ect

Reorganise primary education to deal with falling rolls, with a minimum school size of 200 to achieve economies of scale and deliver an up to date education and attract and retain quality staff.

"Repair of dangerous potholes and pavements, provided public toilet facilities in towns that have list most of those that were previously in shops ( now closed/ derelict )

Improvement of bus timetables to provide longer services ie buses that operate past 2.30 pm "

Repair of roads, help for local businesses inc start up businesses. Reduction in car park fees to encourage town centres to become more vibrant. Tackling the issue of homelessness.

"Repair roads and infrastructure including our poor schools.

Encourage new businesses into towns and support them financially at the start.

Deal with homelessness once and for all by a housing first policy.

Support the building of council houses throughout Suffolk. \*Real\* council houses, not so-called 'affordable' homes.

If it's within the remit, totally overhaul mental health services"

"Repair roads

Improve social care

Invest in green power initiatives - subsidise solar panel installations

Improve public transport

Provide gym/sports facilities

"

"Repair the roads

Provide additional support to GP access, NHS Dentistry, and improve crumbling school and NHS buildings (even though some of these are not direct county Council services) "

Repairing roads and drainage.

Repairing roads and pavements. Projects to support and improve biodiversity and the local environment. Support for the Arts. Local cycling and walking infrastructure. Anything that improves Ipswich town centre!

Repairing roads and road signs

Repairing roads, currently a disgrace.

Repairing the badly potholed roads would be good as our vehicles are being damaged

"Repairing the paths in and around town they are terrible!

Regenerating empty shops in town, with Pop up Shops, or to use as Art classes for young people using Graffiti style what is relevant to young people , repair work shops, poetry/lyrics, grow your own fruit & veg classes, meditation, Yoga. Etc etc use these empty shops. "

Repairing the quality of roads and infrastructure as they are very poor

repairing the roads, trimming hedges and lowering council tax, redundancies in the local offices which are all overstuffed and money pits.

Replace diesel buses with a greener form of transport. Consider trams and light rail etc.

Restore library budgets; train library staff and pay them properly. Libraries should be properly funded and employ paid staff. Instead of celebrating the stripped-down, crippled Library Service overseen by an over-paid SCC executive with few qualified, properly paid, library staff augmented by unqualified volunteers, fund it properly and employ qualified staff.

Restore the arts grant.

Resurfacing roads and fixing the potholes maybe?

Revitalising town centres, introducing legislation to force landlords to fill empty commercial properties or compulsory purchasing these properties and renting them out at an affordable rate. Working with local district councils to solve the fire safety issues and eyesore high rises on the Ipswich waterfront and town centre and get people back into them (most are all cash buyer only due to the issues) The Mill building is awful with its stripped cladding as is the Paul Ltd building

River restoration and flood management

Road & infrastructure improvements. maybe subsidised busses. Social + elderly care !

"Road improvements esp A14

Rural transport for those without cars

Support small businesses with lower rent, rates

Protect environment"

Road maintenance, local business support

Road maintenance, sports and training facilities for young people in the county. The encouragement of more apprenticeships.

Road maintenance. Just fix the roads.

Road repairs

Road repairs & general maintenance

Road transport, pedestrian and cycle path infrastructure is not equipped for future growth and development. This needs investment before anything else.

Roads

Roads and infrastructure, they are in an appalling state

Roads fixed, increased public transport that actually meets the needs of rural communities, significantly improved social care support

Roads repaired.

"Roads

Hospital and health care "

Roads, infrastructure, schools, NHS dentists basically where there has been no investment for years and where 480 million should be reinvested wisely

Roads, roads ,roads. Northern Bypass for Ipswich, duel the A12 completely and duel the A140. Without immediate road infrastructure improvements the country is losing out on massive investment and jobs.

Roads, white lines, pot holes and cleaning /repairing. Less cameras. Lower and fairer parking charges. Fair business rates.

Roads.

Roadworks maintenance such as filling in the many potholes we unfortunately have. Organised community events. New housing. Support for local only businesses (not the big countrywide businesses that don't need the support).

rural bus

Rural bus transport

"Rural infrastructure - including but not limited to transport. Online accessibility in rural areas needs prioritisation.

Supporting communities to become self-sufficient."

Rural transport is a priority. Firstly our existing roads need repairing properly. We need a rural bus service that runs at times that get people to work and in the evening to reduce car dependence. It also needs to connect villages and towns better. Much of the population want to reduce car use but have no alternative. Funds are also needed to retrofit our housing stock for Green energy and to provide charging points for electric vehicles.

"Rural Travel should be free to make it an alternative to using cars.

Business rate review

Infrastructure investment - infrastructure that realistically makes a tangible difference to Climate Change, encouraging businesses to make shift changes"

SCC must NOT have control of this money they will waste it

SCC needs more than that just to fix and properly deliver its core functions. How much just to fix all the pot holes!?

SCC should concentrate on providing services for the vulnerable which are inadequate. People don't need free bus travel when there are barely any buses or routes left

Schools and roads

"Scrap Scottish parliament

Scrap Welsh parliament

Scrap mayor of london

Suffolk DONT DO IT"

See above!

See above. But Suffolk's priorities should be benefiting from wind and wave power, environmental protection in the face of climate change and intensive house-building and farming

see box above

See my previous answer

See previous answer

"See previous comment re. provision of local transport.

The provision of nearby medical and school facilities for inclusion in new housing estates, which seems to be entirely missing currently (with the notable exception of Thurston)."

"SEN and education services

Improvement of the highway network and review of rural travel links"

SeN services, Roads, ect. Making sure money is spent on residents not complaints.

SEN. Road resurfacing. Schools. Local nhs trusts. Mental health. Gang culture. Pushing for more suitable, family, social housing instead of allowing the building of more and more flats that people do not want and are unaffordable for most.

"SEND services

Public services"

Sensibly. I would explain personally but it's TRULY impossible to speak to ANYONE in authority at SCC. Everyone just pushes you somewhere else. But that what All of the authority requires

Services which are chronically underfunded already such as Highways, education and adult and social care.

"Set up an indoor market inside the former Debenhams' building

A new complex swimming facilities

Pot holes through out the town

Youth clubs to help with anti social behaviour"

Shops, doctors, dentists helping young people to get on the property ladder. and not by affordable housing as in 1/2 rent 1/2 mortgage. This is not affordable combined they are more than a mortgage. We need cheaper 100% mortgage properties.

Should be in consultation with Town/Parish councils and on identified needs such as; Dentistry, Affordable and appropriate Housing, Rural/Coastal regeneration (where poverty can be surrounded by affluence making delivery more challenging).



Should go on council houses & a Suffolk green economy to make money for the council that can be re-invested for services, buses, facilities for all of Suffolk that are subsisted my smart initial investments that are long term

Shouldn't be allowed to have it

Sign replacement, road resurfacing, grants for businesses.

Significantly more bus services which run into the night and across the weekends.

Simple just undo all the stupid ideas you've implemented around the town which is strangling the town and turning people away:

Skills and transport particularly aimed at young people in rural areas

"Skills development

Supporting Suffolk's visitor economy

Maximising the opportunities from the green/circular economy - like green trade

Enhancing the financial capability of Suffolk residents, young, older and vulnerable residents

Greater coordination of local transport planning/infrastructure at the regional and local

Funding a community asset development fund

Promoting Suffolk as a regional, national and international hub for the services sector (financial, legal, accountancy, consultancy)

Supporting the future resilience of Suffolk's agri and agri-tech sectors

Creating capacity for enhanced economic forecasting and data analytics

"

"Skills training

"

So much needs to be improved, pot holes pavements, child care, elderly care it seems to me that EVERYTHING is a mess

Social care

Social care

Social care

Social care

"Social Care

Bus travel

Citizens Advice and Libraries "

"social care

free bus/train travel"

Social care, additional educational needs

Social care, counteracting impact of Sizewell and Friston sub station on Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and associated tourism.

Social care, highways and young people facilities.

Social Care, which extends to poor income families, teenagers and children.

Social care.

Social care. Cultural activities. Sure Start & facilities for young people, infrastructure to support existing housing. Environment & public transport.

"Social housing for locals

Free bus travel

reduction in business rates

Social care"

Social Housing 🏠

Social housing, public transport, schools, child care, social care.

Social housing, social housing, social housing, social housing!! After that NHS dentistry, education , NHS services and SEND.

Social housing. Social equity measures. School funding in deprived areas. NOT invested for business gain.

Something enhance the local care market , to grow our own staff

Sort out SEND support to families and infrastructure within the education system to support these young people to age 25 & beyond. The needs do not stop at 25 years old neither should support

Sort out the roads including a northern bypass for Ipswich and more secure transport links from Felixstowe via another road crossing over the Orwell

Sort social housing; reduce parking fees to boost footfall in towns; improve Ipswich town centre; increase zero tolerance re unsocial behaviour; boost green growth and simplify our recycling experience by introducing more innovative ideas!

Sort the bloomin roads out

"Sort the roads out and improve social care access

"

"Sounds like you already made your mind up that you will get your hands on the cash

Why bother asking us? Just a pretence"

Spend it on highway maintenance and filling thousands of potholes, also deporting lots of people

Spend it on projects and activities that improve wellbeing, particularly for older people, so that they stay out of hospital and we prevent mental ill health

"Spend it on Suffolk, not on giving people in the council ridiculously high wages. It should make Suffolk better, not make its' leaders better off.

"

spend money in the North of the county as all you seem to spend money at is Ipswich NOT Lowestoft the 2nd largest town

Spending of the budget should be on the economic growth of the smaller towns, not on the larger towns e.g. Ipswich, Lowestoft, Felixstowe

Spending the money at a local level, including improving the condition of roads, the environment and education

spread evenly across all areas as everything needs money

Start with social care to look after our old people with dignity. Then sort benefits so people have enough to live on ie to eat and heat. Then sort the housing problem for locals and asylum seekers and rough sleepers.

Start with the basics! Get the potholes, roads, our street light, fixed. And unblock all the drains!

Stop businesstax

Stop cars/delivery vehicular busting up our toads and walls in these narrow roads.

Stop funding illegal asylum people. Put more into social care.

Stop the building of homes on arable fields. The homes are not selling.

Stop the spiteful destruction of the local record offices trying to justify the money wasted on the Hold that is nowhere near as useful or accessible as the Gatacre Road site unless you live in Ipswich.

streamline bureaucracy (everyone and there mate gets to comment on planning & building control), reduce staff providing questionable services, review local government top wage earners posts, bringing in new blood with drive. Remove bonus schemes. Focus on growing and supporting local business.

Strengthen communities through things like community arts projects with the associated wellbeing benefits.

Strengthen local community groups

Strong focus on climate change mitigation and services/projects which prioritise bettering water resources and quality, biodiversity, waste management, education, sustainable active travel, and so forth.

Subsidised active travel and public transport. Modal integration. Something like a Deutschland Ticket (though £480mn over 30 years isn't going to pay for that).

Subsidised and extended travel would be very beneficial, especially in rural areas

Subsidising public transport. Investment in healthcare facilities. Improved highway maintenance.

Suffolk CC would just squander it

Suffolk County Council are incompetent and so are the Government and all the political parties.

Suffolk County Council doesn't get to decide how this money is spent, the Directly Elected Leader does in their manifesto. Every councillor elected will not be elected with any mandate to spend this money - only the DEL... and if they are of a different party than the DEL, they will have even less say over how it will be spent.

Suffolk County Council has proved to be incapable of running services for the county now. There are too many vested interests with too many pet projects and half baked political motivated ideas on too many agendas. All we need in Suffolk is councillors who want to provide good basic services with no glitzy add ons. Forget politics, look after the people of Suffolk.

Suffolk growth through investing in apprenticeship's

Support for better public transport and improving roads

"support for care for elderly

social care schools

bus transport

mental health services"

Support for EY childcare, Improvement in school buildings to create safe education spaces, better travel options (not necessarily free!). Cohesive work on projects as there are many smaller groups doing the same thing, in essence, as many others.

Support for local businesses but also local retail and keeping town and village centres alive. Improving local transport would be a huge benefit, I like the sound of the oyster card, but you need the buses to go with it.

Support for local businesses to encourage more independents specifically for Ipswich. Fix the broken bridge in Needham Market close to pipp's ford lock. Make public footpaths by roads accessible again by trimming back hedgerows very dangerous

Support for local businesses to ensure newcomers can shop locally instead of regularly driving to out-of-town superstores. Greater access to buses, including revision of routes to ensure they service the new housing developments.

Support for local businesses, investing in infrastructure and highway repair. I think adult social care and CYP are funded enough.

"Support for Local Businesses: Investing a portion of the fund into supporting local businesses would be crucial for stimulating economic growth and fostering entrepreneurship within the county. This could include providing grants, loans, or training programs to help small and medium-sized enterprises thrive in our region.

Infrastructure Development: A significant portion of the fund should be earmarked for infrastructure development projects that enhance connectivity, improve transportation networks, and promote sustainable urban development. This could involve upgrading roads, bridges, and public transportation systems and investing in green infrastructure initiatives to address environmental challenges.

Social Welfare Programs: It's essential to allocate a portion of the fund towards social welfare programs aimed at improving the quality of life for all residents of Suffolk County. This could include initiatives to address affordable housing, healthcare access, education, and social services to support vulnerable populations.

Environmental Initiatives: Given the increasing importance of environmental sustainability, investing in green initiatives should be a priority. This could involve funding renewable energy projects, implementing climate resilience measures, and promoting eco-friendly practices to mitigate the impacts of climate change and protect our natural resources.

Community Development: Lastly, investing in community development projects that strengthen social cohesion and enhance public spaces would contribute to building a vibrant and inclusive community. This could include funding parks and recreational facilities, cultural events, and initiatives promoting civic engagement and participation.

"

Support for local charities/businesses that provide vital support (for example charities that social care officers refer service users to, parent and child support groups etc). Investing to improve local roads and transport to reduce pollution and traffic build up. Investment in green spaces and tree planting to reduce overheating/ provide shade in summer months.

Support for new/small businesses, connecting rural communities to urban areas with public transport and cycling/walking infrastructure. Actually working with rural areas and their cycling and walking infrastructure. it is so focussed on towns but we are a rural county!

Support for people without transport to dispose of items for scrap or refurbishment. Collection of glass bottles at roadside.

"Support local businesses with the provision of skills training and advice to support the development of the green economy. Prioritise infrastructure to support sustainable travel options (walking/cycling/public transport). Investment in flood risk management projects to benefit communities and businesses.

"

support local small business, give youngsters essential life skills e.g investing

"Support more provision for GP and dental surgeries. Improve rural transport links. Free bus travel.

Free parking for residents via passes.

Reducing rents on high street business premises, to encourage people to open up new shops.

More Community Wardens/Street Guardians in towns and villages to deter anti-social behaviour.

Protection of green spaces - prevention order on land to stop development - we need trees, they are the planet's lungs.

Support for older persons lunch clubs/social and health clubs.

Filling in potholes on our roads - they seriously damage cars, public transport and emergency services vehicles.

Support Trading Standards to do more work on illegal vapes, internet selling of fake and dangerous goods."

support SEND children and young people

"Support Travel Infrastructure

Green Initiatives

Local Businesses"

Supporting all stages of education. Improvement of infrastructure - eg roads. Providing public transport or safe cycle lanes in all areas - not just urban ones. Supporting businesses especially new ones. Opening leisure activities for young people to combat gang and drug culture. Supporting victims of domestic abuse,

Supporting areas of public health and wellbeing. Leisure centres, museums, libraries

Supporting business and making road transport better for users.

"Supporting business growth

Encouraging and supporting local community action

Improving infrastructure "

Supporting businesses and business start up in rural areas of Suffolk - we are an important part of the Suffolk economy, but often get overlooked in investment plans. Supporting businesses to thrive and growing employment in rural areas will also support a more sustainable economic model for Suffolk, reduce travel to work in our towns and for rural tourism businesses reduce the pressure on our existing "tourism hotspots"

Supporting Businesses to engage with green economy and green skills e.g. skills upgrade for retrofitting energy efficiency measures and EV skills for local garages

"Supporting children in care as they are the most vulnerable people in society.

Investing and supporting local charities and small businesses"

Supporting community projects designed to improve the lives of children and those on low income. Especially thinking of school holidays in the absence of school meals.

Supporting infrastructure relating to new housing. I am pro-new housing in the area so spending to aid this would be welcome.

Supporting infrastructure, housing and amenities to encourage the younger working population to stay or to relocate to Suffolk. Not developers who promise affordable housing and don't deliver. Encourage and incentivise self-build and small plot sales, community eco house builds and something for a younger generation to be able to invest their own time or money in.

Supporting investment in initiatives to combat the impacts of climate change

Supporting local bus services

Supporting local business and better public transport for village communities

"Supporting local businesses - making Ipswich Town better again.

Supporting learning disability education"

Supporting local businesses and investing in the infrastructure.

Supporting local businesses to make areas accessible for disabled users,

Supporting local towns and villages to manage their own resources

Supporting rural bus services, health clinics, support for young carers, debt advice services, training in new green economy jobs

Supporting the arts, culture, education, fixing the roads

Supporting wildlife, planting native trees, ending pollution by Anglian Water in particular, ending animal cruelty and creating serene natural spaces that people of all ages can enjoy.

Surely SCC should have a plan based on evidence and gaps? If not why go for devolution?

Tackling backlog of potholes. Funding the shortfall in sea defences in Lowestoft.

Target areas that are struggling and help to improve local infrastructure- maintain roads, support local services and amenities.

Target local people, projects and businesses that encourage local enterprise, create employment and enhance and grow the already good "Suffolk local" culture.

Targeted business support for businesses employing and training young people. A fund to help local businesses move from startup phase to growth phase, where it is difficult to get debt or equity funding. Training provision for doctors who have graduated.

Tax cuts... Massively tax cuts FOR WORKERS... That is, those on PAYE and self employed. Nobody else, they get all the help and workers are people too.

Tax payers money being wasted. Do not agree with free travel etc. the average citizen should pay their way. Business stuff is not effective. See Wales

Teaching people to fish, rather than giving them fish. Working with energy based private sector to support decarbonisation including offshore and nuclear industries and in domestic settings. improving community wellbeing working with district, town and parish councils, especially those difficult to reach. Levelling up within the county and to prepare it for the future.

That is about £20 per head of population, could be a donation to the repair of a pothole

"The , young the elderly, facilities.

Who would use a free bus service where to where only help a few people. Lunch clubs providing food for those struggling "

The £16m per year would be allocated to the place where I presume Central Gov have indicated it should be spend on. So it would be the usual places, just money that is received in a different way.

The £480 million investment fund is over a long timeframe and is designed to mislead. The £16 million per year which it represents is insufficient to even begin to deal with the progressive underfunding of local councils over the past 14 years.

The £480 presentation is misleading. You are proposing a non-inflationary £16m budget for each FY. That said, this funding should be used to better align and integrate public services between Councils and NHS services in Suffolk. Fettering this away on 'Pork Barrel' projects is not helpful to our community.

The answer for me is clear - look at what people most complain about and use it for that - expensive car parking, potholes, street cleaning in larger towns, verge cutting on major roads

the arts

The bulk of the £480 million should be invested in income generating, like rental properties, so the £480 million remains a capital sum, to be constantly reinvested and generate an income for SCC.

The deal should not be approved so the question is biased

The deal should not happen. This 'survey' is totally biased, not fit for purpose and most likely illegal.

The decision on how this money is spent over a 16 year period should not be decided in a lip service 'consultation' process, prior to any deal is made. The very questions in this survey suggest this is a done-deal. Democratic processes should be put in place to decide how any money is spent, and over the course of 16 years, not just at the start of this process.

The fund should support community services, not just the infrastructure around Ipswich and the East West corridor. The north of the county is ill served and this needs to be redressed.

The funds should pay for the same as now

"The infrastructure of the county of Suffolk!!!.

Sorting out the potholes,

LOWERING THE EXTORTION COUNCIL TAX. As that gets squandered on everything else "

The investment should be to ensure Suffolk is able to invest in projects to make a lower carbon future. So, public transport investment and infrastructure to reduce carbon emissions and protect the environment. Onshore wind, insulation etc.

The list would include infrastructure, youth development, attracting new business and work, supporting and improving existing transport networks, supporting more police on our streets.

The main key is investment in key infrastructure and looking a social care provision



The money will be wasted on yet another layer of meddling bureaucracy giving themselves generous pay rises and a handsome expense account

The most important thing has to be making our towns and rural areas places in which people can live, work and play without being forced into making decisions about the way they travel that contribute to the detriment of the community as a whole, i.e. having no viable choice other than to drive everywhere; we need livable streets where children can play in safety, where active travel is normalised and to achieve this structural and systemic change is required to ensure that facilities that people rely upon are available in every local area and where viable public transport systems are provided to give people a real choice about the mode in which they choose to make their everyday journeys.

the question supposes the sum will available in one lump sum which is a false premise

The SEND department has received another bad OFSTED report and year on year the situation on ground level only gets worse! I genuinely am scared what the service means for my children and family. We are making plans long term to move to a county with better send provision- particularly for adults. As a professional who worked in London for send education how parents are supported in Suffolk is beyond frightening. I'm handed a diagnosis for my son and then there's no help. I jump through the hoops of courses to access further support and consistently discharged from every service even though my son attends a severe special school and has needs I am struggling to meet.

The spending should be flexible as needs arise and change

The value of £16m in 30 years time is insignificant and a poor deal due to no inflationary increases

The very question makes clear that SCC has no strategy or policy for this funding.

There are many possibilities to expend such funding. Priming the pump for local businesses, improved services for residents. The key benefit is that fund use will be discussed & decided locally.

There is no bus service here so no point in free bus travel.

"There is no joined up Greater Ipswich Local Plan (like Norfolk has for Norwich). If Suffolk wants levelling up, it must get its house in order first.

Levelling up should mean greater parity for Ipswich as former county-borough, more investment and power for Ipswich, getting rid of Suffolk County Council portfolios and replace with committees that have an equal voice for Ipswich on all. Yet, we know there is no chance of this!

Ipswich has clearly been failed by Suffolk's local government structure for years. It is very easy to keep adding more power to the exactly the same people and broken system. More of the same is not a solution."

"There needs to be greater investment in transport (and not just free transport for old people). There needs to be much more spent on young workers/students particularly in reskilling/further or higher education. There is a complete lack of investment in Education Skills and Training (particularly in north Suffolk) - it's no good expecting Norfolk to provide what Suffolk doesn't.

If it were invested in transport then Suffolk would need to liaise with neighbouring counties and, heaven forbid, share the resources - people need to travel outside of Suffolk for work and education (at present it is very difficult and very expensive).

Active Travel is a great opportunity but your councillors seem to be embarrassed about promoting it - in fact some of them are anti-cycling (do they see it as 'woke'?) Fed up with the pro-car policies and over-reliance on cars that SCC tacitly promotes."

"There should be a public swimming pool, gym and sauna, free at the point of use like the NHS, in the county

The council should build them using the money

"

There would need to be a decentralised totally democratic method put in place so those living in Suffolk can have a direct line of influence. It is impossible and wrong to answer this question with so little background info.

"There would need to be buses available which are accessible to all (elderly/disabled) before worrying about it being free! Establishment of Suffolk SEND schools and current processes - make SCC staff accountable rather than vague responses to items More help to those people looking for social housing and clear guidance as to the requirements to access TO name but a few

"

"They shouldn't !!! If the deal goes through it will be disastrous.

The people in charge of Suffolk all need to be fired "

They won't listen

Think of the kids ! The young families and also turning some of these empty buildings in town into thriving local English businesses. Not just weird little off licences everywhere.

This could provide scope for local renewable energy schemes, helping delivering biodiversity net gain, promoting active travel through better links to public transport infrastructure

This deal is the wrong thing for our County - I suspect like in its recent budget the funds would be used to boost reserves instead of funding services - Matthew Hicks and his administration have proved they can not be trusted !!

This deal MUST NOT go through.

"This devolution deal should not go through.

You can't even keep the grass verges cut in the County Town. As for the roundabouts that used to be beautifully planted are now left to go wild and look disgraceful."

This fund is being used as blackmail by central government desperate to avoid responsibility and find others to blame.

This is a con

This is a false and misleading question that should not be allowed on a survey. The figure is NOT £480M, which sounds fabulous, but is £16M per annum, and that will be worth a fraction of that in 30 years time after inflation.

This is a none question as it not enough to make the idea viable!

This is more Tory

This is not enough over 30 with no built in inflation

"This is such a bias survey.

The level of cognitive bias just beggars belief."

This sum would just about make our roads usable.

This survey has not been constructed correctly and should not be taken seriously. These questions are leading and do not allow a balanced opinion.

This survey is awful and full of leading questions, as a former survey consultant I'm frankly upset

This would be for our elected councillors to work out, but would there be a conflict of interest from councillors, and politics would (if it were to work effectively) have to be put to one side by all parties for the good of suffolk.

"Three ways:

A commitment to new road building to relieve villages from having HGVs diverted through them, the construction or repurposing of roads for quiet lanes, and the requirement to build new A roads wide enough for cars to pass cyclists two abreast.

Second, the construction of new sewage works with sufficient overflow capacity to reduce projected untreated discharge by 75%.

Third: to increase the number of police patrols in the county. I had the good fortune to chat with one of our officers last weekend, who told me that good paperwork practices in the Met are not replicated here, thus reducing valuable public contact time. I believe the Rural Patrol has had some success in actually thwarting crime in progress, and there must be more of this.

Do not waste this money on quangos, green initiatives, consultants, rewilding, or vanity projects. We want good safe roads, clean water for us and our wildlife, and a police force that is a visible deterrent to criminals."

To encourage & support business, improve & support public transport

"to encourage active travel and reduce car use

"

To fix the pot holes

To fund social care.

To give local business more support and give younger new business a good/better start. Better infrastructure also more services for children

To help middle income workers rather than n'r do wells

"To improve access and facilities for children with special educational needs seems very urgent.

Also, better support for companies to offer good quality apprenticeships with better pay than just £6.40 ph"

To improve Suffolk for the people ie stop the second home market improve the prospects for children and make Suffolk a safe place to grow up and to spend the police budget more effectively

To invest in infrastructure

Too much that needs extra funding. Social care is one.

Too small to do anything but virtue signal.

Town centre regeneration

Town centres are dying, I would support anything that can increase footfall on the high street. Lower parking fees, expansion of public transport to areas with no service.

Transport

Transport , housing, healthcare and SEND educational needs. Housing, social housing, council owned so it is not too expensive.

Transport .. infrastructure .. schools .. green areas for leisure ..

transport and protecting our heritage tourism.

Transport for rural Suffolk is important

"transport improvements - northern bypass or similar

town centre investment - specifically Ipswich to try to revitalise it

skills and business support for small businesses

Greenest county related investments - sustainability support

Tourism, Agriculture & food& drink sector support

"

Transport in local area is very poor, compared to Ipswich.

Transport Infrastructure in Ipswich, which has been underfunded for too long

Transport infrastructure improvements are essential. Free bus travel is a "red herring" in a largely rural environment. Buses would never run at the times or to the destinations that passengers need.

Transport links are appalling especially to rural communities. Use more brownfield sites for development and stop eroding the countryside. Subsidised bus travel

Transport, digital infrastructure and skills are key priorities for investment. The growth opportunities presented by Suffolk and the East of England as a whole, can be better leveraged with improved infrastructure and by upskilling, especially as regards to net zero, new technologies, AI and digital.

Transport, local power generation, youth services

Transport, specifically on more investment in bus services, which have declined in number significantly in recent years, especially in the Mid Suffolk district where there are very few services in the district itself and the only regular services are to Ipswich. Free bus travel must be a priority too, in order to encourage more people out of their cars to reduce congestion and carbon emissions.

"Transport....ie road improvements.

Creation of proper carer training courses....improved day care facilities.

More youth club type facilities funding."

Transportation, infra structure and education particularly

Trouble is our council is always wasting money. I can see £480 millions wasted in pointless stuff. I e staff wages and pensions. This is pointless

Typical sort sighted response

"Unfortunately the money wont stretch far enough due to the way SCC has put projects out to tender.

"

"Unproven public transport

Lo"

"Updating our LA schools to enable our children to have a good learning experience with the correct tools & infrastructure.

Investing in staff to maintain social care as the population of Suffolk ages.

Providing amenities for suffolk residents to enjoy for all ages - not just one group.

"

Upgrade the A12 to dual carriageway between Framlingham and Kessingland.

Use for health and social care and transport very useful

Use it to employ people to ensure developers provide the infrastructure to support their developments, rather than the people paying for those through their taxes

"Use local knowledge to support plans eg bus lane on West End Road. What buses use it/frequency, etc- what use is it really? Money could have been spent other places.

Publish consultations widely - this consultation has not been well publicised - why not?

Reading the brochure it looks as if the spend is already proposed. How can it now be changed?"

Using the funds to encourage more local business and attract more corporates to set back offices here leading to local employment, invest in the aging infrastructure mostly roads and bridges, including much needed bypass roads to deal with traffic congestions. Also, more promotion of local historic places to encourage tourism and provide boost to associated businesses.

Very much hoping the deal doesn't go through - if it does, then genuine steps towards good rural bus networks and cycle routes would be a good use of funding. Not free bus travel, but perhaps £1 per journey?

Very wisely with no glory projects.

Village bus services!!

Waffle.

We all need to work, so the infrastructure needs to be there to help business to grow, people to get educated, and easily being able to get to work using public transport. No matter the age of the person or business.

We definitely need roads and infrastructure to be addressed. Public transportation needs desperately to be improved and extended

We feel this should be focussed on investment in infrastructure—transport, industrial/commercial, energy, and utilities—and not used to fund revenue or sustain other services. Instead, it should be used to create assets and infrastructure that can generate further revenues.

We need to encourage free enterprise, this does not come from high taxes, high spending and a high level of interference.

We need to invest for the future: definitely helping businesses through perhaps sponsoring apprenticeships and in supporting our young people through providing more youth clubs.

We pay our council tax to fund Suffolk, so why should we need to have some of the money back. It simply shouldn't have gone to Westminster in the first place.

"We run a business in a rural area of Suffolk. Roads are often closed with no notice, making life very difficult when trying to run a business - especially as it's something where visitors attend events. It would be great if Suffolk could improve the quality of roads and improve communication to badly affected businesses.

Secondly, there is major investment needed in town centres, especially Ipswich. In the 9 years I have lived here, Ipswich town centre and gradually declined to a point where it feels unsafe and unwelcoming, with very little to see and do. "

Well

What bus travel, that service has almost disappeared? the roads are in a diabolical state with pot holes. I suspect this money should it become available will be wasted on woke jobs and funding "diversity" projects

whats the point they have no idea what they are doing

When there are areas in Suffolk of huge deprivation I think this question is silly- people don't have enough to eat

Where it would have most enduring impact. Being creative in driving economic growth that helps local people fulfil their potential. And supporting people to help themselves and constructively participate in society.

Where its going to get the most interest

Wherever funds are lacking that require funds rather money being thrown at unnecessary fields

Wherever they spend they need to more tightly monitor how it is being used. Consider the issues with SEN and highways (Keir). Accountability is essential.

"Who cares about free bus travel?

Is that as an exciting idea as you can come up with?

What about fighting for what little free land is left? Fighting for nature? Fighting for the people of Suffolk, not just promoting your own self importance???

Stop the Sunnica scheme, for starters. Enforce housing developers to install compulsory solar panels/swift bricks on every house. Then we wouldn't need to lose any more countryside/farmland."

who gets to decide... social care, education arts?

Why ask? Another layer of government costs more and a lot of it will be used to pay more people for doing their own vanity projects

Why ask? You'll continue to give contracts to your friends who pay kick backs. You'll take your consultancy jobs as gifts for giving money to your mates. You'll pursue mindless pet projects, vanity projects and all sorts of other things that leave local people poorer but increase your own delusions of grandeur.

Why ask? You'll do what you want anyway. Even this 'consultation' is done in name only. You've already decided to impose this on Suffolk people, ripping them off even further.

Why do we need a devolved county council to do this

Why don't you listen to the people of Suffolk as we don't want this at all!

Why keep showing £480m over 30 years, how is it split into the coming years?

Wisely, preferably. Spend it on things that create network effects to get the most out of it.

Without robust infrastructure nothing else can be done. Build Suffolk from strong foundations.

Work with district councils so that it's a fair proportion spent throughout the county and not just the favoured LAs

Would some money to be spent responsibly and all businesses involved are treated fairly, unlike bus tendering process

wow! that's it? how about using it to address poverty directly? how about using it to, in effect, remove the two child benefit cap by subsidising those families? How about creating sure start centres? fund really really cheap studio space for start up micro business in East Suffolk? how about using a LOT of funding to build council owned care homes for children?

"Wraparound childcare from 1 years old paid

All children free school meals

Free after school care

Free bus passes for all children and elderly

Frequent bus services

Youth services

Local drop-in health centres for scans/blood tests relieves hospitals

RAC in schools sorted out - still in Hadleigh High School (no science labs)"

Yes

yes it would give Suffolk more control over its affairs.

Yes, improve the road and the safe off-road PROW infrastructure for all users; invest in public transport so it's much more accessible/cheaper for everyone; improve housing; invest in education and promote more individual responsibility and better health care.

You can waste it on consultants as you do now. WhyTF doubling bodies think they get value for money doing so? Total false economy - I worked in both public and private sector btw

You can't be trusted with this money. Most leveling up money already spent on lunatic schemes locally. We don't need more, these funds always come with strings to control how they're spent and what on. Been there, worked for a council for 20 years in senior positions. Don't agree with it.

You could perhaps try planning and building some infrastructure before allowing new building!!

You could try repairing the roads and other infrastructure such as the cycle paths that are not maintained now.

You should put lots of money into healthcare, fast broadband like Hyperoptic or better, and good public transport

You talk █████ there's no point ... drain the Suffolk County Council swamp

You would just waste it on personal projects that matter only to you.



You would waste all this money on middle management and poor ideas. I do not want it to go ahead

Young people. Access to youth provision. And free bus travel for those communities who need it

Youth centre or something similar. There isn't anything free/cheap for youths to do. When they don't have anything to do, they keep themselves amused, which can lead to trouble

youth clubs, environmental protection, public transport

"youth mental health and better access to local transport,

more affordable homes"

**Q7. Control over the £9.4 million a year budget and plan for adult education in Suffolk  
Please explain your answer**

'Control over the budget' is a ridiculous phrase, as the Council has no control or effective management process to manage what they have now

£9mil is next to nothing per year sounds a lot but in reality it isn't.

A lot more education about life could be carried out at school before they are let loose in the world

A lot of adult education is already 'devolved' in that it is provided by FE Colleges. Most of the rest of adult education has virtually disappeared. So I'm not sure what role is envisaged here?

A properly equipped workforce is our future, from those with technical and IT skills to those trained under a decent apprenticeship umbrella, all are vital in regenerating and maintaining our community and growth.

A sea change in Adult Education is needed to help citizens engage with the existential crises & change we face. SCC should support & trust Adult citizens to decide themselves what form this education should take - Adults should NOT be dictated to by Govt, Business or provider agendas (minor stakeholders in comparison to the Citizens themselves).

"a) Ensuring all adults up to the age of 19 have a GCSE at grade C in English and Maths

b) Investing in opportunities such as entrepreneurship/apprenticeship"

ABP are not a major employer directly but is responsible for over 3000 jobs in Suffolk. Whilst we don't struggle with recruitment overall, we do see some challenges in the engineering sector. Our close links to off shore wind in Lowestoft are key and we need to ensure we harness this and don't put any developers off.

Address the issues in schools and there wouldn't need to be assisted adult education.

Adult ed seems virtually non existent currently

Adult education and training courses are important to improve quality of life for Suffolk residents and for improving employment opportunities.

adult education assists people to upskill

Adult education gives adults a second chance to "Catch up" and improve on their existing level of education to give them better employment opportunities.

Adult education initiatives traditionally do not work that well unless the funding is targeted at excellent apprenticeship programme

Adult education is a worthy plan. It would boost older people's confidence, sense of belonging and reduce loneliness

Adult Education is already well supported in Suffolk. Any further funding will be swallowed up by the existing big hitters.

Adult education is currently a mess. Need to meet needs of whole adult population many can't afford to reduce working hours to access adult ed. so need evenings, etc to enable a growth in ambition

Adult education is doing fine without interference

Adult education is good but I doubt the right things will be prioritised. It will probably be focused on growth opportunities.

Adult education is hugely important, some children do not know what they want to do after school and this can take some time for them to figure it out. Having Adult Learning available for this cohort would be hugely beneficial to aid them into successful careers. Also this would be useful for those that wish to change careers.

Adult education is important for business growth it should be tied 100% to business needs.

Adult education is important to allow people to catch up on education they may have missed earlier in life, and also to provide opportunities to learn new skills, crafts and languages.

Adult education is important, but children's education should be the priority.

Adult Education is important.

Adult education is useful but more important to support job creation since job skills are very dependent on role.

"Adult education is vital but linked to accessibility, transport and affordability.

Having removed the responsibility for education from the CC the structures for providing this may no longer exist, and would be very isolated. Education should be a NATIONAL strategy"

Adult education needs to be beneficial to those undertaking it. I feel that by targeting it towards local needs this might be shortsighted, and not helpful for the student's eventual social mobility prospects were they to choose to move away. If they are skilled purely to fulfil a local role, their abilities might not fit other pathways elsewhere, thereby limiting them.

Adult education plays an important role in keeping people's minds active - a great way of staving off dementia and all that entails

Adult education supports continual learning and growth of the Suffolk population. Education on key subjects reduces the need for social care interventions with marginalised groups

Adult education, didn't know it even existed!

Adult education?? I think this is purely for special needs adults, that it is important to teach life skills, etc and try and place them in jobs.

Adults can access external funding elsewhere to meet educational needs

Adults can make more money which will filter through to the community and make the county a better place to live.

adults can self fund

Adults education is already quite good

Adults should already be educated. Expectation of "Free stuff" is a cancer on society.

"adults shouldn't need education if the proper education is offered to children

"

Again a national strategy is desirable and this allows too much leeway for budgetary slack and lack of goal congruence

Again access to education would be greatly aided by access to transport, and it being nearer.

"Again different priority and industries for Suffolk

"

Again have they got the expertise to go forward with this?

Again not enough info, does Suffolk cc get a say in how current allocation of adult education funding in Suffolk.g. identifying skill shortages, no distinction between general education for adults and businesses supporting training of their employees

Again personal accountability

Again questions predeposes answer and creates a bigger more expensive government

Again there must be due oversight and governance. Money shouldn't just be earmarked for business and education is more than just business support.

Again this has not been asked for and the adjustment will take time and money

Again this needs to be part of a wider discussion. What good is Adult ed in Suffolk if it is not interested to allow Suffolk residents to train elsewhere for specialist jobs.

Again where is it coming from and why can't we have it without devolution very biased loaded questions as no alternative given

Again, keep politics out of any proposals. Public needs to be informed of all proposals.

Again, scc can't manage with what's available and I don't have confidence this money would be managed effectively and equally I cannot imagine central government while managing money would ignore and not consult with scc so again, very misleading

Again, seems a very low sum and not a good track record of service provision.

Again, the issue is transport. those living in rural areas cannot easily access the colleges, the university and other learning environments unless have access to transport..

Again, the sums of money seem insufficient.

Again, without any declaration as to how broadly spends will be focussed, these are just top line headlines

Agree with proposal

Align spend with local business needs and job opportunities/growth of specific industries that bring sustainable high quality employment

Aligning adult education to local skills needs can only be achieved through local control.

All education should be supported locally for the needs of the residents not necessarily adult

All this will mean is it would be stripped bare and Suffolk locals would suffer more than they already are

Allows central government to absolve itself of responsibility for an ailing and failing system caused by its own mismanagement and lack of funds.

Already opportunity's out there if people want them

Amount too small

An educated adult population may increase investment from national companies into Felixstowe

An important opportunity to focus on delivering for returners to the workplace. This has the potential deal effectively with under employment, especially for adults who have taken partial or full career breaks for a long period to care for children or adults

An opportunity for skills training to align more closely to local needs.

And training providers need to be properly vetted and not excluded from delivering if they have multiple funding sources. The council should look to support independent social enterprises and not just previous block funded services.

Another loaded question. This survey is ridiculous and totally one sided

Anything that helps to get people off welfare and back into work should be supported

Apprenticeships are the way forward, teaching valuable skills and work sense whilst also earning a wage. The Younger generations need this and companies are realising that academic students don't have the work experience which is much needed. Having an Apprenticeship department which co-ordinates and liases between businesses and education outlets to form Apprenticeship schemes would be a good start.

Are you not already responsible for education in Suffolk?

As above local people need to make decisions

As an older member of the community I don;t know much about Adult Education. But always good to support local businesses and provide skills training for younger adults to help them with employment prospects.

as before

As cannot garentee suffolk Council would share it out correctly. Cannot trust them with money as they waste it so would probably spend it on things that wouldn't benefit adult education

As explained already we do not want devolution at all!

As I don't at the moment know how, or whether, the national government policy for management of the spending would differ from SCC policy I cannot comment.

As I understand it, most people feel that Education and other local authority services are already significantly underfunded. So offloading responsibility by central govt onto Suffolk for an inadequate budget doesn't seem to be much of an improvement to me.

As I'm retired . Still against councils having too much power

As I'm retired it doesn't have any real impact on me

As in my last answer locally taken decisions are better informed

As local shops and businesses would hopefully continue and skills from the past would not be lost.

As long as decisions reflect local needs and not for political purposes.

As long as it gets to front line and does not get spent on new directions at County Hall.

As long as there is some for 18/19 with SEND

As long as you don't educate on sex gender, etc., and focus on educating people with correct historical facts, teach them to count and geological facts. Get schoolgrounds for all education facilities to encourage exercise.

As our demographics move to an older population it is imperative that we stimulate the adult population intellectually and enable opportunities to acquire new, more relevant skills.

"as pointed out the money will be coming to Suffolk anyway and will fall into general spending within this area, in particular the uncontrollable growth in SEND provision which is totally ignored

"

As previous question. Recognising the qualities and skills of our NEET cohort let down by education and the LA now need a solid plan to tackle both their mental health, confidence and self esteem and their lack of formal qualifications. Most do not want to have no option but to claim benefits. They're a massive untapped asset.

As previously mentioned, I don't trust SCC to make good commissioning decisions. A deal doesn't seem any more or less beneficial to Suffolk residents with the current way things are run/commissioned across the council.

As stated

As stated above it could be used to invest in skills more aligned to the needs of the local businesses and education providers who would be aware of the needs of children/young people.

As well as an aging population Suffolk suffers from a brain drain of school leavers - the opportunities to develop early and mid stage careers in Suffolk are near non-existent - supporting and growing adult education at a local level could start to turn the tide on this.

As you say it's already part of your budget. Adult literacy and confidence is low. Younger adults are being left behind in some cases as many struggle with confidence to read and write. Look at the National programme as other counties appear to be doing well but again it feels like Suffolk is falling behind. Why?

Assuming the £16 million budget per year, this is over half the yearly budget! Over 30 years (assuming all stays equal) it's £270 million. Basically, this is unaffordable under the suggested devolution deal. Incredibly concerning!!!

Bad idea keep it under central control

Because it's a cheat. They're just offloading responsibility. The supposed cash is just a bribe, a fraction of what it will turn out to cost.

Because the money would be wasted. The County actually needs people who want to work. Not more people who see themselves as above the need to work

because you will not fund evening and weekend training for adults so those who work can take advantage of courses outside of work hours

Being able to target local opportunities that would likely be missed at a greater scale will make the funding more effective so I do believe this is important, although since the budget would still have been in effect I see this as a lesser benefit of the deal, although still very much a positive change.

Better decision making

Better facilities in schools and infrastructure improvements

Better to deploy locally than centrally. Need to maintain option of village schools for such a rural community.

better training to get people working

Better value for money for local people by ensuring courses are fit for purpose and well attended. Helping local businesses find the right people with right qualifications.

Blackmail - threatening less funding if we don't agree central government dereliction of responsibility.

Boost apprenticeships and NVQs, get local business partners to share and develop relevant skills; engender pride in working.

Bring back adult education as day and evening classes

British adults should have taken advantage of our country's free education system. And, not every job requires educated individuals. Many jobs can be fulfilled by conscientious individuals with good common sense and good manners.

Budget expected to be? What does that even mean? If you don't know what you are getting how can you plan your spending?

Business should help educate their own people . Individuals should educate themselves preferably at school .

Business should pay for its own training.

But disagree with principle of devolution.

"But don't let Suffolk organise it.

How many failed unitary bids have there been? How much officer time wasted because the senior officers can't or won't work in partnership? Prove you can change please before thinking you can work locally and in partnership. "

But I don't trust SCC, they'll spend it on prestige projects

But it will be wasted in larger towns on courses that only benefit a few. I travel to oxford to get my GCSEs as no where in suffolk offers these basic courses that fit with my work life.

But its not new money? Local knowledge is always important for allocating resources.

"But this should not be decided by an elected (how many of the population would actually vote?), unskilled, overpaid Leader of a newly devolved County Council. Furthermore, 4 - 5% of this budget would now be spent on administration whereas previously ALL the budget would go toward education.

"

But under the control of SCC. Just at the state of the education services at the moment, especially SEND.

Can funds be used to support Suffolk University

Can't wait to see to see Cynthia working in Aldi, but at least she's got a diploma in arts and crafts....

Children's education is what matters

Community Colleges would be of great benefit to young adults to improve employment opportunities

Concentrate on educating the children and the adults would not need educating.

"Conflating remodelling of a democratic model with a speculative comment about remittance of monies is poor logic. These monies (if obtained) would be spent in urban centres to the detriment of other areas.

"

Control over any budget should be good but is this a fixed amount or will it at least be guaranteed to be kept the same in real terms?

Control over budget generally. Adult education in order of priorities.

Control over EAB needs also to look at accessibility for students. For example, are Suffolk students able to exercise choice, use public transport and travel to other sites eg Lowestoft - Bury St Edmunds or Lowestoft to Ipswich?

Could SCC do it - look at mess now if the papers are correct!

critical business leaders must drive this spend on real benefit and skills. Not 'useless' diversity or 'how to use a computer' programmes put in place by public sector managers

Currently not enough providers for this service

Cut council tax. Cut waste. Cut non essential services.

Depending on what education is going to be offered. Will it be recognised qualifications? Will there be a better variety than maths, English and esol?

Depends on what criteria is used - not holding my breath about Suffolk managing this without going down lots of rabbit holes.

Develop an adult education programme for everyone as it used to be.

Develop the skills of the town

Devolution in other areas of the country prove that it doesn't work in the interests of local people, only those involved in Devolution

Devolution of funding is important but to work requires better coordination between the central and local government. Wider engagement (business/provide) is important but it can also be constraining. Controlling a yearly budget is one thing, having the foresight to use the spend to meet future educational/skills needs over a longer time horizon is a better solution.

Disagree with devolution

Do a TNA for Suffolk especially in rural areas. Develop practical skills

Do not allow this to go ahead

Do not trust local politicians to have control.

Do not wish it to go through

Doesn't impact me personally but scope for retraining adults where possible presents possibilities

Don't know

Don't trust you, would rather have it controlled nationally

Don't want amateurs controlling this

Don't believe it would be spent wisely. More leisure courses for the retired.

Don't devolve

Don't trust scc with it - it won't be used effectively  
Don't trust scc with it - it won't be used effectively

Doubt it will help the types of individuals that need it.

Educate and train people of all abilities to contribute to the County's product whether it be Ports, Transport, Agriculture or manufacturing.

Educate to regenerate



Educating adults throughout life is important but needs planning effectively to only meet need

Educating school pupils properly should be a far higher priority.

"Education & training improves employment options for skilled workers but needs to respond to local skills gaps.

Leisure/interest courses important for all ages - helps combat loneliness and support mental health"

Education and training for the young, cutting their unemployment. Lower the pension age to 60.

Education at all life stages is key to providing opportunities for professional and personal development.

Education at any age is beneficial

Education at school for life in general in the first place would probably save money for adult education

Education could in theory be targeted more at local requirements. The figure appears to be low for this to be achievable.

education is important

Education is important for training but also for good mental health.

Education is normally of a County council budget anyway.

Education is the future. I would hope that the bodies allocating this fund would be highly qualified themselves to take on this responsibility.

Education need to done by educators

Education needs an overhaul. It is ridiculous to see so much money used to accommodate so few mainly SEN. At a time when everyone talks about equal opportunities for all how is this being achieved when the per capita spending is nowhere near equal. Without change I can just see any additional funding being frittered away as more parents apply for SEN funding.

Education of all ages is vital to prepare for future needs

Education should always have been with the counties and whilst were at it bring it back into full local authority control and scrap the for profit academies model.

Education should be free both in scope and in cost and a truly free education doesn't discriminate against age.

Education should be nationally determined so consistent standards across uk

Education should be on a national basis so everyone has the same chances.

Education to help encourage people to help themselves should be applauded, balanced with ensuring that other beneficial services are maintained or improved - ref: "This is money that would be coming to Suffolk anyway, but under the deal, ..." This "deal" appears to represent greater freedom to allocate £9.4 million pa without any additional funding. It seems that this £282 million (£9.4 million x 30 years) is included in the overall £480 million. The overall deal is not a great as the headline would suggest.

"Educational is available now and it is personal choice. Mostly future education will be delivered by on-line teaching. And most companies do internal training to their needs.

Lowering students loans and other debt will be beneficial and attractive to older students. "

Efficient local education & apprenticeships are required to generate a smart local labour force.

Enabling people to train in employment which benefits the local area would be beneficial to Suffolk. Education and creative ideas would be a real asset to making Suffolk a positive place to live

"encourage more apprenticeships in renewable energy

encourage graduates to remain in the county

"

Ensure children's education is improved early in the programme and adult education will slowly improve over the 30 years.

Ensuring young people and existing staff have access to high quality skills training and qualifications, in particular to develop green economy opportunities is critical for the future of Suffolk

Equal opportunities for all

ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT TO SUPPORT CAREER CHANGE AND HELPING THOSE WITH DISABILITIES TO BECOME MORE INDEPENDANT

Every area has different needs

Everyone has the right to an education but we live in a day and age where there are so many organisations and tutorials online to guide people with the tasks that they need, the younger generation such as myself who are now in their 20s are also a lot more digitally skilled. I agree to wanting to boost adult education but I partly have my own reservations about the Education system nationally and believe that there are more vital things to do first.

Exactly as my above statement

Experience is everything, so we need more apprenticeships opportunities for people to learn trades

Experience is overlooked

"Explained in the previous answer - being able to tailor education to the needs, interests, and potential employment opportunities in Suffolk will help people to feel engaged knowing there is potential employment at the end.

If more could be done around helping people re-train that would be fab - whether its because people didn't do well at school, want to try something different, been made redundant etc, so much more could be done around linking education to job opportunities!"

Fine as it is

Fiscal stability

For education and supplies

"For me, this is a big swing factor in our future prosperity. An AI revolution has already started, we need to be retraining almost all adults in work (and others). Even before the AI impact became clear many leaders have cogently argued the benefits of local control. E.g. the mayors of Manchester and Midlands recognise that the skills their area needs are different from other regions. Most of us can't afford to retrain unless it is a subsidised evening class.

"

For myself, this issue is not as important as others. However, I imagine it would be important to others living within Suffolk.

For reasons in your Memo

further and higher education should be run locally to support the local businesses and arts .

Further education is important for employment

Get SEND right first then think about taking on further responsibility

Give it to the schools and scrap academies

Given folks will have to work longer in life to cover costs that govt can't fund, training them in relevant skills is vital but so too is an honest assessment of why and how this will work and building the awareness of what the future looks like for 40-70 year olds so they have hope and "get it" otherwise they won't participate

Given how poorly Suffolk's education is administered at the moment, I'm not convinced allowing it to deal with adult education is the best idea.

Good adult education will help employers get the workforce they need, ensuring employers stay in Suffolk. It supports good mental health and wellbeing and can bring the community together.

Good to decide locally

Good to invest in young people and give them opportunities to get careers and have a future

Great way to increase skills in Suffolk specific to our needs in our workforce.

Hasn't worked in the past so why in the future

Having benefited from a course at Otley College in my early sixties, older folk should be given the opportunities of further education

Having seen some of the more esoteric courses offered at Otley and other places, I would suggest that courses like "Underwater Basket Weaving" are total waste of time.

Having skills investment for our priorities is a real breakthrough.

helping people to travel to employment is more important.

"Higher education is currently available.

Local authorities are not best equipped to decide business needs. Best to leave it to the businesses themselves to train their people and thus match their needs to skills"

Hopefully this scheme would help young people into employment rather than them expecting to get benefits.

Hopefully this will allow control of this spending at a local level and respond to local needs.

How about sorting out health care ???

HOW HAVE WE MANAGED THIS FAR?

How much will that cost in salaries.

However don't suppress ambition - this happens in Suffolk. We need to get away from 'local skills for local people' thinking

I admire the German system where local business is closely associated with the vocational schools.

I am an individual, not part of an organisation or business but I understand the importance of providing the education and skills training that businesses need in order to develop and expand and therefore help grow the local economy.

I am concerned Suffolk will fumble along and not spend the money wisely

"I am not invested in adult education but would offer two observations

The term "education providers" annoys me because that means handing money over to a private company who run at a profit when all education should be provided by the local authority

The money will inevitably be spent on vanity projects for "deserving" causes rather than ordinary people who need it."

I am not someone who is looking to retrain at the moment, however, knowing that I can retrain alongside to work in a local business or help the community is encouraging to hear for the future!

I am not sufficiently familiar with the Adult Education process to comment.

I am not sure this is a good thing. Massive assumption from me might be that education linked to local needs would foster a learning of farming, logistics, warehousing, fishing etc. Where we would lose a focus on innovation like robotics, AI and other skills used more widely outside of Suffolk.

I am retired but I would like to see more apprentice schemes especially for those who struggle with academic subjects

I believe managing it locally could result in adult education that is more tailored to the requirements in the local area which may differ from what is missing nationally.

I believe passionately in adult education but have become sickened over years of working in this field of new initiative, after new initiative which throw money and resources at a project for a short period of time and then abandon the work when the next initiative comes along. So I label this as not important because in my personal experience SCC lacks the ability to work in this field in a genuinely collaborative manner on a sustainable basis.

I do not agree with devolution

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

I do not trust conservatives to spend this money in a way where it doesn't ultimately end up in their own pocket

I do not trust SCC to make the right decisions

I don't agree with the deal

I don't agree with the devolution proposal. If it goes through ensure education for young adults with special educational needs is adequately funded.

I don't currently access adult education services in Suffolk.

"I don't know enough about the current level of adult education to make an informed comment"

I don't see education needs varying greatly from one region to the next. The money comes from central government, surely our local elected leaders can see that this money is used in the best way.

I don't think there is much advantage to the proposal

I don't agree with using it to pay profiteering outside sources.

I don't believe it would all go on adult education if Suffolk County Council had control of it.

I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

I don't think education should revolve around the job market, but the development of the individual. An ability to learn is also of benefit to employers. I've previously done a days bricklaying, cheesemaking, pattern cutting and dressmaking and art. All taught me skills and improved my confidence. I also don't like how adults are locked out of formal education after 18. And only entitled to funding for uni courses once. A lot of young people get a degree but wish they had chosen a different subject. 18 is too young to choose a life course

I don't trust the local council to oversee this fund

i don't trust them to handle any thing.

I don't understand who or what you are talking about - the University of Suffolk? Night classes? Apprenticeships? Life long learning?

I don't want a mayor

I feel education should be handled by the govt not a local council.

I feel it should be used so anyone can access free courses and training at local colleges and schools.

i feel its really important to invest in people for the future. some people have come from disadvantaged backgrounds that would require additional support to access learning and training to be able to find improve their job prospects or transform their quality of life.

I feel that the local authority should be helping her people into employment, courses like this can work out great for some but many will most likely end up doing something totally unrelated, if ever working at all.

I feel this is very important especially for those adults who left school with no qualifications. We need more learning and training courses in Suffolk for adults.

I feel this is very important, as we do have a lot of non English speaking residents in Suffolk, who could benefit from education programmes.

I have experience in working with devolved areas and have seen how successful this is once the processes are in pace. Can provide meaningful training for the residents that make a difference in the county

"I have grandchildren living locally in Suffolk and at present their educational needs are not being met.

"

I have grandchildren who could benefit in future

I have little knowledge of this area currently but would hope this would be an improvement

I have no idea how this currently works and therefore how it can be improved.

I have no involvement.

I have no objection to this.

I have not seen any compelling argument as to why this would improve what exists, where are the current failures?

I have recently begun pushing for more training programmes in my own workplace regarding diversity and inclusion. With access to their own funding, Suffolk County Council would be able to ask businesses what training is missing from their policies and develop and provide such training programmes. When discussing diversity and inclusion, it has become apparent in my workplace that training is severely lacking in availability, and it is important to me that my colleagues and I feel safe and comfortable in the workplace. Suffolk County Council would be able to take a much more thorough account of the training needed throughout the county, such as in my own workplace, and would have the funding and the autonomy to provide the training workplaces feel they need.

I have seen how this money is currently wasted in the county, giving it to scc would make a bad situation worse.

I have taken part in AE classes. I would not be where I am now without their help

I hope that this will take account of the local skills improvement plan that already exists and ensure that employers and education providers are at the heart of any skills improvements. The Suffolk Business board will be a vital voice to be engaged here. There is a huge need for skills improvement and to raise aspiration to achieve and an even larger adult education budget is needed than is propose here. The people of Suffolk need to be enabled to access the education and training and the jobs that this creates in order to ensure our planned economic growth is realised

I like the idea the the money can be spent on what is needed for Suffolk residents rather than a universal national approach. This will give residents a better chance to gain skills that aligns with the jobs in the area.

I might need it

I need a point that says do you not agree with having the money

I read for example that there will be a national shortage of skilled motor/car mechanics in the next decade or more. Local knowledge would help focus on correct areas. Also I think business studies including some accountancy, law, economics and communication skills would be helpful to people who might have more if an idea what they want to do. Those skills are useful in understanding the world (I found).

I refer back to my previous comment in that who knows who is spending our money over the next 30 years. I remember the millions lost by the council in overseas banks , Iceland springs to mind.

I think it is a good idea to support courses and training that would invest in local people to work in Suffolk.

I think it is better to use in schools and 6th Forms and to pay to retain and encourage teachers.

"I think it is very important for the education offer to address the needs of local business and development goals. It is very disruptive to students young and old if courses are withdrawn even if there are jobs to be had in that field.

"

I think it's important that funded training is aligned to actual job oppurtunities or to developing needs.

I think locally made decisions are likely to be better at allocating funds where there are gaps in job market or services required.

I think more needs to be done with children's education rather than adult education.

I think people now reaching adulthood need opportunities so school isn't the be all end all

I think the above statement speaks for itself-training where it is required most

I think this is an area in which local control offers significant benefits (although, as in previous answer the County boundary is a very artificial divide - esp if you live near borders with other counties).

I think this is an important part of the devolved powers, but must be spent in the right places - retraining opportunities for adult education in key shortage industries, but also leisure learning opportunities where possible

I think this is vital to meet Suffolk's needs and local provision is much more suitable than a national plan

"I think this money should be spent on adult education it's never to late

"

I think this should be done on a national basis, to avoid fragmentation of access to services.

I think this would be a distraction to the other important duties of the council.

I think this would mean there would be better investment in non-degree higher education, greater investment in trades would lead to more community resilience

I think you need to have an objective who know about education needs and workforce needs of Suffolk to oversee how this is used

I understand this to mean that while there will be a change of management of education funding, there will be no increase to the funding from the annual £16 million devolution fund. Would money be able to be transferred to improve the education funding and so correct the current underfunding?

I work at the University so of course I have an investment, morally, socially, spiritually and financially, with adult education and its betterment in the region.

I work in adult education and see money going on courses we do not need. If you can change that with this money then I support you

I work in this field. SCC would not spend any money more wisely. The inevitable Bad investments would see us being worse off.

I would approve if it was used on real apprenticeships by which I mean a proper training programme over 3 or more years leading to a real trade such as electricians, carpenters etc. Calling work experience schemes apprenticeships devalues the term

I would be surprised if this money isn't already been received and is being spent on this already. And control is more of a odd word used, like 'sovereignty' in Brexit.

I would have real concerns around funding for new buildings/ efficient green infrastructure, particularly with the current RAAC issue. 9.4 million is not a great deal of funding to address these areas.

I would like access to opportunities to help me change career. Access to an MA course would help.

I wouldn't want this to become starkly different depending on what county you live in.

I wouldn't let Suffolk County Council within a million miles of the adult education provision. Sort out the education you are in charge of - SEND for instance - before you try taking something else on.

I'm a pensioner

I'm intrigued as to what this is exactly for. More concerned about why children in schools on SEND are missing and waiting lists are 2years to get a diagnosis

I've seen first hand how the devolution of the adult education budget can make a positive difference.



Identify genuine needs

If children were educated instead of programmed they would come out of school better people

If control comes to Suffolk then more of that money would be spent on local administration and therefore less on actual education

If courses are offered that improve Suffolk's skills base, not funding geriatric ballet lessons. There needs to be focus so that adult education is skills based and not frivolous

If education in schools was improved there wouldn't be so much need for adult education.

If it's coming anyway why do we need SCC to "get control" of it, this sounds like a money grab

"If more was given to child education this wouldn't be needed, but it is.

Poor education leads to poor parenting leads to misbehaving child, youth, adult! Vicious circle."

If public transport links was improved people in villages would be able to attend college

If Suffolk County Council gain control I can't see how it could possibly benefit anyone young or old as they have a poor record currently

If Suffolk is getting the money anyway, then you will be spending it the way you choose, regardless of outside control. Unless, the outside control would stop you investing in inappropriate sex education for very young people.

If the cost goes to the people then yes, if it just goes to the education centres and no one local sees the benefit then there is little point

"If the courses are easily accessible for all - ie you don't have to be young or unemployed to get a place

That they are new skills that will help improve someone's social life, job prospects, mental health "

If the management of funds to be invested in adult education is local rather than national, the funds are more likely to be spent efficiently as a local council has a better understanding of the skills needed for their local area.

If the money is coming anyway why do we need devolution? Better to spend it on early years education and SEN

If there is disagreement about how to spend this money it should be resolved by discussion between government and the authority. It does not need a devolution deal.

If there was an adult education centre in Felixstowe, it could boost locally needed skills (perhaps in conjunction with the Port of Felixstowe) and cater to the interests of all ages, including elderly retirees. It would, additionally, attract people to the town centre and so help local retailers.

If this includes education supporting those with SEN then this is important as again the council will have a slightly better understanding of where funds are needed rather than central government.

If this is additional ££, retraining or additional training for adults is always needed. Do not have sufficient experience to know if situation existing needs changing!

If you speak to your residents and assess educational needs fairly - this would be a fantastic opportunity to support existing educational provision alongside opportunity for innovation with voluntary and private sectors.

I'm not sure how much local plans would deviate from national plans for Suffolk. Does the extra amount include an amount for administering or would we be spending more to administer same amount we would have received covering mostly the same things?

I'm not sure I understand this one and thought we were getting it anyway.

I'm retired so it doesn't apply.

I'm still not convinced, but perhaps it would enable adult education to be more focused on local skills needs?

I'm sure this money can be targetted towards local needs without devolution.

important but not applicable to me

Important for local business and allowing access to education for those that need it.

Important this is undertaken locally.

Important to be able to tailor the money to local needs. I would like to think some of this will go towards supporting and improveing 'leisure learning' rather than determining that everything has to have a economic need.

"Important to liaise with businesses over outputs, rather than just spend with existing suppliers

Job focussed learning, rather than producing lots of poorly trained apprentices for jobs that aren't required (dog groomers and horse grooms)"

Important to provide skills training for local residents suitable for local job vacancies & businesses encouraged to the area

Improved education is a very good way to lift people back into the mainstream of society. It is clearly difficult to get right, but localisation of decision making could improve efficiency if done well

"In a world where local skills are all but lost, boosted training and apprenticeship schemes for those who might have struggled to go to university would be a big boost for Suffolk. It would give more workers, and allow more people who are in dire situations to gain job opportunities and skills they need to go further in life, than to sit and deal with it as the university based system all but requires them to do.

Allowing anyone to learn almost any skill locally would boost Suffolk's economy, boost active workers, boost peoples' incomes, and reduce dependency on the social benefits system."

In all honesty I have little confidence that you would choose the right companies and it would end up a total waste of money.

In our area, we know who needs help and how they need help. Westminster wouldn't have a clue.

In principle this seems to be a good thing but would controls exist to guide students to follow through on career development after leaving AE rather than just giving up ... ie. to ensure funds going to AE are not wasted?

In theory a great idea

Increase local skills so residents can make the most of opportunities. Work with employers to create apprenticeship opportunities.

Invest in better education in children.

Investment in adult workforce training would ensure essential employees had skills employers are looking for.

Involving local businesses and community groups far more in adult education, steering the spending to match the county's employment and self employment needs.

INWARD INVESTMENT WELL TARGETED IS VITAL TO SUFFOLK BUSINESS AND RATE PAYERS, AND THAT MEASURES ARE IN PLACE TO DETECT AND AVOID CORRUPTION

Ipswich should be in control of its own education system

Is the 9.4 million new money or a replacement for existing funds?

Is this genuinely necessary? Will the average person benefit from this or will it simply be another way for businesses in the know to access money and not have to provide a service because so few people know about it?

It can only be spent on adult education, so signing up for devolution for this small control seems excessive.

It could be worthwhile if control is used to augment the £16m to kickstart some skills training.

It depends on what adult education is being offered & which companies get involved. For example if it was only about EDF staffing and there needs I would not be interested & against. If its diverse and covers multiple learning opportunities great

It depends on who the 'local partners' are who'd be deciding where this money was spent.

It doesn't affect me personally, which is what you are asking. Everything is important to a degree, however, as everything in the county indirectly has an impact on me.

It is a derisory sum

It is important but likely it will go to the bigger towns. Support to encourage residents to access and if they have further to travel offer a realistic reduction.

It is important if managed properly. SCC are incapable of this

It is important that adult education isn't just about commerce and servicing the needs of profit making businesses. It should be used to truly help people transform their lives, socially and culturally. I am very worried that this would not happen, (esp given recent SCC decisions around arts funding).

It is important to direct the funds to adult education areas relevant to local needs and communities.

It is important to invest in people

It is important to provide education which is suited to Suffolk people and their needs and matched with business needs. Distance learning may be an opportunity and adult apprenticeships

it is right the the local government with knowledge of the needs of the county decide how this important budget is spent rather than central government

It is something that has to be provided and is vital to those in need

It is the trainee that needs to be the focus not business or the community

it looks like a small budget to provide any significant impact, hopefully it could be used to help University/colleges outreach to community

it makes a lot of sense to offer local courses for local employment needs

It may improve our education offer

It means yet another layer of administration and control over the spend this way only a small amount per £1 grant income is actually spent on the intended purpose the rest going to the Quango

It might help

It needs to be across Suffolk and not just ipswich

It seems good

It should be coordintaed nation wide

It should be invested in local services instead of paying big private companies, charging twice as much from outside Suffolk to take over existing provision. Instead support and expand existing provision and unskill people

It very much depends on the competency of the council and I don't have much faith in the competency of SCC

It will be needed to cover other costs squeezed by government.

It will be wasted

It will end up being corrupt and money will go to your 'friends'

It will end up paying transport costs for send children

It wont make any difference

It would allow for training/education to be geared towards local needs

"It would allow local decisions to better allocate what is currently spent centrally and therefore, be more Suffolk appropriate

"

It would be good to support people who want to learn

It would be more useful to concentrate on improving basic and entry level education. Reverse the "dumbing down" which has occurred over the last several decades.

It would create a few jobs locally to administer but it would be good to be able to focus on locally needed skills that reflect Suffolk industries, encouraging continued specialist innovation and growth.

It would help support those who are currently out of work due to mental illness, such as someone in my family, who wants a job, to get the confidence and skills to acquire that, after experiencing traumatic health conditions. It would be especially beneficial if it was done in a way that helped provide access to jobs needed in the local areas, without the need to find a way to commute to out of town

It would inevitably get spent on fashionable causes that don't benefit ordinary residents

It'll just be wasted.

It's a bit disingenuous to say central govt controls what is taught locally. Some of the post 19 guidance is sensible. More life skills and basic English and maths would be helpful for those who have missed out on formal schooling

It's an area of importance as has been overlooked/ignored, now it's in a crisis thanks to the council squandering tax payers money for their own personal gains

It's childhood education which is critical. Adult education can be done more and more on line and distance learning

It's essential to oversee our own budget.

It's important to have healthy educated adults- sometimes people need to go back to studying and develop careers

It's important to invest in adult education as Suffolk has numerous areas of deprivation and additional training provide assistance in getting people back to work

It's not how much money is spent but how it's spent

"It's obvious.

Local businesses & communities know which skills are required."

It's only important if it delivers what we need locally & feeds into meaningful employment. Teacher training, truck driving, healthcare.

It's the kids that need education to stop them joining gangs which is a big problem around Ipswich.

It's very important that these services are not subject to the whims and flights of fantasy of here today gone tomorrow Tory County Councillors !!

It's a complete mess at the moment

It's a good idea to for young adults to have the power to have better education facilities in Haverhill

It's important that people are trained for high quality, well paid jobs.

It's not enough.

It's vital adult education is localised to support people getting access to work locally. Too many people are stuck due to not being able to get to or access career changing or enhancing courses.

Job based training will help people onto the job market and increase their abilities to fill those jobs where need is greatest.

Jobs need to change more with the increased pace of automation and technological centralisation, so improving social mobility is important to maintaining the economy.

Just odd this hasn't happened sooner, frankly.

just whoever is most intelligent and loving should be in charge of it - i dont know if thats government or council

Keep people off benefits and in work

"Keep the monies where supposed to be going.

As long as there is a paper trail and an independent auditor to stop the obvious corruption, which we all know happens, then that's acceptable to a degree. "

Key to progress.

Kids should be arvised they will be adults one day and it is up to them if they sink or swim in the woorld of work.

Learning new skills is important

Leave it as it is

Leave it in the hands of the experts ( hopefully)

Leaving it with central government

"Leaving school is a hard step. Help the youngsters to get a job. No people working means nobody paying taxes give them opportunities to learn a trade and new skills.

Also evening classes are great for people to learn new skills, that are already working but want to continue learning new things."

Lifelong learning

Living in Lowestoft we see limited investment from SCC as it is, I have no reason to suppose that mindset will change and the major part of any funding would continue to be focussed on Ipswich and surrounds. There would be no benefit to North East Suffolk who seem not to exist to SCC

local businesses know the skilled workers they need and so the right training and education could be offered

Local businesses would benefit by better qualified local people on the cutting edge of innovation for an ever changing tomorrow. The problems of today will give rise to the solutions of tomorrow.

Local consultation and decision making very important

Local control is important to tailor courses to local need

Local control would likely be more costly because you would lose the benefit of bulk discounts available to a national scheme.

Local councils are best able to determine what local needs are

Local decision making allows for tailoring provision of services to the requirements of the community

Local education and business leaders are best placed to understand the needs of the local population and anticipate those changing needs into the future. Devolving funding would give greater power to local decision-makers to set priorities and ensure our population has the relevant skills we need to take us into the future.

Local government is likely to get the blame for central government lack of funding as has happened in the areas of social care and education

Local knowledge is best

Local needs met by SCC by asking local population

Local ownership of investment decisions in skills enables targeted and informed investment in the right areas of skills development and the targeting of funding towards those areas of the economy that need skills support. It will be important that businesses have the opportunity to influence the decisions regarding skills investment. In the agriculture and tourism sectors we have shortages of skilled local labour and need support to develop this.

Local people are more aware of local needs

Local people know best

Local people setting budget to address local needs.

Local skill base essential

Low aspirations are endemic in Suffolk and this may address that issue

make it available for apprenticeships and specific skills training for the job sectors we need filling

Makes sense as long as pathways can still exist for other careers to a lesser extent.

Management training, vocational training, apprenticeships, improve the small business advice and training, support the creation of more co-operatives which tend to have a higher survival rate than other business models.

Managing it locally doesn't mean those adults would choose local education

Maybe better for local people to have more say in local training needs

Maybe but not the big deal

Meeting identified local needs would be good, but there needs to be some metric of benefit to the organisation included and it is not a way for training organisations to get easy money

Merely handing back what was SCC's purview anyway.

Money already coming so no benefit at all apart from you can make decisions what places get it & courses can offer, sure be money wasted due to no idea how to handle the money so nationally would be better

"Money could be spent filling potholes and banning the vehicles that make them.

Electric vehicles by any chance.

"

Money doesn't go to where needed.

"Money like this seems to get spent on council officers and admin and a small fraction ever gets to the people it's meant to help.

"

Money needs to be for the benefit of all

Money should be spent on this subject not on consultants

More apprenticeships in the 'niche' skills. More money available so that the small businesses can offer apprenticeships at a reasonable wage rather than a pittance, this would encourage more young people to take them up.

More apprenticeships should be provided.

More investment in vocational training at FE college. A commitment to raise training and education.

More leisure learning courses for older people to help them engage in social activities

More local flexibility

more opportunities for students to study other than expensive university.

More privatisation of education under another banner?

More red tape.

more rural skills are needed.

More trade courses, it would be nice to have cheap adult courses for OAPs but not if it eats into the budget for the unemployed

Most adult education should be central government and companies offering training and apprenticeship schemes. The county council should be offering additional support for those less able to go into "the main stream" training.

Most of the money spent on adult education is wasted. It would be better spent ensuring our County schools are educating under 18s to a standard where adult education is not paramount to a 19-25 yo having the necessary knowledge to find work.

Most students study to get a degree bur never use it! Total waste of educational funds.

Must do better than at present.



My children are still young and both school age, this is important but not personally to me at this time.

My previous comments echo my sentiment here.

National Government has used "devolving responsibilities" as a ploy for making cuts for many years. There is no guarantee that this money will continue to be forthcoming, or will be sufficient. Nor is there any guarantee that the government will allow Suffolk to do anything different from the national policy.

Need skills provision that is responding to local needs. Also need to be able to have a more flexible regime to fund new skill delivery to support emerging sectors - not just meet the historic needs of existing ones.

Need to encourage education for both 18s and older adults. Need to focus on practical and academic areas.

Need to get people back to work and help anyone with mental health issues feel better about rejoining the workforce

Need to improve workforce skills to be future focused

Need to produce homegrown, local talent. There would need to be incentives such as free or low cost courses to encourage take up.

Need to sort children's education and school places

Needs to have control on a local level

Needs to sit in line with National certification. Not everyone will want to stay in Suffolk

NIL SCC control.

No benefit to the county

No devolution

No doubt a new manager and team would need to be appointed to administer the AE budget. That means more chiefs controlling the money and more non-jobs like Diversity and Inclusion officers sucking on the teat of public funds which the taxpayers put into the budget for central government to hand back after their admin costs have been taken. Taxpayers put the money in and every level of government takes some out before deciding where to spend what is left. This is why we left the EU.

"No longer aware of what's on offer / planned for this sector.

Please increase number of practical shortage trades apprenticeships. However, paying apprentices appropriately so they don't have to live with friends or family should be included in this. How do you expect young adults to step up to maturity if you trivialise their wages which stifles their life options. "

No need

No one in further education

No reason to change the current system.

NO to further devolution .

"NO!

This is an unnecessary extra layer of decision making that is a waste of time and taxpayer funds paying salaries that are wasted on dead time like this. No, no, no, no, no."

NO, NO, NO.

Not a great sum and the value would fluctuate with the demographic

Not an age group that I have any interest in

Not applicable

Not everyone gets a great chance at education during their early years so its important that adults get the support they need.

Not relevant as SCC have underfunded in this area for decades

Not relevant to me.

Not relevant to me.

Not very impressed with the way SCC works

Not very much money for such important work

Now jobs are not as safe as they were the need for retraining is vital.

Nowhere near enough

Obviously it's important, but you are phrasing these questions in bad faith. The money is important, but SCC would mess up any implementation.

Offer what local people want and need

Once again this question is not relevant as I do not agree with the devolution deal full stop

Only if this is what would happen. Unfortunately I don't trust the council, they have let too many people down.

Our business needs are changing from a rural economy to a rural and high-tech economy. We need to provide training opportunities for people to get skilled up and access these roles.

Our kids are our future and education is key

Our local college is not fit for purpose, it would require much more investment than this

Overall, the control of the Education Budget represents a significant opportunity to enhance the quality and relevance of adult education in Suffolk, ultimately leading to stronger workforce development, increased economic prosperity, and a more vibrant and resilient community.

Peanuts, and the issue is not really a priority in any of the districts or borough when so much work needs to be done on other, more urgent problems (see my previous answer)

people of all ages can learn and enjoy it

People will seek out the education that they want irrespective. It will benefit only those who either want to go in to the partnership company's or weed out the best for those companies so they don't have to

Personally I would prefer that this remained a national award, because the political boundaries do not mirror the socio-economic boundaries and much of the FE delivery crosses county boundaries

Please do not waste it working with partners that are not fit for purpose!

Please ensure the money is spent where it is needed to fill both the skills gaps and the gaps in skills that exist in the county to ensure we are able to encourage inward investment.

Please see my answer concerning devolution as a policy above.

Plenty of opportunities to work and pay for your own education.

Poor child education causes necessity for adult education. Cure the root cause first!

Potholes.

Presumably adult education could be flexible to meet local need - could be tailored to local economic and business needs. With big projects like Sizewell let's maximise our local workforce or those that need upskilling.

priority should be given to serious adult learning subjects

Probably wouldn't access adult learning in Suffolk but would like this to be supporting skills for employment and entrepreneurship to encourage growth

Proper apprenticeships where young people learn a real trade or skill. Not a glorified work experience scheme. Encourage tradesmen to take on apprentices and use some of the money to incentivise firms or sole traders to do so

Provide training that specifically supports the "Suffolk local" culture and growth mentioned above, could be about setting up a small business, etc.

Providing skills aligned with needs and opportunities locally looks like the best way to encourage economic growth and support public services.

Reading consultation it looked like this is new money - not existing as it says in this question. I find the booklet misleading

Residents need to be involved in the spending plans rather than small committees

reskilling the unemployed especially considering the future impact of AI

Reskilling will be very important and Suffolk has lots of older people

Retraining for work opportunities only, if someone wants to learn something outside a work experience or a qualification course let them pay for it. Once again the amount of cash is a drop in the ocean over such a long time period.

"Rural communities need skilled people to help them maintain their environment and assets

Additional training in hobbies/crafts help people develop their social skills and are good for overall wellbeing"

Sadly having little faith in our present government and what I have observed here in Suffolk I am very wary of supporting the idea.

Same answer as before

SCC can't provide proper education for all children so really not sure that they would manage to provide any for adults.

SCC currently waste too much of our Council Tax already .

SCC education track record is awful. You think allowing them to spend even more money on jollies will help a since young person?

SCC has a poor record on education, I'm not sure they will do better but at least they can decide what service get the cash

SCC has continued to fail to provide a quality education for our children ( both in mainstream and special education needs). They are unable to provide adequate social care. The evidence indicates they will fail to provide quality adult education

Scc has the most abysmal record for SEND for children, and LA maintained schools are pretty poor too. Scc cannot provide good quality education provision at compulsory and post 16, therefore I have zero confidence in your ability to provide for Adult education

SCC have displayed little skill in investing money in improvement schemes and will end up employing a highly paid professional, and probably ignore them anyway.

SCC have not made a success of managing this so far.

SCC knows far better than govt how the money should be spent in Suffolk. SCC would of course need to liaise with business and schools / colleges before making decisions

Scc poor performance in all other areas does not give confidence they can manage this.

Schools need more funding.

See earlier answers.

See my previous answer

See my previous answers. This survey is very poorly constructed and should not be used to inform decision making.

See previous answer - continuous learning hens to be encouraged and become ingrained.

See previous answer. Local training for local jobs. Good to have local council making decisions.

See previous answers

See previous reasons

Sensible to invest in the skills that are needed for the county to thrive

Should be managed by an holistic education policy at Government level.

should be normal not as part of devolution

should stay national

Shouldn't exist

Since when did Suffolk give away control of this?

Sizewell proves we have no say

Skills are needed in the care industry to cope with an increasingly frail population and need to be attracting younger people

Skills training and apprenticeships focused on local need.

Small local businesses are vital for providing employment and training opportunities. Skills training aligned to local employment is very important.

So many other things need doing which are more important than adult education

So much bias in the writing of this.

So much money gets wasted

Some people may need more help than others I guess we could say and that's perfectly fine.

Somewhat important yes but not to the detrimental of all else.

Sound like an increase in admin costs over the status quo

Spend it on proper schooling for the young.

Spending should be close to the end user

Still feel this is merely just moving the same pot of money around

Still not sure we can trust SCC to spend wisely.

Stop using "education" as a sop for training for employers. Education and life-long learning is many things for many people — it is truly transforming for those able to benefit from it, but employers must not be absolved from the need to properly train employees, and certainly not at public expense! — but education, particularly Adult Education, must be cherished for the life-enhancing knowledge and pleasure it gives to individuals and especially to those who have survived the failings of the state education system.

Suffolk CC has just been given a damning report about its SEND services. How can residents be confident that SCC will manage this service or any others for that matter any better as it does not have a good track record.

suffolk county council are not capable of using the fund appropriately

Suffolk education decisions that are currently made does not give me confidence how this funding would be spent. I am in complete support of Suffolk county funds being ring fenced and monitored. Spending £1,730,877.10 on consultancy for SEND services since December 2021 would nearly be a 5th of this budget. This service has added no value to the SEND services and if that was the price needs to identify the issues within Suffolk services I question Suffolk county's respect for Ofsted and government guidelines.

Suffolk fails our children every year with the worst standards in the country. Now it will fail adults too.

Suffolk has a high elderly population and very little infrastructure in terms of actual higher education or jobs that would facilitate this higher education, this would likely create a brain drain with the benefits of this spending being lost in Suffolk.

Suffolk have made a mess of secondary education with school closures due to lack of pupil funding, I predict the same will happen with adult education.

Suffolk needs investment but it must be spent locally and wisely by the council with help and input from parish council members and folks working in the sector who know best what is needed.

Suffolk University and its partners is a fantastic service, but as always needs more support.

Support education but differentiate that support to help all including those with additional needs.

Support for training the workforce would be terrific

Support further adult education.

Support local education organisations..eg libraries, U3A, weather,local art groups.

Supporting young adults in education is very important for the future of our country.

Sure, seems good.

"Surely it needs focus now on adult education. Why would a devolution fund make such a remarkable difference?"

SCC history for SEND provision so far does not fill me with confidence that they should have control of this"

Surely local employment and community needs should always be an influence on adult ed and training - no need just to be trapped into devolution

T

Tailored training could be provided

Tailoring adult education for local industry and business is important to offer but you cannot ensure its uptake

Tailoring adult education to local needs is imperative. Severe lack of post school. and adult training skills to equip both the individuals and industry requirements.

Teach them properly as children then you would not need adult education

That's 2 questions. AWFUL SURVEY. A DISGRACE!

The 9.4 is less your costs for administration

"The administrative costs are estimated at £470,000 at 5% seems like a lot lost in a county that is already very short of adult education opportunities. It sounds like a lot will be spent on acquiring the know-how to do a job in Suffolk that is already being done by qualified people in London ("Suffolk County Council will look to build on national

good practice and ensure that key stakeholders

are actively engaged in deciding what training is

most needed in Suffolk")

The amount is not index-linked, and will soon lose its power to deliver essential educational services."

The amount of money is trivial - can't see how it could make much difference either way.

The choices are presupposing you get the money, or rather how its spent. Not confident SCC can handle this.

the close alignment with actual local employment and community needs is vital. Whilst leisure courses are great, flexible courses to help those in employment improve skills for career progression are also important, not just for those out of work. The key is cost and timings - evenings and weekends not mid morning!

the colleges and university are already in position to promote this

The Council are not capable of managing it!

The council should be spending less money not more

The council will need extra people to do all this!!!! Accessibility to adult education important. Again good for many reasons. Implications for health physically and mentally. Schemes to be added to social care.

The Council's education record is abysmal. Don't add adults to its catalogue of disaster.

The county is generally undereducated high levels of illiteracy in adults and school leavers. Most of the employment seems to be low income, with prospects for development or promotion. Not enough students are staying in schools for A levels

The county should be in position to gauge the local needs for adult education. It's finger must be on the local pulse.

The economic prosperity of the UK depends on upskilling its workforce to provide employees for innovative enterprises.

The funding proposal is not protected from inflation and its value will diminish over time.

The funds should be used as they are now

The government is not running the country well, why would transferring control of services to less qualified people improve things.

The government should give this money to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding of local authorities over the last 14 years. Don't waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The government should give this money to the council anyway. It doesn't need to waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The government will still control the agenda for learning and skills. Ie apprenticeships in sectors short of staff.

The idea of targeting provision of adult education to match community needs and demands will only help the county

The local council can influence this at present.

The money would be coming in anyway. It won't be enough, but this entire scheme is about camouflaging England's lack of attention and commitment from the British Parliament in matters of English affairs.

The public do not have confidence in SCC to deliver SEND services. Why should they be trusted with Adult Education at this point in time?

The review of managing the finances and how this can manifest into adult education provision is not only about the high level provisions but the smaller programs and impacts which can greatly affect education which are often ignored at government level.

The skills and courses available can be tailored to the needs of the area.

The sum is too small

The University of Suffolk is performing very well and should be invested in because it will bring young people, talent and investment to the area

The way people are moving around now, there needs to be a national strategy, not just local.

The word education here is better described as indoctrination and brainwashing institutions in favour of the globalist totalitarian and authoritarian dictatorship that will not benefit the good people of Britain.

"The work environment is changing with increased automation and AI.

Working in customer service, my role is at risk. Easy to access education would help me up skill to find work in other fields"

There already schemes in place for this

There are adult education needs not currently being met to satisfy local needs, against that we don't want to artificially introduce a post code lottery.

There are bigger priorities in education, the state of schools, S.E.N. and the "dumbing down" of FE colleges

There are children with send who do not have a place this September!

There are plenty of independent places adults can go to learn and better themselves. There needs to be reality that once left full time education those that don't have the grades probably don't want them and therefore the money will be wasted. It is better spent on youth homelessness.

There are those who were unable or uninterested in taking the qualifications needed for jobs that might now seem interesting to an adult, nursing, policing, engineering, etc. So some GCSEs and A levels are needed. Also, subjects that support other local workforces

There has been a noticeable decline in adult course options over the past 20 years and yet it's so good for people to continue learning. A lot of practical skills have been lost over the years and these community classes help create social cohesion as well as learning new skills



There is a huge gap on the market for education around sustainability in terms of renewables, plant based eating and reduction of animal farming, travel. This needs to be brought into public awareness and promoted if the world is going to survive. Suffolk should lead with this

There is a lack of good adult education providers.

There is demand to upskill

There is great emphasis on skills and vocational training but I hope other learning opportunities which can improve quality of life could be supported. The not for profit Coastal Leisure Learning used to offer many of these but it became unsustainable after Covid. Because it was run very frugally, with minimised overheads, it could offer recreational courses which were uneconomic for Further Education colleges

There is no evidence that the ways this money is currently managed aren't working, and certainly no evidence that SCC or, indeed, the Directly Elected Leader, would be any better or worse at managing it - so I see no reason to change.

There is no evidence that what is in place now isn't working - and certainly no evidence that SCC would be in a better place to administer it. "If it ain't broke don't fix it".

"There is no help for those who may have good degrees but through circumstances have not been able to utilise them to gain decent employment. They are told that there is no funding to retrain or receive vocational training as they already have a higher level qualification but are told by employers that their degree is worthless as it was attained more than six years ago.

"

There is no trust that you would,

There is nothing to be gained by scc managing this, but I imagine costs to scc will be involved so overall it would be less money available

There is the fear it could be targeted at "mates local business". I saw this in Luton. You might get better results by targeting the people who feel they need training rather than the employers.

There may be some specific local needs but general adult education services across the country cover a wide variety of topics

There must be jobs as a outcome

There needs to be a clear economic strategy (ideally promoting green economy) from which education priorities can flow. Also social care and nursing are evidently key areas of the economy that need support

there needs to be a national element of control to safeguard standards and choice; if the provision is too closely aligned to local needs, creativity could be stifled

There needs to be far more opportunities for adult education

They can't spend the money effectively now so why give them more.

This already has adequate provision imo

This amount is a FRACTION of what will be needed now and in the future over 30 years.

This bit is a good idea.

This budget is key to us creating a virtuous circle from education through to employment, social mobility is key to creating economic security and growth for Suffolk.

This control needs to be held locally by councillors who know and understand local priorities and are held to account by local electors.

"This could be a key opportunity to improve local skills / knowledge / education - possibly getting some more people into work or improving wellbeing and social skills - but it needs to be done correctly, with the right institutions around the table for this discussion.

This decision shouldn't be made lightly by those in offices without an understanding of what is lacking in these areas... "

This could be tailored to the local need for skills

This could assist and help with better job opportunities.

This funding could be aligned to develop future proofing skills combatting the impacts of climate change through local businesses and regenerative agriculture practices

"This illustrates the point that the money is not what it seems. There is no free lunch and no magic money tree. What we get someone else loses.

I do not believe that 'control' of this money means a better outcome. "

This is a biased question because it is assumed that the respondent agrees with this deal: which I do not in its current form without better consultation and information than already given

This is a UK wide not a local issue and should be dealt with at a national level.

This is a very valid area of required investment not just for young adults limited by the standard of learning teaching training available to them in there areas varies drastically within the county itself by lack of affordable public transport to access educational outlets.

This is important but must not be limited to getting jobs. Leisure education & evening classes to broaden minds are just as important & help social cohesion & a sense of community.

This is important, they are the future for Suffolk.

This is income that you would receive anyway but you would allocate 5% of the funding to administer the funding? In essence a real life drop in overall funding to post 19 education. Skills required in Suffolk are not so different to those required nationally. Whilst I agree that the national government can do a better job than they are currently, nowhere is it explained how Suffolk County Council will improve post-19 funding.

This is not an index linked amount that would not keep pace with inflation.

This is not enough money to be effective

this is wasted money and all further education should be paid for by the adult

This level of funding sounds grand but I wonder whether it will be sufficient. The level of Adult Education has diminished over the last two decades and needs a large boost. I hope that

transferring control will improve this area which is very important for individuals and businesses.

This local management of future employment would be a key part on f moving towards a more locally centred authority that actually focuses on the needs of people in suffolk

This should be a national project

This should be Government level not SCC

this should be important but will it just get spent on private taxis to ferry naughty kids to a school of last resort . Spend it wisely

This should be viewed from a perspective of accessibility - how does community 'A' get to education, skills, employment site A, B, or C etc, etc?

This sum of money is insufficient to meet the education needs in at time of rapidly changing workplaces due to AI etc.

This used to be under our control I believe and then changed. I guess it will cost us to get a team to work on this.

This won't substantially change courses on offer

This would be a perfect opportunity to return to the full timetable of night classes

This would be unlikely to affect our business, unless this included apprenticeships which are extremely important to us.

this would not have a direct affect on me but I believe that this money should be well spent to ensure that everyone has the right to educational opportunities

Those adults who wish to study further or later in life would have better (and perhaps more affordable) options. Those residents who have not been able to fulfil FT education when they were young people could also benefit, at a reduced, or no cost.

Those who have the control of this budget need to be realistic and prioritise where the money is spent and do so fairly, and with discretion.

Those who want education will find a way to get it. Better for national government to remove the joke of tuition fees from university courses. I would not want any money going to University of Suffolk. These people are a laughing stock and should all be fired immediately as they have no idea what they are doing and have zero organisational skills. University,? I think not. Takes more than changing your name to hold that title. University of Suffolk should be disbanded immediately.

To allow Suffolk to prioritise and base decisions directly with local knowledge and need.

To give a better, and refined future/job for adulthood.

to manage the budget in the needs and best interests of local communities

To many adult education schemes seem to fail. Manly due to financial pressures.

To small amount of money SCC would probably swallow most of it up.

Too much money is already wasted on useless degree courses which offer people no real benefit in later life. More money isn't the answer, a change in thinking is.

Too much of the budget is spent on Suffolk University, one of the worst performing universities in the UK.

Too much! Would every penny be accounted for?

Too small. Is it inflation proofed?

Tories have privatised education via acadamys which have wrecked teachers pay and failed our children

Tories must go

Training adults especially relating to local employment prospects will help reduce the unemployment figures

Training for practical skills is needed nationally. We will have a big shortage of properly qualified and skilled tradespersons.

Training needs to align with needs of the local demographics

Training/ ed should be accessible and tailored to meet both existing and future needs - we have wealth of untapped human capital here ..... and don't forget the Arts!!

Transport is more important but this can shape local skills

Understanding needs and skills in Suffolk (e.g. Green technology), special needs especially adults with ASD, we have many adults with autism in East Suffolk and I have seen good schemes to support them into work in Brighton and London, but we don't seem to have much here

University courses are dumbed down now and learning on the job and supporting the businesses to allow this is far better

Up grading Skills

"Upskill and retrain in particular to meet changes both locally and evolution of service delivery  
"

upskilling and training for young adults with employment available at end

V. I but not if govt-style boot camps. What adult ed providers?

Very crucial, but it's way too small!! Given the volume of major projects e.g. NSIPs, in Suffolk, this feels too small to make any real difference on adult education, reskilling, and upskilling.

Very important as it enables provision to better meet local needs in a way that can't as easily be done if administered nationally.

very important every adult should have the opportunity access training if needed

Very important suffolk do not get control of this money

Vital for our business to help upskill workforce and adults into better paid work and achieving higher qualifications

Waste of money put it into hospice

Waste of taxpayer money

"We are unable to answer this question as there is insufficient information to know if £500K is enough to cover savings/costs.

Key that local partnerships are equally represented across Suffolk not just urban areas, for example."

we can Taylor to the needs of our residents

we could assist in providing real world/on the job training

We don't need this; we need to fund what we already have!

We had Adult Education YEARS ago, this is not a new idea and we have plenty of colleges etc already.

We have a fantastic university and higher education providers but they are not being utilised. Some people don't even know the University of Suffolk exists!

We need evening classes run on practical subjects like plumbing leading to a qualification to allow people to change careers without giving up their day job.

We need more creative ways to incentivise adult education. Local knowledge of the county's demographic and open / accessible consultations will inform what sorts of education opportunities are actually needed.

We need national goals not a series of local ideas administered by councils.

We need to also ensure young people can afford to travel to work. We need investment in rural locations of education and not just Ipswich, bury and Lowestoft

We need to be sure that local people can have apprenticeships and basic skills eg English & maths.

We need to get some of the 6 million not looking for into the economy.

We need to improve skills and attainment levels across the county so employers have a good pool from which to draw. Need to develop high quality jobs that keep our young people in Suffolk. Local knowledge and understanding should feed in to decision making.

We need to invest in our future generations but I fear a devolved SCC will waste money.

We need to upskill people

We never stop learning. Some adults want to learn a new skill for either a job or career change, a hobby or to assist others in a voluntary capacity or even to brush some cobwebs off! Others may want to better themselves, for example some who's had a bad start in life.

We rely on an educated population to take this county forward . We need to support families. Unfortunately we have for too long a Suffolk Council that has ignored them and only concentrated on businesses who have had more influence than the electorate. With little concern within them for their workers .

We will be stitched up on this

We will receive HMG funding whether or not we devolve. If we don't we will lobby for CC priorities, as usual

We would get it anyhow

What will change in the offering. Will be heavily regulated and statutory duties to follow

What would you do to improve the schools? as it's the schools that are failing our children then as we all know they turn into adults!

What's wrong with allowing all money spent locally to be collected locally? Why the bribery with parsimonious subsidiarity?

Where has this new money £9.4 million come from? This is a carrot from this failing government to attempt to remedy their decimation of Adult Education in 14 years of government. It is cynical, politically motivated and too late to have any impact as this government is going soon. What a waste of all your energies.

Where is the evidence that the situation in Suffolk is so different from national adult education needs? Where is the evidence that SCC will have the appropriate resources and capabilities to run this effectively? SEND provision has been truly appallingly managed and this is the only near example.

While the benefits gained might be increased by devolving control of this budget, the £9.4m is not new money. And the benefits gained might just remain the same, or even decrease.

Whilst past the age of needing "adult education", the availability of suitable courses for others is acknowledged.

Who in the council has experience in education all very worrying. Free school meals for all children

Why can't we have this without electing someone

Why do you think suffolk council would do any better ?

Why doesn't the Council already "work with local businesses and adult education providers"?

Why don't you access this already?

Why educate adults, surely at 19 they have been in the education system for 14 years, if they've wasted that time don't waste more money on lost causes

"Why would local people know better what is needed on this?"

Do NOT waste the money on English classes for immigrants - they can pay their own way, just as they did to come here!"

Why/ I disagree with devolution -why try and shepherd me into answering irrelevant questions?

Will allow adults to develop skills.

Will hopefully allow quicker response to specific needs. Knowledge of skills and training which can feed in to other development the council is involved in.

Will this actually change anything or just use up funding locally in administrative costs?

With changing work patterns, an opportunity for retraining etc. is necessary.

With so many opportunities for courses, especially online, I don't see this as a priority for Suffolk.

With so many working from home now & ageing population new jobs need to be created & adult education or re-education could benefit the county.

With the advent of AI more people will need to retrain as certain jobs become obsolete. As new businesses expand they will require highly trained employees

with the arrival of artificial intelligence more older people will need to change jobs and this can help them

With this, Suffolk can prioritise education and skills in the green sector that the area can lead on

"Working in the education sector too much has been invested in young people compared to "Adult " learners which means anyone 19+

There are a lot of young adults who need education but realise too late and can't get funded but from experience of working with Adults there are so many that didn't get a good education. Provided the colleges and training providers actually deliver what is needed rather than pay lip service to get the funding but don't as is happening and has continually happened. I know I've seen it. No funds should be provided up front to the organisations they need to prove they are delivering the right training and have results before funds are given to them. "

Working with HE institutions like the University of Suffolk would help raise the profile of the town.

"Would allow businesses to partner in effective apprenticeships.

"

Would improve job opportunities for local s ..

Would need a thorough breakdown of the providers and their background to have any understanding of value for money.

Yes - we are such a centralised country - Suffolk should have control over where it spends our money!

Yet again I don't think you would be capable of managing this money effectively. Money would be wasted in the wrong areas

You are getting the money anyway, and should be able to work with local businesses and organisations. Government only categorise, you get to do the details.

"You can't control the education budget for the schools, let alone adults.

Look at the mess you lot have made of SEND."

You cannot allow local businesses control over education

You can't be trusted

You can't be trusted with this money and I wouldn't trust any single elected individual with it either

"You do that now so what would change?

"

You have already demonstrated your gross incompetence

You have already stated that this money would come to Suffolk anyway , so the only difference is that it would be spent on pointless vanity projects.

You mean translators and appeasement for non natives

"You need to take this back in-house. Realise Futures are a disgrace! (all they offer is low-level stuff - not what I, as former maths teacher, would call 'education')

Even Norfolk has retained its Adult Education and works with UEA and other providers - SCC doesn't seem to work with anyone.

You need to have come from outside of Suffolk to recognise how poor the offer is here. "

You need to work other counties to share expertise and maximise resources. You can't be too insular

You ruined education by removing middle school provision ( oh yes that was done under the promise of getting funds under the building schools for the future) so don't think you could be trusted with Monopoly money

You used to provide this years ago, but overpaid paid bureaucrats have drained the available funds. As for the pay offs whey they retire or lose their job is unbelievable.

You will only waste it

You'll waste the money on hare-brain schemes

You're useless spending money

Young children are being taught a number of subjects, or rather somewhat arguable ideologies, at a ridiculously early age. Greater thought and care should be given to current practices, and proper parent consultation, and agreement should be sought.

Young people need jobs and more job opportunities.

Young people need the skills to be able to stay in Suffolk, rather than emigrate and leave gaps to be filled by incoming elderly.

Your track record is poor

You've screwed up SEN and are not fit to run any education programs in Suffolk.



**Q8. £5.8 million of new funding to develop brownfield sites for housing and new powers to purchase land for development, regeneration or infrastructure projects**

**Please explain your answer**

£29,000 per site is a tiny amount of money for preparing grounds for development. This would likely cost much more than is funded, with no further recourse to further govt support.

£29K per brown field site in Suffolk? It won't go far will it. The developers know every wrinkle to build as few affordable houses as they as can. The government hasn't enforced the rules on affordable housing nationwide so what makes Suffolk think we could do it here? We need housing that is affordable for the young people who are born here and want to stay here but in a mainly rural county how is that to be ensured? Developers are businesses that need to make money.

£5.8 million is not a lot of money in the grand scheme of things.

£5.8 million divided between 200 brownfield sites ? They'd probably spend more than this on planning consultancy for each site , never mind a a compulsory purchase agreement !

£5.8 million when we eventually get the money would not go very far at all for developing brown field sites.

£5.8M across 200+ brown field sites would be less than £0.0029 per site. Clearly this should be handled Nationally to gain bulk discounts.

£5.8m is insignificant.

£5.8m is not a huge sum at all. At a cost of up to £100,000 per acre, that's 58 acres that can be prepared. At 18 houses per acre, that's 1,044 houses that could be built providing developers can be found to do the job. None of that includes the cost of purchasing the land to start with. I

"£5.8m is nothing in the world of brown field sites regeneration - just the Jeld-Wenn site in Lowestoft is expected to cost £4m

Please stop trying to con us "

"£5.8m over 200 sites is peanuts. Lots of room for corruption and self-interest here.

Would be easier to answer the question if you had provided a plan of what you intend to do. Then I could judge whether I thin it worthwhile."

£5.8m would probably cover the cost of feasibility reports and plans for one site - again, not really an encouragement to head for devolution.

£6mil would probably cover the cost of buying 1 site so it's a joke of an amount of money.

200 sites and £6m - that's going to achieve a lot

5.8 m is not a significant enough amount for purchase of land etc...

5.8 million of what's the people's money in the first place is a drop in the ocean, you need a lot more months that!

5.8 million seems inadequate to fulfil what is stated

5.8m doesn't sound very much for the whole of Suffolk given how difficult it has always been to get these type of sites which often have been assessed as unfit or unsafe for public housing without significant work.

5.8million to prepare 200 sites, that sounds highly optimistic?

A chance to build homes in the right place

A drop in the ocean, but better than nothing. Anything that makes building homes more likely is a good thing. Clearing sites will make the scheme more viable and therefore increase affordable too.

A good idea just not much money to buy land lol?

A grand idea but is there enough money that will be wisely spent.

A lot of new builds in Suffolk with little thought of Infrastructure.

A one off payment would not go very far, and brownfield sites may continue to become available over such a long period.

A small amount of money again, and there are concerns about the concept of making sites financially viable to developers when viability assessments are often very dubious. If this money is used for public sector development schemes, all well and good.

A tiny step in the right direction

Accessible housing for all would be welcome

Action should be taken and managed sensibly.

affordable and social housing is crucial to allowing local people to live near where they work

Affordable and sustainable housing should be a priority.

Affordable housing & regeneration are key to the county's success

Affordable housing for English people and not illegal immigrants. Stop looking after all those illegals coming into our country and focus on your own!!

Affordable housing is a must to keep the youngsters in Suffolk and the rural areas, housing is out of the reach of many young people.

Affordable housing is essential but LA needs to retain control of assets.

Affordable housing is important, and given the amount of greenfield sites also available in Suffolk, it is very important to me that brownfield sites are used instead. However, it would be a concern of mine that using brownfield sites to develop housing would force any farmland development on to greenfield sites, therefore damaging the current greenfield sites anyway.

Affordable housing is rarely affordable. If council money is to be spent cleaning up sites, the housing built on those sites must be council owned and managed and on social rents. With \*no\* option to purchase!!

Affordable housing is very important. The current developments focus on large homes, but it is the less-well off that are struggling to find somewhere to live, especially with the growth of the for-profit rental market driving up house prices

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING MUST TAKE PRIORITY

"affordable rents and building council housing with no right to buy from the council.

Purchasing empty holiday houses and second homes left empty for months.

young people have not opportunity to rent or buy at the moment.because of cost

"

Again as long as local people are kept involved and informed and that there is transparency.

Again as part of a national strategy to provide housing

Again I would ask the question: how many residents would actually vote for a "leader" of the newly devolved County Council? How would that leader be equipped, schooled in such matters? It comes across as a ruse for current county council staff to have access to roles of greater self-importance and higher salaries as a result. Suffolk is not Greater London, Greater Manchester or the West Midlands and to suggest it might gain greater consideration by a Government if it were to become devolved is disingenuous.

Again in theory a great idea.

Again it is right that locally elected representatives make the decisions which sites to develop to give the best results for future development in the county

Again less money should be spent not more

Again same answer

"Again same as the previous answer.

However make sure there is suitable infrastructure to commute.

And also make the housing actually affordable and to a high standard.

Younger generations don't stand a chance due to the entitled and greedy generations before them. "

Again -see previous answers

Again Suffolk County Council has not generated enough expertise to look at this as a package

Again the council should be better positioned to understand the particular local requirements and opinions of its constituents.

Again the money/investment would be used for councils to spend on local sites for housing/regeneration.

Again this is certain rules for the council. Back handers. But a person buys piece of land it's all refused. Our council is a laughing jockstrap completely

Again, any extra money is welcome.

Again, appears to be quite a small sum for the intended use. It would be useful to know what this sum would actually provide.

Again, I am very concerned that decision makers at SCC do not have the vision to use this money wisely. Green, progressive, affordable housing is needed, not more 'Noddy' homes that are poorly designed, and mainly serve to make money for developers. There is an opportunity to be leaders in developing innovative green architecture that is truly social—are SCC up to such a challenge? On evidence provided already, I don't believe so.

Again, misleading. It is important but housing development is down to the district authorities not scc so the money should go to the districts and not scc.

Again, the money is coming from Central Government, some am sure conversations can be had regarding which sites to redevelop.

Again, this is not enough money to make much difference.

Agree you need to make it easier but really clean the land? What does that look like? Would you be looking at the tenders and ensuring the best value? When it comes to council contracts some firms feel they can overcharge which are then accepted. Really? Please ensure there is responsible and investigation the paperwork to do the job indicates fair price. If firms fall behind and do not do what is needed by you then there should be robust clauses to get the money back or consequences so money is not wasted. Manage everything there is no bottomless pit of money as we know.

all "reduntant" or vacant premises and brown field site should be developed

All building in the past 20 years that I know of has been built on green field sights so nothing will change

"All new homes must come with triple glazing, loft insulation and cavity wall insulation prebuilt in by the developer, and electric car charging points in the driveways and car parks

There should also be solar power panels covering every roof, like Tesla's Solar Tiles as reviewed by many people on YouTube

"

All of the things above you should already be doing. If you can't manage your budgets now what makes you think you can manage this?

"All sounds good but it is vital that brownfield does not take into account non polluted sites with a wildlife interest. Chalk quarries should not have had housing as they were potentially rare habitats in Suffolk. The environmental impact must be considered. Also all too often houses are built without adequate community facilities.

Invest in town centres too.."

All very well developing sites but please ensure the infrastructure is there to support additional housing e.g schools, Doctors, Dentists shops.

All very well providing more housing but there need to be more schools, healthcare facilities and recreation facilities as well.

already too much building and ruining the local country side wildt having unfinished properties such as ipswich waterfront

although new houses are being built, we need the infrastructure in place as well transport/ Doctors surgeries

Although gaining funding for this purpose is positive, there may other avenues for accessing regeneration funds.

Although I agree with this I feel the amount is not enough for the whole of Suffolk.

Although the new funding is welcomed, why can't SCC undertake the vast majority of this currently? Without the necessary expertise and long term planning, this money could be squandered.

Amount too small

An especially exciting factor of the deal, seeing the renovation of land across the county is extremely important to me. As is the introduction of more affordable housing.

Another bias question which will result in fewer council houses and more private developers profits

Another example of local government using tomorrow's money on yesterday's business!

"Another key area that needs work however, these housing sites need to be well managed (to avoid the usual 'new build pitfalls') and AFFORDABLE.

No-one wants to buy at the moment because of mortgage rates, even if these buildings were council properties with lower rents, feeding money back to the council, it'd be a better option than expensive housing that remains empty. "

Anything that helps grow the local economy is vital. Amount seems small, how much impact will this have

Anything to help young people get on the property ladder at a time when rentals are becoming more and more difficult is good.

Anything to keep the green fields green

Apart from using land parcels made available to developers for new housing both social and private, it should also be utilised for setting up new business parks and encourage businesses to use them. Also, some percentage of these land parcels to be reserved to green spaces including parks, playgrounds and nature converses.

Areas in Lowestoft have brownfield sites that have remained stagnant for over a decade. Additional funding would give these areas viable development opportunities

"As a predominantly rural county, we have more land than some other counties. However, once it is built on, it is unlikely to ever return to open countryside and we have lost that forever. It makes perfect sense to develop brownfield sites for either housing, businesses or retail instead of countryside

"

As above

As above

As explained before we need more affordable housing there just isn't enough

As I travel the county I see lots of new housing going up using up brown fill and greenspace sites. I do wonder whether there would ever be enough housing but am saddened to lose open spaces in towns and villages.

As I've said before - the upper orwell cost us £8 million which we lost as it was scrapped. So why do we think we would be able to purchase/develop multiple sites/do any form of detailed plans for less than £6 million. Sorry I'm not convinced.

As long as they prioritize brown field sites and don't spend it on dubious 'investments'

As long as climate change impacts are considered when developing land such as surface water flooding/building on flood plains etc to avoid flood incidents

As long as decisions reflect local needs and not for political purposes.

As long as drainage issues, parking problems and volume of new people is considered in this building of infrastructure.

As long as drainage structure is supported. The flooding in local areas these past few months have clearly been down to the constant building on fields and not sorting out the drainage

As long as it does not damage our lovely forests, and wildlife which Brandon is famous for.

As long as it's spread across all the districts

as long as roads were featured in the planning to ease congestion, public transport provided for new housing estates, shops, GPS etc

As long as the developments in question are suitable for the location, and any housing going onto these sites is aimed at first time buyers to keep the younger generations in the areas where they are needed. Many current housing developments are unaffordable for first time buyers forcing them out of the area.

As long as the land isn't sold off to developers after and the site/money is used to build new social housing with required facilities

"As long as you don't not up cheap flats and small houses everywhere.

Quality and not quantity!!!!

And don with climate and environment in mind."

As long it's spent on social housing only

"As our grown up daughter is still living with us due to lack of first time buyer housing stock.

Fine idea in principle. Who will lead it? Which sites in which LAs will be prioritised?

And will SCC advertise self- build in plots to London buyers again to get the highest return, rather than offering to Suffolk people first? "

As per previous answer this would be brilliant and reduce the destruction of greenfield sites. I find it immensely frustrating that parts of Ipswich lie empty such as West End Road and yet the outskirts continue to be built on.

As someone who lives with their parents, affordable housing is a top priority for me, it is very important to me for both an increase in the number of houses and a decrease in the house prices. Furthermore, undertaking both of these whilst preserving parts of Suffolk's landscape

As stated completely against local government having more powers

As the current new housing stock is being sold to landlords, I think this would be a very bad idea unless the council could guarantee that the housing could be bought by young people who need to stay in the area

As we live longer, stay in our homes longer, grow as a community, we need more homes, that are affordable with local wages!

As we need more homes for ppl.

Aside from spending money on Defence, on reforming the NHS model (to something like what obtains in Western Europe's state backed health schemes) getting more housing is the most important political issue at present. I would like how this is arrived at, and funded, to be decided locally.

At a time when we need more housing redeveloping brown field sites is a must. But also attracting commercial and leisure interests into towns and city's is important.

Availability of affordable housing is fundamental

Bad idea

Be good to see existing sites improved & developed. Preserve the countryside

Before any development and growth starts, Road infrastructure needs investment and watercourses networks maintained and enforced. Due to Suffolk's predominantly rural area, most of the brownfield sites are in remote locations with unsuitable transport infrastructure and in flood risk zones from surface water. In the current state, developing without adequate infrastructure will cause major hazards and damage to current buildings and rural areas.

Before we build on more of our beautiful countryside we need to fully utilise all derelict land.

Better than building on green fields

Better to build here than on green belt.

"Better to fill potholes than spend half of the new budget on adult education when they should have been educated properly at school before they became adults.

"

Bias again.

Bringing forward additional land for affordable housing (which probably means local authority or housing associations) is of vital importance

Brown field sites are mainly in the towns and will have contamination issues such as heavy metals. Are you sure that £5.8 million is sufficient.

"Brown field sites are often unviable to redevelop without subsidy.

Compulsory purchase should not be necessary in every case."

Brown field sites should be cleaned up and planted with trees and other natural flora. For housing, it would be better to renovate already existing buildings in Lowestoft, for example converting the commercial properties that are standing empty. Living in the town is more desirable. It is less lonely, and there is access to shops and to the fantastic beaches.

Brown field sites should not be built on. Too many agricultural land being lost to housing. We should be paying farmers more to keep fields to grow crops and provide jobs

Brownfield development and regeneration makes the future of Suffolk more sustainable. It makes it an attractive place for companies to invest in rather than just being somewhere to buy a pretty house

Brownfield development must take priority over developing green land, and this is a real problem in Suffolk - particularly in Ipswich where there is no more land to expand outwards from. Making brownfield sites more attractive to developers should be a priority in housebuilding, but I would question how much leverage Suffolk County Council would have on this given planning and development are district/borough council matters. I would also suggest that a one off £5.8m sum would not go very far given brownfield sites cost more to redevelop than greenfield, even if this is only being used to fund preparatory works.

Brownfield development should be happening anyway. The way local government capitulates to the whims of developers is shocking, and devolution wouldn't change this.

Brownfield regeneration is always good but this feels like a paltry sum.

Brownfield sites are a mess

Brownfield sites are best left as they are often surprising havens for wildlife

Brownfield sites have so much potential and remain poorly used for housing projects which need to be sustainable . We need to look at new housing providers that focus on green and healthy spaces, outdoor gyms and healthy activities, local schools and services and pleasant outdoor communal spaces

Brownfield sites should be developed rather than greenfield sites

Brownfield sites should be used as hubs for nature/turned into areas where residents can relax and take walks - somewhere for all to enjoy - we do not need more housing, our current services (GP, Dentists, schools) cannot cope with the amount of housing being implemented.

brownfield sites should be used for generating businesses and not for housing, too many houses in the area already

Brownfield sites should be used in preference to valuable agricultural land.

Brownfield, NOT greenfield and only with good local infrastructure to support it and no flood risk



BUILD COUNCIL HOMES. NOTHING IS "AFFORDABLE " WHEN YOU'RE ON MINIMUM WAGE. SORRY TO "SHOUT"!

Build more homes!

builders are currently destroying villages - build your own social houses not 4 bed detached for Londoners

Building affordable housing especially for first time buyers

Building more houses is essential to help housing waiting list

Building more houses that get used as holiday homes and then stand empty most of the year? Or let out as holiday accommodation?

Building on brownfield is a bad idea because they have toxic chemicals deep in the soil that go into plants, trees and grass, and later into people

Building on brownfield sites would be far preferable to building over the green areas of Suffolk. The outskirts of Ipswich, Stowmarket, Needham Market and Bury St Edmunds is horrendous. The traffic has increased terribly.

"Building should be encouraged on brown field sites & facilitating this is crucial

"

But don't build on flood plains!

But ensuring environmental safeguards are present and the buildings are energy neutral

But far too little to make a real difference. Developing brownfield sites is an important thing to do but the amount seems far too small.

But NO building on green belt or green space land. We need green spaces for health and leisure.

But only brownfield sites. Losing too much arable farm land to housing

But only for social housing not for corporate developers or private landlords

But only if it is for social and affordable housing.

BUT please be smart about this and tie the private developers to delivering environmentally and economically sustainable projects. This should not be just a hand out to developers

But probably not enough to deal with 200 problem sites sensible

But SCC should devolve this power to district councils who spend much more time talking to local people to find out what housing people need and where it can be built

But SCC should not be allowed to make these decisions without proper consultation with the local population.

But so far you/they have used greenfield and altered original plans, like foxhall/A12 layout and use of the original road into the site next to Telecom as well as inserting a completely unnecessary filter land and traffic lights. This year summer traffic that on occasions overflows onto the A14 WILL cause accidents by further A14 ingress. All because someone showed you a £sum, that

seemed attractive. You've yet to dual the western Woodbridge A12 because you don't think things through.

But the national government could just as easily fund this without creating another local bureaucracy.

"But there's no excuse for them not doing this before rather than building excessively on farmland, so I wonder if it would actually happen.

"

But will be paid as back handers to corrupt developers who never deliver or get bribes paid to civil service to change the plans last min.

Buying land equals more control and power to the Globalist institutions that want to own and control the entire world including human minds. No. Absolutely not. Don't fall for their deception.

Can't imagine this amount would go far. Need to explore demand and ensure affordable housing on brownfield sites is of a good quality and appropriate to prevent further 'sink area's with poor social cohesion, poor educational aspirations and low lifestyle expectations

"Central energy provision

On estates"

Cheaper rent is needed for the young adults.

Citizens Assembly to decide approach - should empty second homes be compulsorily purchased/made available for rent before new builds etc.

Clearly these things are important but I am worried that we will not have enough money over the 30 years to do all that we would want to do

Community empowered and led initiatives please. The schemes in Mid Suffolk are an excellent example

"Compulsory purchase should not be up to the local council, only national government should be able to

"

Concern that money would not be used strategically or for green projects

Consider compulsory purchase of derelict land for housing first time buyers. Ban second homes on these lands.

Consider in-house planning consultancy to support enabling these sites and presenting them as opportunities to JV partners.

Consider possible energy opportunities as well as just housing

Considering the average developer's profit margins, this should not be indirectly subsidised by the council through clearing brownfield site.

"Could help unlock sites and deliver the right homes in the right places

"

"Could this sum not be used more beneficially to convert vacant retail premises in urban areas for residential use than the vastly expensive environmental clear-up needed for derelict industrialsites?"

More properties , more quickly."

Council should develop strong and effective policies and inspections to brown sites clearing. No tenant of a brown site should be allowed to disappear without clearing site in first place. Public money should not be spent on act of clearing but control and supervision for the interest of public and nature.

Councils keep allowing more housing to be built but there is no new hospitals or NHS dentist to service the additional people

Crying out for decent housing

Currently greenfield sites are being developed in places where there is no infrastructure to support them and all done m with no transparency to local residents why would we believe that brownfield sites would be used?

CURRENTLY HOUSING IS GOING ON GREEN FIELD SITES. BROWNFIELD MUST BE USED. FLOODING ALSO NEEDS TO BE ADRESSED.

Definitely for brownfield sites but not for greenfield sites particularly where prime arable land is being taken out of use

Delivery of affordable housing at pace is a top priority for the County. Unlocking difficult sites is an important piece of the jigsaw- Lowestoft is a prime example of this. The private sector will not, and has not, historically, invested in the 'hard to do' pile sites and so public funding and partnerships led by public sector leaders are key to delivery. Regeneration also has a hugely important role to play in place-shaping, driving economic growth, creating pride in local communities, and resolving broader issues such as crime, ASB, fly-tipping etc.

Depends on the type of project proposed

Developers are already reaping generous profits. If they want to develop, let them remediate brown field sites.

Developers are more business astute than councils

Developers need to be encouraged to use brownfield sites as a first option, rather than encroaching on greenfield sites.

Developers should pay for this, not residents

Developers should pay for up grading their assets

Developing affordable social housing on brownfield sites is a win win - as long as that's what happens. Plus having council control of developments SHOULD mean builders have to follow through with promised infrastructure, like walking and cycling routes, local facilities like schools and access to doctors, pharmacies etc, and combined with funding for public transport. Provided the councillors are on board and don't give the jobs to their mates.

Developing as many brown field sites is the way forward. Local knowledge can easily recognise these sites.

Developing brownfield sites discourages developers building on any more greenfield sites

Developing brownfield sites is important but we don't just need affordable housing as it is still affordable for a lot of people. We need social housing.

developing brownfield sites is very important but again county council involvement fills me with apprehension

Development and regeneration are only worth doing if the businesses involved are worth having. You need much less infrastructure investment if you don't 'regenerate and develop'. I would ask that infrastructure be prioritised over r&d as you can't continue playing catch up forever. Suffolk is well behind itself as it is.

Development must come with employment opportunities and local infrastructure to support new/expanding communities e.g. schools, GP surgeries (with the NHS) and facilities for local residents such as Green space

Development of brownfield sites is good but too much other land is already being built on. We also need infrastructure before any more housing.

Development on brown fill sites NOT green belt or farmland as we have seen lately Flooding where we have Not had before!!

Disagree with devolution

DISAPPOINTED how you have destroyed Suffolk Rural farmlands. So. You Lot can say we are saving the environment. Rubbish. You are destroying it

Distribution needs to be fair and upfront. We need to know what's going on at all levels.

do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

Do not give SCC more funds to waste .

DO NOT spend the money getting sites ready for Developers. Instead see the sites as community assets - keep ownership & the enhanced capital value that development brings in local ownership. Local economic activity that doesn't export money out of Suffolk, building community cohesion + resilience.

Do not want brownfield sites developed.

Do not wish it to go through

Doesn't happen in a cost efficient way.

Don't subsidise fat cat developers. Protect the green spaces properly and they will fund the cleanup themselves

Don't think this money will go far at all. We need to stop building on our fields .

Dont devolve

Don't know much about this but using brownfield over greenfield is always preferable

Don't trust scc with it - it won't be used effectively. Keep it with central government

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES ARE VITAL TO SCHOOL LEAVERS AS WELL AS OTHER YOUNG ADULTS ALREADY LEFT SCHOOL.

empty buildings are a waste of space so this is a great plan

empty buildings are very illogical so this would be great

enough building on green land and farmland - so many horrible brownfield sites about that needs sorting out!

Ensure building contractors put infrastructure and space for shops, GP surgery and education centres as part of the bid. Also have enforced completion dates so land is not held indefinitely by the owners

Equates to approx £29000 per site, a token sum such will achieve nothing

"especially important in relation to housing but such developments must include necessary infrastructure

Re-invigorate tourist information service"

Essential to regeneration in the County. It leaves vital rural parts out of building threats.

essential to stop greenfield sites being developed

Excellent - makes sense to avoid building on prime agricultural land.

Far better done by private companies through the planning process.

Finally a positive, but surely developers make enough profit blighting villages with unwanted development to cover the cost themselves.

"First you have to have public interest

."

Fix social housing is vital, incorporating green spaces as well to boost wellbeing and health on these sites .

For how many of the current 200+ sites would this sum of £5.8m actually enable regeneration?

Frankly as as a retired ground engineering consultant £5.8m will not go very far at all and is a one year deal IF there are schemes ready and waiting for funding. If there are not we don't get any monies.

Funding site clearance and acquisition is likely to prove beneficial for communities. However, the land should always be sold at or close to market value, otherwise, the public purse will again be funding the financial interests of profitable organisations.

Get these sites developed and stopped delaying

Get this done now, developers will do it once planning has been approved, at the developers expense, why hasn't it already started. ?

Getting more control of housing development is clearly needed (e.g. low quality of some of the Felixstowe North Neighbourhood residential development happening ahead of the master planning process).

Give available housing to those who need it.

Given how little housing and infrastructure development we have had in the 21 years I have lived here development is essential

Given the cost of land the money offered is far too small to be of much use, but better than nothing.

Given the costs of regenerating brownfield sites, this is small beer

Given the extent of brownfield sites across our leading towns in Suffolk, there's certainly plenty of scope for action in this area. I seriously doubt, because of the large numbers of brownfield sites, that this one-off payment will go very far in addressing regeneration projects without collaboration with the private sector landowners/developers.

Given the need for more housing, it would make sense to use existing brownfield sites rather than building on farmland and open countryside

Giving an elected single leader power over land deals is to welcome corruption, as evidenced with the devolved leader in Teeside.

Go for it! A great idea.

Good housing help families to stay in communities and improve health with the support they can get.

Good to get brownfield sites cleared but £5.8m is a limited amount.

Good to use these sites

great idea. please also involve parish and town council and their neighbourhood plans

Great, but it's a small amount.

Helpful, but again a one-off of c.£6m is tiny considering over 200 sites. That could be swallowed by a handful of sites. I recall OrbisEnergy in Lowestoft, now a thriving hub for clean energy, needed an extra £3m for land remediation and associated works.

Here on the peninsula we have enough traffic problems without creating more congestion due to inadequate roads caused by new housing.

House building should be stopped, it's creating pressure on local services, damaging the environment and destroying local identity.

Houses should be built on brownfield sites near to bus routes, GP services, dentists, schools and local shops. Greenfield sites should be kept green to grow food.

Housing affordability in many parts of Suffolk is much higher than the national average so anything that helps improve the supply of affordable homes is of high importance.

housing is a basic need for residents and without it come many injustices and a section of the community being effectively ostracised. Housing is key now and in the future. However sites

need to be carefully considered in the round and wider implications of development to make sure that proper support and services are available within said areas.

Housing is a district function

Housing is sorely needed, especially affordable housing. Hopefully the council, because it is locally accountable, will be careful to avoid blighting beauty spots and ensure that public transport and adequate facilities are in place to support the new housing.

Housing needs should be concentrated on affordable (not large multi bedroomed family homes - plenty being built already) for the next generation who struggle to buy locally and appropriate housing for our elderly local population. Def redevelopment of brownfield sites as priority over every other site.in Suffolk

Housing needs to be a priority on brownfield sites

Housing needs to be built where it does not infringe on our farm land and green spaces. Councils need more council houses. Stop council houses being sold!

"Housing provision ...

(a) in the right place (e.g. with associated appropriate community and transport infrastructure), and (b) with emphasis on affordable/RSL/HA housing

"

How much of this expensive brown site would be sold cheaply to large building companies and how much will be social housing?

However, I do not think £5.8m would go very far in cleaning 200 brownfield sites. I would rather the sites were sold at a lower price to make them more attractive to developers and for the developer to cover the clean-up cost.

i agree the sites should be made presentable but not so sure about more buildings

I am a first time buyer that has been priced out of the market. We need thousands more affordable first time buyer properties so that people like myself can get on the property ladder.

I am cautious about any extension of compulsory purchase powers, which generally are alien to the British way, and wonder what real accountability there would be other than a re-election every 4 yrs.

I am not sure that SCC or a directly elected mayor is competent to handle this. The upper orwell crossing and the debacle of roads and transport in Suffolk would seem to confirm this

I am retired but there should be housing for those that cannot get a mortgage eg council housing

I am sure housing is needed and to clean up Suffolk is good

I believe developers should be incentivised to use brownfield sites through economic pressure rather than grants. As we have seen with solar grants the money is taken but the results are poor as companies invest in taking the money rather than providing a top tier solution.

I believe it would be used to house those who do not come from or born in Suffolk, rather asylum seekers.

"I believe that this is something which local councils should have been working with their communities to achieve.

This is a small amount and will be eaten up by consultants' fees and compulsory purchase is a very blunt tool. "

I believe you will waste and misuse this money

"I consider the housing developments in the rural areas of our county to be a disgrace - the District Council in which I live submitted a Local Plan which was NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE and had to be redrawn. The new rural dwellings are largely inhabited by folk who travel variable distances by car as public transport is not feasible, matched by the infrastructure of other services such as education and health becoming inadequate for the population increases..

I have no confidence that this new scheme would have positive outcomes for our populations."

I do not agree with devolution.

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

"I do not support this !!!!

I wish to see Suffolk kept as countryside and not a building site of ugly homes

Let's give farmers support to grow what we need and keep Suffolk as a beautiful countryside area

"

I do not trust local councils to make the right ecological decisions in developments such as these, nor to actually create "affordable" housing. Or housing that is structurally sound.

I do not want further development of villages

I do not want the deal

I don't agree with the deal

I don't think it needs a new layer of bureaucracy to have a better housing policy

I don't see that councils have the knowledge and experience to decide on what sites are best for development. A lot of past planning decisions have been poor due to lack of knowledge and understanding, as well as ignoring the public's views

I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

I don't trust the County Council to do this without lining developers and councilors pockets

I don't trust the local council to oversee this fund

I don't want a mayor

I don't want the deal to Go through

I expect the funds would be wasted on continuous consultations with very little end product.



I feel we will continue to be presented with a fait de complis and the benefits of the mooted projects will service individuals within the council and not the people of the county.

I have long wondered why we are so slow to develop the brownfield sites, I see them everywhere.

I have some misgivings about the council using public funds to improve derelict sites. Where there are degraded, polluted sites the polluter should incur some of the clean up costs.

I like the idea of regenerating derelict sites for the community, i.e. the old bus centre in Sudbury has been adjacent to derelict land for years. I am not keen on brownfield sites being used to build cheap faceless housing estates like the one proposed on the outskirts of Bury and the one in Long Melford. We need to protect villages and their historical charm.

I live in Lowestoft an area that SCC neither knows or cares about is the general perception

I live opposite a brownfield site, all bulldozed in 2018 and just left, it would be good to see much needed housing built on it

I moved to the area near a brownsite which I believed would never be built on. It now has a massive chicken factory (Yes, I am in Eye, thankfully not close to the very smelly old one still in Eye town centre) various other buildings on the old airfield as well as a generator being built. We also have a huge housing development, too big for the town and its roads, schools, GP surgery. I believe that the environment should be priority and we are losing that in this area. So development should not move into brownsite areas to suit business.

I refer to my previous answers. SCC should concentrate on their current responsibilities.

I still dream of a world where someday i could own a home

I think it is important as these places can be made into AFFORDABLE housing or business sites, but at the end of the day, it is just an eye sore and not actually doing much harm

I think it is very important to prioritise development on brownfield sites rather than green sites and prime agricultural land.

I think that local authorities need to be controlled.

I think the development of brownfield sites should be the responsibility of developers not SCC.

"I think the use of brown field site's should be considered provideing it's not contaminated or has been in the passed.

.  
"

I think this is really important. Could reduce the controversy, argument and stress involved in planning applications which encroach on green fields or housing estates full of contrived landscaping. A more natural environment , preserving ecology and building appropriate homes on brownfields would be much better

"I think this issue goes hand in hand with the issue of Suffolk's infrastructure and any brownfield sites that are redeveloped should also take into account the transport and other infrastructure needs of the area before commencing.

In my opinion, the development of new sites is currently quite often carried out without proper consideration of the area's current infrastructure limitations causing problems further down the line. "

I think using such land is positive however not so much more compulsory purchase powers. There is visibly a lot of building happening across Suffolk which I see and the locations were valuable land being used for crops, I don't understand why such sites are used instead of derelict.

I think we need a thorough impact assessment of current development projects before considering any more.

"I think you should be Regenerating areas that are looking a bit tired and in need of a lick of paint!

Please reuse any old buildings you can, these old buildings are so precious of times gone bye. "

I won't live long enough to see this

I wonder how much money is going to spent on new posts and bureaucratic management structures? Not confident.

I would agree if it meant no more greenfield sites and country side being lost to development. In these uncertain times food security is very important

I would much rather see brownfield sites be used than lose more agricultural land. If we could invest and make a return on cleaning up brownfield sites to put more back into local community regeneration and genuinely affordable council houses that would be great.

I would still rather not have devolution but this is the only sensible use for the money

I would wonder if a lot of the money would drift away in lengthy discussion groups, consultations and legal wrangles

I wouldn't wish to see SCC given further powers. SCC have a proven track record of refusing to listen to local opinions.

If a brownfield site is viable a developer will front fund. This amount of money would be minimal to say prep a contaminated site.

If a company wants to develop a brownfield site then clearing the site should be their responsibility not tax-payers

If a development company is interested in a site, then they should be dealing with site clearance and development. Why use Council funding to do their job?

If brown sites are to be used for housing the developers should pay for any clean up

If brownfield sites can be remediated they can take some pressure off of green areas. Developers often seem to try to wriggle out of providing affordable housing but if the council could offer land ready for development at a reasonable price it might be possible to persuade developers to more affordable dwellings

If done sympathetically to the local environments

If invested responsibly it's okay, not on councillors little follies.

If it is going to provide affordable housing for young people to start on the ownership ladder

If it sticks to brown field sites, we are losing some good quality farm land to development and solar farms, we may have energy but no food to cook!

If its spent directly on the building great, If it's just getting a load of paper ideas then please don't waste the money

If limited to social ( Council house for rents to locals ) housing only and where the need exists. Each site needs a transparent approach and any deviation from the social housing objectives needs to be quickly identified and stopped. Contractors that seek to change terms should be dismissed and fined a sum equal to the cost of putting the scheme back on track with developers prohibited from future contracts.

If making better use of brownfield sites reduces councils snatching more, and more good farm land, I'm in favour.

If the council uses the power wisely and doesn't use purchase powers to the detriment of land/property owners with compulsory purchase and diverging into green belt!

If the developer wants the site it is up to them and the polluter to clean it up not the tax payer

If the land was valuable i'm sure a developer and/or council would have made the investment already

If the local plans were robust this wouldn't be needed. Compulsory purchase of farm land for housing is not the way to go. Developers aren't keen on brown field sites even if it's been cleared of old buildings due to potential contamination.

If the money is available we can do this without devolution.

If this means a growth of thoughtless, and unfair compulsory purchases, I'm not happy about this. History shows that so called public consultations, are little more than box ticking.

If you are going to regenerate why can't you regenerate the existing areas rather than brownfield sites. Why leave town centers empty?

If you can not do this without funding then its not commercially viable.

If you could increase this it would do more good. The concept is great but it won't buy much in Suffolk!

Its peanuts compared with what is needed

I'm not overly keen on 'developers' doing any of this as they rarely deliver on all promises. "Affordable Housing" is not what developers believe it to be. Housing <£250k in East Suffolk is hard to come by and new developments usually start at £300k or with a token property on for less. A single parent earning £50k cannot raise a mortgage for any more than £220-250k but also is unlikely to get social housing. We are stuck in the middle unable to get UC, housing benefit or own our own home without rich parents while paying £1k pm to a landlord. What incentive is there to stay in Suffolk?

I'm still not convinced that devolution would get things done any quicker or better because it's the same money

I'm sure that sum will be eaten up in red tape.

Important as £5.8 million is, the one off sum is very small in relation to values and sums involved with property development and almost miniscule in the support of schemes that may require compulsory purchase.

Important but needs to be hand in hand with the planning legislation. I'm not convinced it will be.

Important for the entirety of Suffolk and development as a whole.

important to develop brownfield sites to provide more residential options in and around towns

Important, but clearly not enough money to "unlock" a large number of sites.

Improve existing sites and take direct control of the affordable housing market and reduce reliance on individual landlords.

Improve the look and feel of local spaces, by renovating derelict areas that feel unsafe and neglected. More pride of local area and better used spaces, more opportunities for community spaces, for classes and support networks for young families etc.

Improving central government planning, irrespective of which party is in power, would be a far better use of the money than giving it to local government.

In Haverhill we have a lot of derelict land and buildings which are an eyesore. For years they have been left to rot.

In this plan, the Council spends a capital sum to help private business to make money. Redeveloped the land, but retain ownership to ultimately create an income for the council.

In towns this would would enable the creation of much needed affordable housing but would require legislation to remove the 'right to buy' which continuously reduces accessibility to affordable homes

Infrastructure for all, affordable homes, schools with better buildings and conditions, social spaces and care homes are all needing a review

Instead of building on greenfield sites we should be building on brownfrelnd ones

Introduction of affordable homes and living conditions

Investors themselves will determine whether a brownfield site is an attractive investment or not. £5.8million will go absolutely nowhere to improve over 200 locations! Who are you kidding?

Ipswich and Lowestoft ought to be in far better shape. The latter adjacent to many offshore facilities - it should be the Aberdeen of East Anglia. As Suffolk's county town Ipswich is an embarrassment alongside those of neighbouring counties. Indeed I struggle to think of any county town that is worse across the country. It needs a plan and for people to work together, including development of all its brownfield sites.

Ipswich full of abandoned buildings, especia5near the docks/Star Lane.

Ipswich should be in control of its own redevelopment sites.

Is a national perspective not safer?

"It all depends on council attitudes...no more huge hoising developments but homes for life with sufficiently sized gardens which encourage self sufficiency and off grid technology. Future proofed access and room for extensions to encourage growing families to stay together through generations

.a shift to Spanish or more family based cultures. No more extortionate mini mushroom houses popping up everywhere beung bought up by Londoners or landlords "

It could provide a better solution than the current expansion of development on greenfield sites, e.g. Brightwell Barns

"It depends what the projects are. There is no council housing in Suffolk so how will the county retain control over its investments? Is this just money for the big housebuilders? (who get away with shoddy developments and do not have to include any net zero measures e.g solar panels and heat pumps)

I am not encouraged by what I see around me so have little confidence that it will improve if there is more money as there is little political will."

It doesn't feel enough money to create the impact needed but any money that can clean up these sites would be great. It would be nice to see a mix use of these sites rather them all being housing sites.

"It is concerning the amount of building sites / new housing estates going up everywhere.

I do not like the idea of extra compulsory purchasing powers, if the land has value the owner should be made an offer, not forced to sell. "

It is helpful to have control of this budget but £5.8 million is a very small sum and will not be able to deliver much

It is important that we support the regeneration of areas that are deprived.

It is important to me that the developers also contribute or give some of the land cleaning finance back to the council when properties are sold so increasing the usefulness of the fund

It is not clear why this is linked to the devolution deal? Will other sites be identified in future? If this is a 'one-off sweetener' then it should be rejected and the case stand alone.

It is useful, sure but also tiny. Please tell us the cost of cleaning up the over 200 sites? How much are we likely to make by selling the clean sites at a profit? Or will we copy Newcastle Freeport and sell them for a song? This could be good - but you need to say more about how to navigate the risks etc.

it is vital for people to have the right housing so that they can live a happy life.

It is vital to use brown field sites instead of further encroachment into greenfield location for the benefit of both local residents and visitors

It s too easy to get planning permission for development on green field sites, so it makes sense to develop brownfield sites as a priority

It should be very important - but the amount of funding is far too small for this to make much meaningful difference. With approx 200 sites this will most likely only cover a small handful of them.

It should not be down to councils to bribe developers to build on brownfield sites, stop permission for Greenfield building and only allow brownfield site building.

It will never happen

It will soon get eaten up and run over budget. The ongoing management costs will be greater than any benefit.

It would be wasted. A large proportion of the money would go on form filling, process and bureaucracy.

It would get rid of eyesores, but please ensure something better looking in its place if its in a central location

It would make no difference. Green fields and open spaces would still be built on, just as they are currently.

It would make sense if unused brownfield sites are not used for them to become used - this would reduce some need to continually build on greenfield sites

it would not build a modern warehouse or school

It would reduce the need to build on greenfield sites, such as the Brightwell Lakes development

It would significantly increase efficiency of land management and hopefully reduce the endless car centric urban sprawl with it making suffolk a living hell to live. Providing key services e.g. health, education, leisure hubs, retail on brownfield land within towns with working public transport connections would allow many of us to actually be able to use them and spend money there,

It'll just be wasted.

It's a smoke screen. I am opposed to this deal.

It's an important proposal, but I didn't want the council to be responsible for it. If it goes wrong the costs have to be picked up by ourselves. You just have to look at the fiasco over the previous council buildings

It's essential to oversee development opportunities.

It's immaterial. I can't imagine it would find more than one or two sites?!

It's needed, but in a sustainable way. Current planning policy is with central government so local councils can't mandate higher standards - such as solar panels - on building proposals

It's not enough money to make any difference

It's peanuts

It's Very important that this Tory administration led by Mathew Hicks can not ██████████ up the Adult Education in the County to the extent that they have SEND

It's a drop in the ocean of what's needed.

It's a shame you don't know the meaning of affordable though

It's a way of dealing with much needed housing

It's giving developers money, stop allowing developers to use farm land, which we need to grow food for the population, this will force them to clean up brownfield sites. There are also many ways of building on brownfield sites without expensive cleaning programs.

It's important to build homes, but the homes need to be affordable and a certain proportion need to be allocated to first time buyers. We also need to be careful at the rate we grow the population of Suffolk. Public services such as health care and dentistry are already near unattainable on the NHS, so we can only build more homes if the infrastructure is also there to offset the increase in the local population.

It's not enough.

It's not going to people who have paid their way.

It's not important unless local services eg roads, schools, public transport etc are improved as well

It's only as important as it is affordable for residents. If the housing is affordable then very important but if it drives up house prices in the area this will not benefit residents.

It's very important to local residents to have a better life and having good bus / train network also, developments for local people be it housing, affordable housing and green spaces in Haverhill

Jobs are more important than houses

Jobs, jobs and more well paid jobs.

Just because land is brownfield does not make it appropriate for development or the setting of precedents which may lead to countryside development.

Just because they're 'brown' field doesn't mean they should be built on! Some should be left for wildlife and others could be made into public amenity places for healthy exercise.

"Just fix the roads, cut out all the Green woker, 15 minute cities, obscene campaigns to vilify and fine road users etc. Release SCC's huge land bank of redundant buildings, such as Courts, Schools, Offices and other sites - sell for a profit and return to the tax payer

"

Just looking in Ipswich neither SCC nor the local authority are capable of running such a scheme. Look at the mess the place is at present. Poorly developed and mismanaged and many hollow promises.

Just release the land

Keep green field development to a minimum

Keep off farmland and green belts

Key part of mix - but again think beyond usual boxes - consider sustainable mixes of housing and new tech

Land /brownfield sites can be used for housing and industry

Land appears to be the largest contributor to unaffordable housing - brownfield land is by definition cheap land

Leave it as it is

"less than £6m to support redevelopment of more than 200 sites is completely unrealistic!

This money should be prioritised into unlocking commercial sites, not housing

Need to stop landbanking of land by housing developers to make sure that development is happening"

Let Suffolk decide what it needs to prosper

Let the private sector pay to clean up its own mess

Let's build more houses but not worry about schools, GP surgeries, dentists, the hospital, the roads, the local wildlife or anything else. As long as we can make a field look pretty.

Little or no faith in councillors to achieve this as not much has happened in the last 10 years. Why will it change now.

Loaded - I don't want it.

"Local authorities acting as developers is a recipe for disaster. Affordable homes for the young and first time buyer are a must

"

Local control on where to build housing and its infrastructure

Local decisions for local people

Local housing is needed for local people

local knowledge is best

"Local land owners will be queuing up to sell you land that is

a, overpriced

b, not where local people want housing

c, there are areas already allocated that have been undeveloped for years "

Local people block regeneration as hate change.

Make developers pay in anticipation of future profits.

Make sure that there are enough jobs in Suffolk.

makes better use of land without having to develop on greenbelt .

Maybe then developers wouldn't be able to take so much arable land and wildlife areas for housing



Metrics by which sites are selected should be made transparent and based on official indices, such as IMD for regeneration, as well as demographics, brownfield land availability, etc. Lowestoft's deprivation is hidden in East Suffolk unless extrapolated at lower area - LSOA levels. Important to look at data in smaller areas than whole district and get to the patches of hidden needs that are all over Suffolk.

Money needs to be available to developers to ensure they clear brownfield rather than take more fields which can never be recovered for the environment

Money to make more money for developers? How about local authority owned properties being built?

More affordable housing required.

More bypasses

More houses for the illegal boat people? We don't need anymore houses

More housing inc social housing will retain locals and increase business in shops and council tax

More housing is a local issue not a wider county one and is a very contentious area with communities feeling overwhelmed with current expansion. Better planning and design of both industry and housing needs is required.

"More housing means more people which means more infrastructure. We live in age where a lot of automation and artificial intelligence is/has taken over meaning less jobs yet for those the many that are out of work are chasing/have fewer employment opportunities due to automation & AI.

I suggest less road building as currently our roads are in an abysmal state as well as looking at the cause of flooding....we need more green spaces for drainage, our health as well as paid or even voluntary work.

All new buildings or regenerated one should be fitted with solar tiles, use old water mills to generate electricity rather than using fields for solar panels or wind turbines that can be used to grow food..."

More need for affordable houses not large unaffordable houses

More should be invested in affordable or social housing not all these posh 4 and 5 bedroom houses no one can afford. More should be done to renovate old buildings but the infrastructure needs to be in place first such as doctors dentists school public transport roads before any more new houses are built and they should be in keeping with the local area

More social housing is needed especially for care leavers that will become homeless without the housing.

More social housing required.

More thought into what's being built rather than use green sites for housing that is dumped outside Ipswich from Babergh and East Suffolk councils.

Most of it will go to friends and family. Why not refuse planning permission on green field sites? Oh yes, I forgot that the council likes granting themselves planning permission on their own land, selling it and squandering the money whilst raking in millions in extra Council tax and spending that who knows where. The corruption is so clear.

My area is becoming overdeveloped and resources are limited and the infrastructure can not cope. Stop expanding towns and redevelop areas instead.

Nature must be protected at all costs and wild areas increased. The use of brownfield sites is a must.

Need houses not more flats and look at access on to roads that are already busy

Need houses. Low cost. More business development

Need more funds

Need new housing, especially low-mid market but avoid damaging AONB and wildlife.

Need take into account the biodiversity that might have developed on derelict sites and provide appropriate compensation. Its really important that these sites do then save development of greenfield sites and are not in addition to greenfield. My concern would be they would be in addition.

Need this money to kick start stalled sites

Need to cease building on prime agricultural land.

Need to enforce better building practices , new builds over priced boxes badly built

Need to get more affordable housing with links to transport

Need to give higher priority to business use rather than housing. People need jobs more than housing.

Need to maintain prime farmland for food production and stop building on flood plains.

Need to make sure that any development is AFFORDABLE and not only a small percentage of homes. Need to balance brownfield sites to avoid taking green sites. Could more be done to offer affordable housing to young people?

Need to manage where houses go and build the correct infrastructure to support ie roads, schools, gp surgery et.

Need to stop building on farmland and make brownfield sites useable

Need to use brownfield more

Needs de-politicising if we are to get the best vfm

New housing is essential but should not be done at anyone else's expense of lowering their standard of living.

New housing is vital and not enough has been done in recent years to provide it. Alas catching up will take decades even if we start tomorrow

New housing should be on brown field sites and the countryside should be preserved

"New money and powers and an important topic – social/affordable housing should be a priority, but need local control of projects in our area (eg golf course)

What assurances will there be that Town/Parishes will be able to influence decisions, especially if Town/Parishes do not have an approved Neighbourhood Plan?

"

Nice idea but SCC hasn't established that it can do much more than arrange expensive reviews and consultation procedures.

No additional comments.

No benefit to the county

No devolution

No further payments after this? Provided the money doesn't go to "mates" as up in Teeside, local decisions are best.

No more badly planned estates with no shops, drs, schools or gyms factored in

No more building on green spaces. It destroys our environment and negatively impacts health

No more houses

No more housing. £250,000 or more we need housing such as prefabricated & sustainable that is cheap for first time buyers

No one should have the right of compulsory purchase, if land is not for sale it should stay that way.

No stop building houses for illegal immigrants ! Stop messing with our green spaces !!!

No to devolution!

No way

Nobody who is honest will be able to afford a home anyway.

None of this money would be spent in Ipswich unless it had the potential to make things worse

Not as a businessowner but a resident of Ipswich, I see many derelict industrial sites and places that are prime locaiton for housing development. Whilst great work has been done in recent times, it could be furthered by this. This land sits empty, and useless, and is an eyesore and makes the local area look messy. Instead of using precious farming land to build houses, we could build apartments on these sites, and make them affordable.

Not enough £

not enough money

Not enough money to achieve anything positive.

not much money but a good idea

Not needed

Not new money goes nowhere near replacing the money the government has taken away over the last 10 years

Not required - social housing is (council owned-no shareholders )

Not sure this will resolve the reasons brownfield sites are not utilised more now - will need added encouragement for developers to choose over greenfield sites.

Not the business of the council.

Not the council's business

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the Council are capable of managing this money properly

Nowhere near enough for all brownfield sites.

Obviously it's important, but you are phrasing these questions in bad faith. The money is important, but SCC would mess up any implementation.

Of course regeneration is important but the maintenance of these projects have to be costed in as well

Oh, yes please! The child and descendant of farmers who worked to feed the nation, living now opposite a large private housing development building on good farmland, my heart breaks. The wrong houses in the wrong place. Let's have the right houses in the right places.

Once again NO to devolution

once again, this smells like 'is it okay if I pay my mates £5.8 million in taxpayer money and pretend it's done something for local people'

Only BROWN field not green. Also, proper infrastructure inc. new schools, surgeries & amenities to cater for the influx of people.

"Only brownfield should be allowed.

The planners have massacred the green belt around Felixstowe and Bury St Edmunds whilst imposing colour schemes on garage doors. "

Only good if the road/school, etc are in place too. Also need to ensure houses are affordable for single purchasers which none of the new development sites are currently

Only if local services included in development. Schools, health care, roads, water supply, environmental protection. All future new roofs should have solar panels.

open to abuse by local councillors and businesses. Invested interests etc.

Opportunities for young families to buy homes and get on the property ladder

Or in other words .... subsidise developers who will be given planning permission and then further down the line say they can't afford to include the agreed number of affordable homes.

Our tax money shouldn't be spent developing land for businesses. Let the businesses pay for the development.

park and ride for towns with inadequate parking is more important than further development.

Peanuts again - and planning is a districts/borough matter, not the county's

Peanuts compared to what is needed

"Peanuts for the number of development/regen/infrastructure. Most of £5.8 m will go on 'consultants and/ or surveys.

ILLEGIBLE asbestos will need more than £5.8 m

"

People need homes they can be proud of

People need housing, but they also need the infrastructure to go with it - schools, doctors & extra hospital space.

People shouldn't be allowed to purchase sites and sit on them as a future investment. I think businesses and homes should be integrated suitably to reduce travel. New homes also need better regulation for environmental standards and comfortable living spaces, not boxes with tiny windows and no room to store clothes

planning - everyone can see more housing is needed but there is not the infrastructure to support it

Please do include retail (except supermarkets)- too many cars are already on the road trying to get to retail parks on the edge of town - traveling across town. Retail needs to be placed in town centres - attraction to towns helps other business (less cars on the road as going to one place, also provide better transport links.

Please do not overdevelop Suffolk countryside. Villages near to me have been completely destroyed by over-development

"Please don't build more houses with no support infrastructure such as GPs, hospitals, schools, community centres and DENTISTS!!!

And car parking. Not cycle lanes"

Please see earlier answer about developments.

Please see my answer concerning devolution as a policy above.

Powers to the Council to buy land for infrastructure projects? To blight a bit more if Suffolk? No thanks.

Protect rural sites and positively re develop derelict ones. Need to include infrastructure updates...roads, schools, nurseries, GP & dental surgeries, play, leisure and green areas

Providing that this affordable housing is offered to young families already situated within Suffolk this would be beneficial and give young families something to aim for when trying to get onto the property ladder.

public housing is needed not developers getting profits

Public money should not, in any circumstances, be used to subsidise developers, even miniscule amounts like this.

Quite a small figure, that I guess every little helps

Rapid and poorly considered, dense over development is already having a huge impact in the quality of life here. It is proving to be an exercise in leveling down not up for local residents. An immediate withdrawal from in-balanced placement of development and a properly considered way forward put in place to cater for local not national needs.

Re use land rather than green fields

Redevelop housing for town center first

Redevelopment is important but needs to be done in conjunction with local communities. Often development plans are not fully fulfilled by developers due to limited resources at council level.

Reduce demand for greenfield (agric) sites

Regenerating areas in disrepair is important to improve jobs and housing available, however this seems a small amount in comparison to the size of the county

Regenerating brownfield sites would preserve more of the countryside, and this is an important concern for me

Regeneration can include 'green infrastructure' provision, particularly in urban areas where access to green space is more limited.

Regeneration is important, however often the expense is not worth it. With flats/houses built not being used for years after being built. So I would want it to have clear objectives of getting individuals onto the property ladder and supporting homeless people with accommodation pods

Regeneration prevents depleting greenfield areas and rejuvenates local communities

Re-purposing the old, derelict sites is so vital and I fully agree with that but I would also have a much happier preference for some of those brownfield sites to be regenerated in a natural sense to invite back the greenery that makes Suffolk so special. There must be a balance.

Rural areas being ruined by over development...with pressure of solar, wind farms and business parks we need more food security and protect green areas

Rural green site development will ruin the countryside, abandoned brown field sites are blighted and regeneration is preferable

Same answer as q5

SCC does not spend the funds that they are currently provided with in any way to provide value for money. Should Mr. Hicks be provided with even more money it will only be used for even more inflated wages and 'gold plated pensions'.

SCC must not be allowed to control this funding.

SCC would somehow manage to get it wrong.

See answers to previous questions

See previous

See previous answer

"See previous answer ref. construction of new roads and water and sewage plants.

Too much low quality new housing going up with insufficient oversight and infrastructure. No penalties for fraudulent development, as happened in Occold. Councils must not go against residents wishes, as they repeatedly have, with new housing developments."

see previous answer regarding waterfront Paul Ltd building

Seeing the number of good agricultural sites that have been used for housing development, it's important for brownfield sites to be used for future projects

Seems a very small sum

Seems very low amount to make real impact but would prefer use of brownfield sites for development

Should be controlled by central government

Should be done anyway

"Should be passed already

To many greedy people out there "

Should have been done years ago! Now using more and more green fields!

should leave some spaces for wildlife and the public. e.g. more local country parks

Shouldn't be anything to do with council

Sick and tired of losing good agricultural land to housing when there are so many abandoned factories and industrial sites which could be used

Sites saround where I live that have had planning permission for years yet have not been developed. These 'wonderful' new builds are expensive and provide very limited social housing options. When new builds go up and they adding more strain on local resources. Our local doctor surgery has also been graded as requires improvement, I cannot move surgery to access better health care services for SEND individuals I support because of the lack of facilities as a direct result of new builds spreading a short service shorter.

Sizewell proves we have no say

So loaded questions not a fair survey

So long as everything is well known by local people. You need social media community officers to respond and communicate alongside paper information in local shops/ co-ops and get town councils and parish councils on board or it all gets into the hands of a few

So many contaminated sites that we can develop.

So much better than building on green field sites. As our population increases and with instability in world markets, it's important to maintain as much green field as possible in order to be as self sufficient in food production as possible.

"So the TAX Payer pays for the land to be improved for the independent House builders.

I wasn't born yesterday.

"

So the tax payers funds the clearing of the sites and then get ripped off again by the property developers! Teesworks episode 2

So what happens to Sizewell A land

So your buying/improving brownfield sites so then a private developer can come in buy the land from you on the cheap (while tax payer has paid to develop the land) to make a profit that the taxpayer won't see as it's private company...

Social housing is critical, followed by regenerating brownfield sites.

Social housing is desperately needed.

Social housing is desperately needed. Without a home it is impossible to secure regular employment and thereby contribute to the local economy and society in general.

Social housing is extremely important, but greedy developers do NOT make affordable housing. They just use it as a label to justify large developments with no local infrastructure. It is not affordable. Leasehold housing is a big con.

Social housing needs in Suffolk is a big issue, due to population forecasts. So long as top quality research into the brown site long term viability is carried out, then developer and council can expect a decent return.

Social Housing 🏠

Some large brownfield sites in town live in. Need affordable housing, need jobs but also improved environment for residents who live near them.

Someone on the council will be making money from selling brown sites etc.

Sort out infrastructure first

Sort the housing problems and never worry about those who get free bus access, ie pensioners. That can all come later

Sort the infrastructure first

Sounds sensible but again how does this differ from current practice? Are all decisions imposed on the Council from central govt. or is there consultation/ recommendation process

STOP .... BUILDING MORE HOUSES ... close Suffolk borders and kick out anyone that hasn't got 2 great grandparents born in England

Stop building on green belt as is being done in Ipswich where the infrastructure is not fit for purpose. Developments are still being built using a 1960s blueprint, Nothing environmentally



beneficial or sustainable about them. Valuable loss of green space and invaluable increase in pollution and strain on local services and resource.

stop building on the green belt! brown field first

Stop building woke eco homes in fields and build dense housing in towns on brown field sites. It just common sense.

Stop destroying green belt and focus on brownfield sites in town. There are many disused sites which could be converted for other uses. There are too many housing developments springing up everywhere

Stop developers having so much control over housing and creaming off too much money.

Stop developing sites, your just interfering

Stop immigration. The country's overpopulated

Stop now! You haven't got a clue.

Stop over building until the infrastructure is in place

Stop spending our money on silliness.

Success will depend on working with local planners and land owners. Location is key and are these the right places for social housing?

Such a great plan and so much better than allowing building on farm land where there is often insufficient infrastructure locally and the land is needed for food production.

Suffolk as a dreadful record in developing brownfield sites and the £5.8M will not be enough.

Suffolk as a rural county needs greater development of brownfield sites rather than opting to use valuable arable land.

Suffolk can't be trusted

Suffolk council and residents will know more about local sites than central government.

Suffolk council stands very much in the way of new development, and takes the side of existing conservative residents, however selfish their stand.

Suffolk is not built for excessive numbers of people, our roads are already congested and our healthcare / schools are overwhelmed. If there is commitment to improving this first, then I would be in favour of developing brownfield sites

Suffolk is supposed to be agricultural. The only brown field site round here is a ww2 airfield. It would be awful to have it turned into housing. I have nothing against small factories and mini nuclear power plants

Support to local community land trusts as a priority

Surely, if we had devolution, we could spend any amount of recurrent expenditure on this.

taken down and rebuild all areas of gray building first into social houses or flats before ripping up the local areas.?

Tax payers funding helping developers?

There are very few opportunities near where I live to regenerate current unused premises.

terrible idea. Compulsory purchase powers????? Fix the current problems first

"The £5.8 million funding for brownfield site regeneration and the new powers to purchase land for development, regeneration, or infrastructure projects present an intriguing opportunity for Suffolk County. However, it's imperative to approach this with caution to preserve Suffolk's picturesque countryside.

While addressing the demand for housing is undoubtedly important, it's equally crucial to maintain Suffolk's unique character and beauty. Therefore, any development efforts must be conducted strategically and sensitively, prioritizing the rejuvenation of derelict industrial sites and underutilised areas without compromising the natural charm of our countryside.

"

The ability to stop over development of some areas is greatly needed especially for those areas that continue to prove the total lack of infrastructure for future planning of access to and from and the quality and capability of existing overwhelmed infrastructure

The amount of money is nowhere near large enough. It will be vital to focus on affordable housing rather than facilitating massive profit-making by those seeking to put up large numbers of poor-quality housing. They should be designed with community in mind and designed/built in the most sustainable way.

The builders should pay for this out of the profits they make from the money you give them

The compulsory purchase powers is a dangerous edict as it gives precedent to do this on a wider scale: there must be some protection powers also given to owners of such land and property.

The council is too short sighted to spend this wisely. Take Lowestoft as an example. There is a fantastic opportunity to develop waterfront accommodation along the river. Do this to a high standard and all of a sudden you improve the look and feel of the area (look how Norwich improved their river front). However all I hear in regards to plans for the area is to squeeze as many houses on the site as possible, mostly social housing, as it will be a quick fix.

The countryside, especially around towns like Stowmarket, is just disappearing. I can no longer go for a field walk from my house - I have to drive, otherwise I've walked 3+miles before even getting to a field.

The county and some towns are already overdeveloped with outcomes of consultation not being listened too, with SCC ploughing on to do what they want anyway. Democracy in this council is non-existent.

The county has failed to set out how compulsory purchase decisions are to be appealed: is it still possible to appeal to central government? Will there be an Ombudsman. Surely this is a key part of describing how these new powers which the council is to acquire are to operate.

The county is already becoming too busy why do we need more development

"The current development of green areas in around areas of Ipswich has made without much regard for existing local issues such as traffic congestion / road improvements.

Any increase in housing MUST be linked with workable infrastructure. The provision of additional buses / cycle ways, looks great on paper, but rarely improves things.

Likewise, restricting roads to certain users also adds to congestion on existing road way. It should be possible to identify, potential ""rat-runs"" on new estates before they are built and ensure the roads structure are capable of handling these."

The developer should pay for clean up - not role of the council to subsidise developers

The developer should pay to clear the site paid from its profits

The developer will NEVER develop brownfield sites. Just look at the left over land around the developments in Walton (Felixstowe).

The developers, not the taxpayers, should be paying the remediation costs fir brownfield sites.

The development of brownfield sights is very important in terms of rejuvenating the economy as long as this is done with the idea of promoting long term businesses or public facilities rather than dying public facilities e.g. libraries

The districts -at least where I live- are so backward with planning I can't see this happening. Where's the progress on traveller sites?? Focus on what is actually achievable.

The figure is far too low to achieve any large scale regeneration

The government sh

The government should give this money to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding of local authorities over the last 14 years. Don't waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The housing is needed but so is careful placement of the new developments.

The idea of utilising brownfield sites is excellent. However, Suffolk has been absolutely hammered with new housing developments in the last 3 years alone, a huge amount on good land meaning a lot of habitat destruction. I simply do not trust that Suffolk would use this money to develop on land that is brownfield and not on other land, destroying more habitats and cutting down well established trees.

The infrastructure can't take more and more housing. The roads around ipswich are at bursting point and adding more traffic lights when you build new housing estates is just making the situation worse. More houses means more traffic and the town can't cope as it is with the traffic lights and roads blocked off as it is.

The infrastructure projects need to come first!

The majority of brownfield sites should be used for planting woodland

the money is [REDACTED] all - might unlock 1 maybe 2 decent sized sites

"the money should go on services not more housing.

The James Paget is serving to great an area and number of people as it is adding more housing and people will stretch this to breaking point - this is also the case with doctors dentists plus all secondary schools being over subscribed - where will these extra bodies go ? "

The money would sit in the coffers for years while meetings are held and plans formulated very very slowly, and no doubt any money that is spent will go to sites with connections to councillors mates and cronies anyway .

The more money developers receive the less infrastructure and facilities the existing residents receive.

The only benefit from this proposal. Are you competent and qualified to undertake compulsory purchase, let alone identify suitable sites?

The planning in Suffolk has not been in sympathy with the environment. Brownfield sites usage is a very good ideal but control of urban sprawl and good design on development is needed as many houses poorly designed and an eyesore

the prospect of builders developing brownfield over greenfield is zero

The recent projects have not done anything to encourage the local economy or businesses.

The redevelopment of brownfield sites would be mainly service industries because manufacturing has been sent to Asia. The only thing we need is housing for the couples and their offspring and homes for the elderly. Tourism come somewhere.

The sum is small and may mean less local access ( District level) than current arrangement

The sum is too small to be of any real use. Local authority money should not be spent making life easier for multi-national wealthy construction companies. If they want to buy a site and build on it let them use their own money

The use of brownfield sites is important. Keeping our countryside is becoming more and more important for several different reasons.

The use of brownfield sites will improve the appearance of urban and village areas whilst enabling the expansion of social housing availability.

There are constant planning applications by builders on greenfield sites, trying to cram as many houses as possible together, especially in small villages not equipped for this large increase. They should only be allowed to build on brownfield sites.

There are currently sufficient housing developments in Suffolk

There are enough developments now. Villages are becoming mini towns and roads are insufficient as it is. There has to be proper infrastructure and stop building in our countryside. I believe Henley Gate has been halted due to the state of the economy.

There are lots of brownfield sites that could be used rather than green.

There are too many derelict sights, especially in Ipswich, such as the old cinema building there currently isn't enough housing in Suffolk to meet the needs of the residents.

There is a dearth of affordable housing for our students and this is a key priority for us as well as the wider need for Suffolk and to be able to attract inward investment with the infrastructure support that goes around this

There is a desperate need for affordable housing - but it should come from a central government plan, not piecemeal regional plans.

There is a desperate need for affordable housing - development of brownfield sites is obvious

There is a housing crisis in Suffolk, Brownfield sites should be used to build affordable housing.

There is a huge demand for and need of affordable housing. There is also a need to regenerate our town, to make it a place we can feel proud of.

There is far too much development such as Gateway 14, etc happening on greenfield sites. Anything which reduces this demand on previously undeveloped land has to be a better option.

There is inadequate transport Infrastructure to support any new development, social housing is a mess there are proportionately higher proportion of houses built in new developments for private ownership and private rent than true social housing. So it's not really going to benefit those who need housing but can't afford to buy, or improve the roads, so no its not important

There is little regard for residents points of view on building. Compulsory purchase says it all.

There is no need to subsidize developers; brownfield sites can be used for publicly owned solar farms to provide cheap or free energy for household use or for charging EVs.

There is not enough doctors dentists parking for the influx of more people

There is so much building happening why do we need more?

There is too much development now without placing further strain on the local infrastructure

There needs to be better infrastructure and flood defences added before more brown field sites prepared.

There seems to be a lack of affordable housing for people these days and not enough council and housing association properties

There should be a concerted effort to ensure that all building (domestic and commercial) have solar panels fitted. This should form part of planning policy.

"There's plenty of land and areas not being used.

Enforce means to take them back from business and people not using them instead "

These sites are often ugly, but in areas where they are perfect to develop into housing which is much needed

They are incapable of doing this type of role, leave it to the public sector.

They have failed in any infrastructure as proven in new builds

They would spend it on unaffordable housing, don't give them the money.

They wouldn't just use the brownfield sites but the countryside around them as well. Maybe be better to look at the pressure all of the extra building have put on doctors surgeries, hospitals, schools etc and fix that first.

This amount is a FRACTION of what will be needed now and in the future over 30 years.

This amount is not enough to make a real difference

This can be better dealt with nationally

This cash may be coming our way anyway, but anything that makes better use of brownfield sites might save some of our villages from the ravages of the endless building sites we see around us in every location. Most villages in my patch are quickly being joined up by the vast developments of big houses that many people just can't afford. Why not do more with brownfield sites?

This control needs to be held locally by councillors who know and understand local opportunities for development, and who are held to account by local electors.

This could be done already

This could be done now through planning instead of allowing more greenfield sites. You don't need more money to achieve it. Food security is increasingly important we should not be covering arable land with housing

This could be great, but it depends how much money is needed, and whether this funding would actually cover much at all. £5.8 million spread over 200 sites is £29,000 per site - not enough to clear land and build a house.

this could help develop businesses and prevent them moving elsewhere

This deal assumes costs will remain static, they won't. This will lead to service cuts as costs increase.

This doesn't feel like a big figure for what it is proposing.

This doesn't help prevent the development of Greenfield sites which are still being targeted by Developers. The Local Plans should better prevent the countryside being swallowed up by new housing estates.

"This fund to clear ""brown field sites"" hould be put aside to offer assistance for social housing and not properties for sale.

Developers need to take on more social responsibility."

"This has an importance as we need social housing for families!!!! We DO NOT need any more flats, apartments or supposedly affordable houses that most people cannot afford to rent or buy!

With the social housing that between scc and ibc could choose to deliver, parks, schools, surgeries will also be needed.

If scc and ibc cannot deliver urgently needed, appropriate social housing, just leave the areas alone and let the wildlife live free!"

This idea is useful but the amount of money involved will mean the impact will be minimal.

This is a drop in the ocean and will have little impact

This is a drop in the ocean.

This is a good initiative and could be largely self financing if managed effectively. But it doesn't need devolution to achieve this.

This is a good thing as unlocking brownfield sites for housing is very worthwhile. However, mentioning that there are over 200 brownfield sites this would require a lot more than £5.8m. Not going to object to any additional funding though.

This is a great opportunity to unlock the potential of former industrial sites, especially in Lowestoft and Ipswich.

This is a job that needs doing but £5.8 million won't even touch the sides of it. With over 200 sites, this works out at around 25–20 £8000 per site

This is a key sector for us commercially as we offer many of the relevant technical services needed to achieve brownfield development.

This is a miniscule figure to achieve what it sets out to do, which is often expensive and intensive work. The funds would also ultimately primarily benefit property developers and so would be better spent elsewhere, or ring fenced for publicly owned social housing developments.

This is a really tiny sum which would easily reduce to being worthless once consultants and legal advices are covered

This is a tiny amount of money - Government hands more than this to Local Government all the time with and without any Devolution Deals in place. This is also something that I think should really be aimed at District and Borough Councils, not the County Council that has no responsibility for planning.

This is a very good idea, the council knows a lot more about what is needed for Suffolk than the government does so it makes sense to give them the powers to deal with it.

This is a very small amount of funding in the schemes of development, regeneration and planning. The disbenefits of this small scale devolution outweigh the benefits delivered by this new funding. There is nothing to drive greater vision or sense of place and democratic engagement in this devolution offer.

This is also a good idea

This is an exciting opportunity to repurpose derelict land and give it a chance to support and nurture new communities.

This is hugely important - but only if the council are set on doing this in a better way than the government - high quality, well insulated, future-proof homes are needed.

This is important, but please ensure new housing development is of good quality, 'green' (why aren't solar panels installed on all new builds?) and affordable for those on lower incomes.

this is key to our economic growth

This is key, so long as land purchase is brownfield first - rather than continuing to build on large swathes of agricultural land, which is short-sighted and completely unsustainable. Would also like to see environmental considerations incorporated into brownfield projects too, e.g. supporting urban wildlife, use of renewables etc.

This is not the answer to the inability of local people being able to afford housing

This is such a small amount of money I cannot see it helping development of the 200 identified sites. If owners of run down properties and sites do not wish to redev them, I'm uncertain how SCC could proceed; compulsory purchase?

This is such a small amount of money, equating to £29k per site. If that is the only cost associated with making a brownfield site ready I would suggest it is not currently a barrier to building.

This is very important, and there needs to be a strategic, wide-ranging and long-term approach taken to this. The planning system in Suffolk is broken and the infrastructure such as roads, GP surgeries and amenities are not keeping up, not to mention public services.

This isn't a survey... It's a means to try and get the answers you want, so you can justify devolution

This makes alot of sense if the land has sat unused for 10+ years. Otherwise I think we should invest in bringing industry back to Suffolk.

This money is insufficient to deal with a single large site, such as Cattawade, and will almost certainly be used to substitute for money would have been forthcoming anyway.

This money should be available to all, not just Suffolk.

This must be for the benefit of the people of Suffolk not necessarily for big business, maybe a consideration for community housing schemes with sustainability in mind.

This must not allow carte blanche building even on brownfield sites, the local councils and residents must still have input.

This one off funding is insufficient to make a significant impact on the problem

This seems like a very small sum of money that could easily be swallowed up on 1 or 2 projects.

This should be a priority when it comes to new development in Suffolk as the use of brownfield sites should always be priorities and they can become major economic and residential areas

This should be happening anyway.

This should be happening now

This should not be part of the devolution "bribe; but an already important way to release brownfield land for redevelopment.

This smacks of a bung from central government to dissolve their responsibilities.

This would allow for incentivising the redevelopment of areas either through the reduction of regulation time periods, reducing cost such as VAT on clean up measures and speeding up reform for signoff of Net Zero exemplar solutions which meet a defined development guideline



such as passivhaus. These could all be placed upon the developer to achieve quicker delivery times of homes which include for social housing uptake greater than 25%.

This would be great if these redevelopments are not then given over to purely profit-driven companies with international interests

This would be great. A lot of Ipswich and some surrounding areas have old run down disused buildings which detract from the rest of the town and put people off. Ipswich has some lovely historic buildings, the waterfront etc. but so many boarded up shops, old industrial buildings, etc that could be transformed and so too encourage more shoppers and businesses to the town and further investment generally. It is the county town but has less appeal than say Bury St Edmunds. It needs a little sparkle

This would clean up many spaces and make the area look better plus provide housing - using what we already have available rather than digging up the countryside for new housing

This would help if it was focussed

This would improve density of development and save unspoilt areas which can be used to benefit wildlife and provide areas to benefit from the countryside generally

This would just be a bailout for landowners and a total waste of public money! The Council should not interfere beyond ensuring the clean-ups meet standards.

This wouldn't happen lots of talk and bluster. That will take us nowhere broken promises we are used to

Tiny amount of money, paltry.

To avoid housing developments on greenfield sites that are essential for food production

To build on brown field sites with proper infra structure eco and ergonomic use of materials ensuring that the buildings whether homes or industrial should be self sufficient in energy and offering greener and comfortable places to be whether working or living

To ensure brown fields sites and waste land are put to good use

To help provide real affordable housing for local people

to limit development on greenfield sites

To make community hubs so services can co-locate

To many greenfield sites are being taken now.

To many houses already been built with no services to support them now

To only develop brownfield sites.

To use true brownfield sites & keep away from agricultural land is vital for survival of residents in food resources & also wildlife which is also vital in the natural food chain & pollination etc

Too busy selling off county land for greenfield sites for housing ,look at school sites empty for years.

too little. we desperately need more houses brown or tiny amount of cash . Greenfield or brownfield You need to stop aiding all the planning hangers on to make the cost of development

unaffordable. ECO Red tape is the problem not regeneration. understand the issue better then spend it . make some planners redundant maybe !!

Too many brownfield sites have been left derelict for years, while housing has been built on greenfield sites with no new infrastructure to support the people living in those houses and the surrounding local residents. Having more funding to develop brownfield sites will encourage less approved developments on greenfield sites that would have been more costly long-term due to more money having to be invested in more infrastructure and local services.

Too many greenfield sites being developed.

Too many homes being built and not enough trees being replaced

"Too many houses!!!!

No shops - can't get a doctors appointment - PRIORITIES"

Too much development going on. Leave some space, make use of existing housing.

Too much farmland and green spaces being used for housing..

Tories must go

Tory councillors have been in cahoots with the developers for years. Giving the council the opportunity to do more of the same more easily will not help house those who need good quality cheap accommodation.

unless this is for housing owned by the council this should not be done so commercial companies can make massive prffits

Unlocking brownfield development is key to achieving sustainable development

Use brownfield for housing, Greenfield for farming!

Use brownfield sites before greenfield sites!

Use these spaces to build new homes - not necessarily flats. Save the countryside to provide food.

Use to create a mix of affordable homes/flats and local business hubs and retail units to support the "Suffolk local" initiative mentioned

Use your current powers to persuade and incentivise builders to build on brownfield sites

Useful to save wasted land . New home only of ant use A, if all the empty homes have Been utalised and B the the infrastructure is agreed and built BEFORE the homes

Using public funds to improve profits for developers is plain wrong.

Using the money to develop brownfield areas seems good to me as affordable housing is a very hot topic issue and if the county council has more control over that destiny then it seems as if it will not only give affordable housing but also the construction of these areas and also the preparation of brownfield land will also give job opportunities to people

Very important if social housing is developed a great need .

Very important to provide for local workforce with affordable rents or assisted home purchase NOT supplying 2nd homes to the detriment of working people.

Very important, BUT not to aid developers. To provide social, council owned homes for the expanding needs of ordinary people. If you are just building more commercial housing or developments it is not required.

Very important, especially for affordable housing for local people.

Very much in favour of brownfield site development, need to get solar panels on these sites and public buildings wherever possible

Was this money coming already - this is opportunity to invest money to make money with new homes or business getting income & using this to re-develop over sites

We already have huge areas of housing development - more people than the current infrastructure can cope with e.g. GPs, hospitals, roads and schools. If this protects green space, then fine, but I don't suppose it will.

We are actively looking at off port purchases but cost and timescales are key factors hindering this process

We are concentrating on development ref housing too much. It is the price of these developments that needs to be tackled! Council housing is required.

We are desperately short of housing. Anything that would provide additional housing is good.

We are losing too many green field sites for housing developments and not utilising our brownfield sites. This impacts on not just the environment but the look of the town too.

We are seeing small villages grow into green fields. Anything that helps build on more difficult sites is good news

We are using too much green belt land, the Trimley's being a classic example of an explosion of housing with no jobs, so residents will have to commute possibly back to Ipswich for employment

We do need more housing and infrastructure projects. This should be implemented carefully so as to conserve the environment and keep Suffolk looking attractive.

we do not need extra buildings in Suffolk BUT the infrastructure needs are huge

we do not need new homes being built on green belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty

we do not want more houses - roads cannot cope now

We don't need more development- you can't look after the infrastructure that's already here!  
You don't need more power

We don't need any more development on greenfield sites

We don't need more housing. We need to make the current housing we do have more affordable.

We don't want more developments. We NEED dentist, schools, doctors! Not more housing. We need investment in protecting the environment not destroying it. If there was a focused effort to rejuvenate the buildings sitting empty there wouldn't be a need to build on any sites.

We had a local plan - in my part of Suffolk and instead we spent our time opposing huge developments in an area supposed to be a 'jewel in Suffolk's crown'. We were not listened to. Vast housing estates are going up. No money for schools/health centres infrastructure. Government priorities rode over local people yet again.

We have empty factory units and waste land that not been developed for years

We have enough new houses without the infrastructure to support them - highways / education/ nhs

"We have some of the best agricultural land in Britain and it is sacrilege to build on it.

British agriculture is vital to the economy and environment and more emphasis should be placed on being self-sufficient in UK food production. "

We haven't got much brown land in relation to other counties.

We must continue to evolve and use space we have effectively

We need houses for people who work and live in Suffolk not commuters because houses are cheaper than where they work. Homes for local families first.

we need housing but this isnt enough money

We need more affordable housing and youth activities

we need more and better housing

We need more community halls, schools, doctors and societal infrastructure than is commonly encouraged.

We need more smaller dwellings. Lots more single people about these days. Either always been single or divorced. Some nice apartments with balconies for green space. So many people with mental health issues, just need somewhere they can call their own. Not luxury expensive places.

We need more, higher quality houses. Brownfield sites are most appropriate to at least address some of the quantity issue

We need the power to be able to allow us not to be manipulated by national developers and I'm not sure this money would be spent correctly to increase council housing stock for social housing.

We need to attract more younger people into our workforce as we have a very aging local workforce.

We need to encourage a 1920's style housing boom, we need less government interference and a more laissez-faire attitude towards house building. Encourage free enterprise by keeping government out, with the only exception of building standards.

We need to leave some countryside for wild life and the well being of the residents.

We need to preserve our green spaces.

We need to protect green belt and reduce industrial farming where possible

We need to stop building on agricultural land and reducing food production and start using brownfield sites instead.

We need to use our disused land effectively and not waste it.

We need truly affordable housing, not just housing that is relatively affordable, but housing that is high quality. Totally in favour of brown field sites being used rather than green field.

We seem overrun already with new housing. What we need is affordable housing - not just for those on the housing register, but for our young people. If you want young people to stay in Suffolk and develop it in the future, they have to be able to afford to live here.

We will receive HMG funding for regeneration, whether or not we devolve. If we don't we will lobby for CC priorities, as usual

We've got too much housing going on. The infrastructure is quaking.

We've lots of old industrial sites that could be housing

What has Suffolk done so far, can't tell

"What, just to get them ready?"

Waste of money. Burden should be placed on developers "

While an extra £5.8m regeneration fund would be welcome, this would only increase the current SCC budget by 0.8%. And it is unclear whether the fund is a recurring payment or just a one-off.

While it is important scc have a very poor record of brown site utilisation.

Whilst I agree brown field sites should be developed before any other sites are considered. Too many farmers have got rich by selling off farm land, we have an increasing population yet planners seem to think it's ok to develop on land the produces our food! I do not agree with giving more CPO powers to anyone in government either local or central. The decision on planning should be with local communities. Stronger conditions on developers not just using heat pumps but solar panels, grey water recovery also condition of any new properties.

Whilst it's important to build new housing, we must also invest in infrastructure, such as the roads, schools and GPs that will be needed by the people moving to the area. Housing developers often do all they can to avoid building these important resources.

Whilst this is important what is more important is to update the existing infrastucture; no point in having more homes if drainage cannot cope and more building leads to greater areas being flooded!! More traffic queues as no bus routes, trains/trams or path/cycleways.

Who owns these sites . If some are privately owned why should the tax payer pick up the bill. If the council own some why haven't they already done it

Why can't we hav3 5his without electing someone

Why do we need any more housing? Felixstowe will soon be a suburb of Ipswich!

why do we need more housing when there have been widespread building over the past few years?

Why do we need new power to buy land thought we had compulsory purchase powers anyway it's not enough money

Why keep developing when there are so many empty shops and buildings which could be converted to homes.

Why should developers not fund this?

"Why should taxpayers money be spent subsidising private developers.

If the brownfield sites are available they should be tied in with other sites as a condition of planning approval. "

Why would you pay money to develop land for private companies to then buy on the cheap and make even more money from??? Doesn't make sense.

Will this include doctors and schools to accommodate the extra people

With all the building houses going on in the county, do we still need more houses?

With more housing must come improved infrastructure, roads, schools medical centres, community hubs of shops & services. Greenspaces for leisure & mental health otherwise becomes concrete urban sprawl

With the amount of new builds in Suffolk, more should be done to develop local services, such as GP/Dental surgeries, school places, supermarkets, and rain water disposal.

With the caveat that more schools and doctors surgeries are also created, lack of infrastructure to cope with all these developments and none of us can afford them

Work with local communities and don't impose overlarge car driven developments.

Would feel more confident about this if SCC had better record re infrastructure

"Would have ticked 'very' except that it's a tiny amount of money.

CPO powers would be good and could be useful "

Would like to see more social and council housing schemes to tackle some of the issues with homelessness and giving people opportunities

Would the powers to purchase be restricted to brownfield sites?? yes, good. no,bad

"Would this mean less natural sites (like fields) would be destroyed for housing?

I've long wondered why new properties are being built on areas of green, when there are so many empty properties or buildings that are just sitting there!"

Would this money be spent on local housing for local people ? I very much doubt it.

Yes build on these first. But don't forget before you do, we need more hospitals, GP, dentist and schools for this increase population

Yes, go and solve homelessness, it will return dividends

Yes. Needs to be done. But £5.8m is chicken feed. It's a joke.

Yet again, the sum of money is insignificant in relation to the needs of the county.

You are clueless.

You can clean up as many brown field sites as you like, it won't mean that you will get any planning past the district or borough councils, or indeed the local populations who will continually seek to block any proposals that impact near to them. It's practically no money at all and doesn't represent a needle change moment for Suffolk's housing crisis.

You don't get much for that money across the whole county

You have already stuck up housing estates inappropriately. There have been brown field sites available all along but you were more interested in vandalising the countryside.

"You need businesses to be attracted to Suffolk, which will then create jobs...will this attract businesses?"

Increases in skilled work force, advances in technology

are factors of growth. How will development of brownfield sites achieve this?

Economic growth is driven by consumer spending and business investment. Do you intend to offer tax cuts and rebates to business to boost spending power?"

You should increase this and reduce adult education. Desperate need for affordable housing

You'll designate your own council land as brownfield then grant yourself planning permission to build houses and flats. It's another council scam.

young people are desperate for affordable flats and any new business will bring new jobs too

Your track record is poor and that isn't anywhere near enough money

## **Q9. Multi-year transport funding, rather than on an annual basis.**

### **Please Explain**

"seem to have a higher profile"? Does that only apply if they are Tory-controlled? Seems very Jenrickian

(Re)Build a railway from Haverhill to Cambridge.

.

£250,000 what's that one more bus route in the county ?

£250000 pa for two years, would staff an office of 5 or 6 planners who would have no authority or money to push through the plans their 2 yr jolly has invented

"100% increase in no busses is still no busses in some local areas where oyster cards will be of no use.

May be some help in urban areas but usual apathy for rural areas."

30 plus years of poor rural services will take time to turn around. My village has no Sunday service and no direct route to nearest large supermarket ( Tesco at Copdock from Capel St Mary), meaning isolation and impractical journeying into Ipswich and put again

a consistent funding stream is vital to allow transport to be provided in Suffolk, one off annual initiatives are inadequate to promote significant change from the existing car based dominance of transport

A council is not here to provide 'free bus transport'. You need to provide us services we actually want. If a bus service is worth it, people will pay to use it. If it isn't worth it, people won't. It's how private companies work...

A disaster wishing to happen when you run out of money.

A fairer, easier to follow care system, new homes that are built with hybrid/electric

A good idea if sensibly managed and controlled.

A joined up travel policy for all parties is vital. Buses arrival times linked to major train departures times. Trains that run on time. We are a very rural economy , Oyster cards will not encourage public transport. Bus stations need to be located near to /next to areas people want to go to.

a long term plan is the only way to create a usable public transport system

A longer term view is essential if we are to develop the infrastructure and services needed to reduce our reliance on personal cars / encourage electric or alternative fuelled vehicles.

a road with out hole sin is good and helpfull as at present we dont deliver to or use roads with pot holes in , as it jolts our products ..!

A rural county with poor public transport and need more focus on sustainable options

A very small sum which will be of no real use and likely wasted on vanity ideas like cycle lanes, bus lanes and closing roads off to vehicles

A wish list which will never happen

Ability to offer and extend public transport in rural areas

ability to secure and fix investment in roads for a 3-5 year period critical than 1-2 year cycle.

Able to invest in long term projects

Access to relevant public transport will enable people to access the job market, local services whilst reducing our carbon footprint

affordable and reliable public transport is hugely important, would fully support the introduction of oyster style ticketing and more reliable buses.

"Again



To many managers taking away funding for working people "

Again an attempt to avoid responsibility and financially a bad deal.

Again it needs to be a comprehensive service otherwise people wont use it.

Again it seems in principle a better way, but the funding seems small and you give no real impression of what a plan funded by this amount might look like. So very hard to answer the question

Again this needs to be managed by District and Borough

Again too small an amount to have an impact

Again transport in local areas is very important but will this golden egg gives us all what we expect?

Again we'd rather that money wasn't in scc control

Again why the need for devolution we would get it anyhow or are our rates and taxes going to increase to fund this

Again, I would have liked to see some index-linking, but am pleased that this will give the Council some visibility on the funding going forward to apply a multi-year approach to investment.

again, important but current services are not run well

Again, the bodies involved in negotiation need to be highly qualified for this post.

Again, we need better road maintenance as the car owner pays enough in taxes. We do not want money wasted on bike lanes and restrictions on drivers. Suffolk is very rural and therefore cars are essential. STOP PENALISING THE MOTORIST

All bus services in Suffolk are run by private companies they already have smart ticketing in place (First, Ipswich buses etc). Extra money might help for a couple years re-fund the services SCC has cancelled due to lack of money but when it runs out services would get cut again.

All funding if used wisely is important

All has been covered above, let Suffolk be in charge of what Suffolk needs to spend the money on.

All Suffolk business would benefit from an improved road network both in infrastructure and road surface making it easier to get around, do deliveries and generally to do business.

All the suggested benefits are welcome. Can we add - the provision of far more electric charging points and the routing of buses to service new housing developments?

Allow long term planning to make sensible decisions

Allows for better investment on both sides and will improve quality

Allows for better planning and reduces amount wasted with replanning and uncertainty

Allows for planning

Allows for proper planning and investment. Need to focus on the needs of all road users - not just about pedestrians and cyclists.

Allows for strategic planning for the longer term population needs

"Alternative to Orwell Bridge crossing.

Bus ticket/card for all bus services in Suffolk instead of just concessions bus pass.

Pothole repairs.

"

Always better to plan ahead and know what your budget is

Always needs improvement so regular injection of money would help this area

Amazing that this relatively small amount in the scheme of budgets will all of a sudden make a wonderful difference when residents have complained about lack of transport for years.

Amount too small

An investment in green travel would be important

And the train system? Increase frequency of trains?

Annual accountability is very important. It's tax payers money.

Annual funding is based on economic availability which is practical

Another important topic since public transport is more expensive than owning a car overall. Modernising the system would be a great benefit to Suffolk.

Anything that helps and improves transport has to be a good thing

Anything that helps move away from short term fixes is to be encouraged.

Anything that improves the currently atrocious rural bus service will be welcomed

Anything to decrease the amount of traffic during accidents/incidents or rush hour would be great.

anything which helps young people get to work from remote villages is very important.

Are we talking driving restrictions here .

"As a transport company, the proposed shift from annual to multi-year transport funding under the deal with Suffolk County Council is undoubtedly crucial for addressing the pressing issues of road congestion, inadequate bus routes in rural areas, and the poor condition of our roads. However, it's understandable to question whether the allocated funds will be sufficient to tackle these challenges effectively.

To support the importance of this element of the deal, it's essential to gather data and evidence regarding the current state of our transport infrastructure and the projected costs of necessary improvements. "

As above - transport is the key.

As above, important to improve bus and train provision.

As an elderly resident I feel this would hopefully ensure that there is ongoing public transport available for people who no longer drive.

As before, not convinced devolution would lead to improvements

As before, we don't get this investment

As I have said, transport in Suffolk is dire, I come from a village outside Manchester and it has a far superior bus service compared to Ipswich, which is a town. There are too many cars in Ipswich and it is almost completely negative for a pedestrian, I come last even compared to cyclists so it would be good to see those on foot take priority

As long as it is used wisely and focused on areas that have zero to nothing infrastructure

As long as its not subbed out to a 3rd party out for profit enterprise

as long as its not used to encourage car use by building more roads and killing the local and global environment and worsening public health

As long as the money comes it's needed for local transport

As long as you realise Suffolk extends beyond Ipswich

"As long as your not going take months to do road works that things are done efficiently!

Do something about the [REDACTED] congested one way systems you have all around ipswich

Say from the local residents on how the money is used "

As previous comments, you should already be providing this as part of your duties.

As previously mentioned, public transport costs are far too high, and air pollution is particularly bad. Both should be a priority.

As previously stated.

As there are no bus services in large areas of Suffolk - multi annual funding would have little benefit.

As we don't even have a proper dependable bus route, I'm not sure how this would improve matters

Be good to actually make public transport reliable though!!

Because it would allow more efficient planning

Before spending money make sure it's what people want! The consultation process used by SCC is not good. I was fortunate to come across this one - not feeling informed or included by SCC

Being in a position to plan improvements to transport that can be sustained can only be positive!

Being such a geographically large county with a lot of small villages, public transport is important and complicated

Better ability to plan

Better for long term planning

Better for the environment however very unreliable and strikes make public transport unusable on a regular basis.

Better long term planning and strategic thinking.

Better long term planning would mean more likely that positive changes can be made, in terms of reducing traffic and pollution making it safer and healthier for all.

Better longer term planning for council to make improvements with less restrictions

Better planning

Better planning of the transport network, perhaps by introducing franchising for buses and better ticketing would be great to get people out of cars and onto buses. Please don't use this for road narrowing, reduced speed limits and road closure schemes.

Better planning with long term investment

Better to have annual reviews in my opinion

Better transport would be great, but the council is talking about introducing technologies that are already 20 years out of date - Oyster cards? We could already support the local plan by investing £250k a year - that could have been in any budget.

Better, reasonably priced transport is essential - car travel needs to be reduced but there is no reasonable alternative to get around the county in many instances

Beware inflation!

Bribe money

build more roads, resurface more roads, widen roads. don't waste it on nutty cycle paths and pedestrian routes to nowhere

bus offer in rural areas needs improving - road surfaces need improving above looking at congestion

Bus offer?! Routes in NE Suffolk don't do evenings/Sundays. 'Devolved area' is not a mayoralty - will these additional powers lending credence. Manchester in-house buses

Bus routes to rural areas important. Bus provision in larger towns poor due to poor planning and infrastructure.

Bus services Haverhill to just about anywhere are abysmal. Improvement badly needed. We need to stop discussing and start doing.

Bus services in Suffolk are very important for the rural community. Can SCC be trusted to improve things?

Bus services need improving

Bus services. An Oyster card system is an administrative thing. No good without buses.

Buses already run way below capacity. I honestly have no idea how you will get more folk to use buses. They are slow. Go at awkward times. Are not comfortable.

Buses and trains are used/can be used to keep communities connected. Buses are very important in communities which are isolated with no other means of getting to shops or work.

But disagree with devolution.

But don't trust SCC to spend it wisely

but I don't trust SCC to actually be able to manage a successful plan

But that's not a lot of funding for a geographically large sized county

But this could happen now

But this should be coming from the British government anyway, and it would be better managed if it came through an English Parliament who was governing the whole of England. Handing out local control to the English regions is simply a denial of England's rights to govern itself. The Scottish government has access to and influence in the British Parliament, but it also manages Scotland through its own Parliament. Why can't England do the same? Remember, English taxes pay off Scotland's annual budget deficit every single year!

But would Halesworth be a priority

"But you're having a laugh really.

Road tax covers this."

Can invest into things with larger chunks of money

Can't keep up with pot hole repairs and managing your budget now so why should more money be wasted on daft schemes

Can't see villages getting any more services

Central government will use devolution as an excuse for abrogating their responsibilities.

Certainty in funding is important when developing systems, as without knowing your future it's unlikely that larger investments are to be made. These investments would allow for improved infrastructure, as mentioned, and would indeed allow for a more friendly, both environmental and human, schemes for travel, and allow for a more interconnected Suffolk.

Cleaner air is hugely important to everyone. There are very few EV charge points in Suffolk which is a deterrent to switching from petrol or diesel vehicles. Just one aspect of the importance of this.

Comments as before. Bus services at all hours will encourage more use! Must be tuned to train times.

Community transport using local providers NOT Vertas!

Conflating remodelling of a democratic model with a speculative comment about remittance of monies is poor logic. These monies (if obtained) would be spent in urban centres to the detriment of other areas.

Could be good but no doubt would get coopted. Likely to be abused and used without any common sense.

Could be useful for local services but longer routes will still require cooperation with other areas, eg train lines running through several administrations

Council can't be trusted with this money

Currently SCC is reducing the bus service.

Currently this would not be enough for the scale of the issues we have in Suffolk.

Cut services.

Deal with potholes....

Definitely improve bus services please, and yes smaller buses during the day ffs. Eg Why have we double decker going up and the a12 between Colchester and Ipswich with 3 people most of the time?

Disagree with devolution

do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

Do not let SCC control this funding.

Do not trust Suffolk Council to make sensible decisions in this area. Tokenism and tick boxing

Do not want 15minute cities, that's what local politicians will want to enforce.

Do not wish it to go through

Does this mean you would actually maintain the roads to be pot hole free ! Of course not , the money would be wasted on bureaucracy

Dont devolve

"Don't think the council is interested in relieving congestion or don't have the necessary understanding.

Again, how can you possibly suggest that such a small amount is going to make such a difference.

The questions are phrased in a leading way, all sounding great the way you put it, but not realistic"

"Dont waste money on oyster cards. We already have credit cards as TFL now do.

Suffolk villages need better transport options."

Efficiency in operational

Enable better planning

enables council to plan in advance

Enables reassuring public transport users so they know a bus service will be in place for a set period of time.

Especially important for rural access as not all people have access to a car.

"Everything to do with the roads needs massive funding, so £250k is going nowhere to improve this.

Again the Council is sitting on its hands in regards to everything associated with transport. I assume because they have no idea what to do."

Except for safety government should have no part in regulating public transport.

Fare easier to plan ahead and deliver what is needed as opposed to what can be delivered in the immediate term

fix our transport system

Fix the potholes

Fix the roads first

Fix the roads first! So many potholes causing vehicle damage daily.

Fixing potholes

For people living in a rural environment on low wages transport is vital and keeps communities viable. Multi year funding allows for a longer term view and hopefully setting up sustainable transport options, particularly public transport both to support those who can't afford a car and also for environmental reasons

For rural areas. Too much is already given to Ipswich

For the reasons given (about housing) in my previous answer.

Free parking and resurfaced roads please

"Funding for roads, improve movement of goods

improve situation when Orwell bridge is closed and only passage seems to be through Ipswich itself or back roads."

Funding should be available to all councils without conditions

Funding should be used to improve roads and pavements. They are in the worst state that they have been for years.

Funding to Suffolk County Councils for highways has proven to be a disaster. The failures are graphic.

"gain, not sure than Suffolk would spend this money any better than the UK.

Oyster cards? these have been replaced with more innovative solutions all over the UK, and Suffolk wants to go Oyster card style solution. Think bigger (this supports my concern that Suffolk may not spend the money wisely. "

Genuinely scared at the idea of Suffolk having control of transport plan. It is a fight to secure transport to school for SEND students. The transport bid system of going with the lowest offer results in very VERY dangerous transport arrangements for very vulnerable individuals. Again I question whether the funds that would be available fully cover transport expenses for Suffolk.

Gives better continuity.

gives the ability to consider longer term planning however those responsible need to have appropriate commercial experience, often lacking when LA are leading

Go and make a super loop and have busses go directly to train stations with links to London more frequently, as London is how you access the world because that's where our high speed rail is

Good and efficient transport links are extremely important

Good to hear of multi year funding to enable better formation of longer term plans. However funding is used it needs to be advertised to a wider area of the population - finding out 'offers' is not easy and often have so many restrictions/limitations associated with them.

Good transport links are essential not just for the public but the supply chain keeping our shops and restaurants out of the red! When will Suffolk County Council do a deal between Ipswich Buses and First Bus to see public able to switch buses?

"Greater certainty for longer-term planning - Yes. But please show more imagination. This sentence is almost certainly self-contradicting, "road improvement schemes, reduce congestion and carbon emissions." Every time we improve roads it leads to more cars and more carbon. No mention of the '15 minute city' concept here and how it can be applied to Suffolk.

What problem is Oyster card style model solving? Could I take 3 buses in a day and only need to pay for two because you had capped the daily charge? If so where does the new cash come from (to cap the charge)? Do you just want to look sophisticated? "

Greater certainty over funding enables better planning and therefore, better use of/outcomes from the funding.

Have no expertise in this area.

Having given up driving because at my age I have no wish to kill anyone else, I find public transport very limited and services have been cut in recent years. We have only one bus a day between Framlingham and Woodbridge ie the school bus on it's return journey at 0930 and back in afternoon. If you need to go to Woodbridge for an appointment in the morning, you have to go on to Ipswich in order to get back to Framlingham. Both Fram and Woodbridge are towns which attract visitors and public transport is a joke.

Having seen money wasted on "quiet lanes" and unnecessary cycle lanes I don't trust you to spend wisely.

Help to prevent short-termist thinking



Helps long term local planning

helps with planned work

Highways officers have forced through wasteful schemes which are unpopular and ignore elected members' wishes in their divisions. So we can't give them more power.

Housing, education and especially special needs education must come first. Cheaper rents from private landlords. An end to no fault evictions mostly caused when landlords do buy to let then run out of money

Hugely important. We keep getting this wrong.

I agree with having a more rolling programme for funding but I have concerns about the direction all Transport decisions could take. Far too many considerations and need for strong policies such as reducing the need to travel than I wish to write here

I am a great believer in supporting active travel

I am concerned about the environment, however even though the local bus stop is a 2 min walk from both my home and office doors I still take my car to work (when working in the office - 3 days week) as it is cheaper than the bus.

I am not a user of local bus services, however what I see on social media is that many children are let down on local bus services being very late or not running which is meaning they are late to school or not even making it - so yes something needs to be done on local bus services

I am so fed up with short-termism - local politicians just go for short-term gain and to make themselves look popular. How will you get the politicians to take the 'right' decisions rather than those in their short-term interests?

I believe in the concept of multi-year funding for all aspects of government. I don't believe the promises that this money will be the catalyst to make sustainable change.

I believe it would be wasted on things we the public do not vote or want

I can see why this would be important to many. Rural transport is a major challenge and has never been funded properly. People are wedded to their cars. However well intentioned I don't think this will make any difference.

I can't see how this would benefit wider Suffolk, probably be blown on Ipswich cycle lanes. Would I be able to get a bus from rural West Suffolk to the Hold and back or still have to drive through the busiest bit of Ipswich and pay to park if there is a space available. Was so much easier before the records were moved to the unwanted Hold.

I cite again the mess in Ipswich and money wasted on projects that never go ahead. The roads being blocked off by flower pots, where does this traffic go, oh that's right, congests other roads.

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not not trust them to use the money wisely

I do not think any of the statement would improve the basic problems which need a real thinking out of the box approach such as `Tramways that do not get effected by road works and transport jams

I do not trust you to have greater control over public funds. You don't listen to your constituency as it is. NO to devolution

I do not want the deal

I don't agree with the deal

I don't agree with this being devolved as SCC's Highways is not providing a satisfactory service at the moment.

I don't agree with devolution

I don't live in rural Suffolk but I would imagine it's a nightmare to get anywhere on public transport.

I don't see the council delivering on this.

I don't trust the local council to oversee this fund. The local bus service is full of illegal vehicles and the problem is already well known

I don't use local transport

I don't want a mayor

I don't want the deal to go through

I drive so I'm not even going to start on this idea.

I feel local public transport is poor as it stands.

I gave up my car 7 years ago so I walk and commute using buses. The patchy service in the evenings limits my socialising and spending in town in the evenings. Pedestrians are forgotten under the current programme - delivery drivers park across pelican and zebra crossings, drivers obstruct the pavements with their vehicles damaging the pavements and increasing risks of trips and injuries and reducing access and independence for wheelchair users. Any transport plan needs to include pedestrians as one of the greenest forms of travel

I have no idea of how responsibly the money would be allocated, any mismanagement would be magnified if allocated over longer periods of time.

I have travelled across the England quite a bit recently and find Suffolk roads certainly where I live to be a poor state, no enough dual carriageways to many potholes no safe cycle routes.

i hope it would do a better job than what Ipswich have done with a few of the buslanes, have yet to see any buses use them

I like the idea of oyster card style ticketing but I wonder whether enough people travel by bus to make this a sensible investment. It would be more prudent to improve the rural bus network before investing in the ticketing tech

"I live in a rural location. The lack of an effective public transport network will not be resolved by multi year funding. This sum of money is too small to have any significant positive impact on public transport across the rural parts of the county.

Putting more resources on comprehensive transport plans rather than investing directly in transport infrastructure/services seems typically bureaucratic. "

I live on the edge of Bury yet buses have been cut over the years. No incentive to encourage people to use public transport and consistently unreliable for those who have to use it.

"I really can't be bothered with this anymore.

It's clear you won't listen and are just using this as a ""hey we've followed process"", happens everywhere. "

"I suggest Oyster card-style smart ticketing should not be priority, as many elderly people are likely to struggle with it. It is essential to keep use of cash.

As mentioned earlier, it is important to extend the hours public transport is available if people are not to be more or less forced to own a car if they are not to be confined to their local area in evenings and on Sundays. Taxi fares are understandably high in this area, where the cab is normally returning empty. (Some time ago a taxi from Ipswich to Woodbridge cost over £20)."

I think it is important to be able to plan transport funding on a longer time scale.

I think priority should be given to reducing vehicles on the roads. Not more roads or faster roads that just encourage more traffic.

I think roads are more important than transport plans.

I think rural transport is a big problem in Suffolk, and shrinking bus services in recent years has not helped this. An Oyster style ticketing system would be good as I find that system in London very efficient, but probably wouldn't be used much outside the bigger towns like Ipswich, Lowestoft and Bury St Edmunds.

I think smart ticketing is the way forward and it is highly important to continue and add bus services to rural areas to avoid people being isolated and restricted to taxis being their only form of public transport

I think there is a large number of people in rural areas that would love to use public transport but simply don't have the option. Need before profit. I would like to see work with the football club to provide more alternative transport options, because the success of the team is great but environmentally a disaster with increased crowds and pollution.

I think this would make sense. Annual planning whilst good can be short-sighted and I would hope that multi-year funding would allow for more consideration of the county's transport needs.

I think your own summary of what would happen under the deal sets it out quite nicely.

I use public transport as I cannot drive.

I would again reiterate that our bus services are operated from Norfolk, Suffolk has no input or representation into the services provided.

I would be good to have guarantees of transport routes, and a reduced cost of transport would definitely lead to myself using more public transport

I would be interested to see the evidence you mention and the evidence in those areas of improvement.

I would like to see a clear vision of moving to electric vehicles and having the infrastructure for this as well as moving to a driverless society. This will support a move to on demand vehicles which can support remote areas.

I would like to see more evening services in rural areas to help support pubs etc in the evening

I would welcome more bus routes and park and rides to reduce pollution in towns. Buses need to be run when people need them for work and to the right destinations. There are currently no buses running from my area of town on a Sunday evening. This is dangerous and inconvenient for people working in town, and not everyone can afford a taxi or is fit enough to walk the 2 miles. Why are double deckers running constantly at low capacity? Perhaps more frequent smaller mini buses on certain routes instead of cancelling the route because it's unprofitable

"If getting more money from central government is more likely when the area is devolved, there sounds like some sort of corruption going on

"

If it means lower fares and rural services

If it works as described above and the County Council can make sure the councillors are on board. (Because I know many councillors in the region actively block the kinds of improvements you are talking about).

If SCC had the staff to manage these projects/ how would the new staff be funded?

If this is capital funding for local infrastructure projects, then great. So long as it isn't an attempt by Treasury to fob off the County on all other infrastructure funding, and so long as you obtain proper costings and set bonuses within the management contract for every penny UNDER budget.

If transport planning is decided more locally with consultation, then communities will feel more involved and accept decisions more readily.

If transport was better more reliable and so much cheaper than it is more people would use it. It's just extremely poor now and too expensive. Park and Ride systems in the bigger towns like Ipswich and Bury car free zones

If we are going to try and reduce the congestion on our roads then it will be crucial to offer easier and more accessible transportation options.

If we get multi year funding it'll just get wasted quicker on what so far have proved to be ridiculous road traffic schemes. Money poured into consultancies and planning. At least the way we do it now limits the expenditure to the essentials. What we need is a repair programme for the roads we have and improved public transport. We do not need devolution to achieve this.

If we had better transport links, I would consider driving less.

If you ever listened to us we may have more trust in you

if you get the strategy right it would be very important but you lot have your heads in the sand most of the time

If you have no limit on the fund you will just waste more

if you have to take a bus you did not use the opportunities you were given in free education for many years. Do not expect the taxpayer to subsidise your daily travel requirements. School buses and Park N Ride the exceptions

If you spent your budget correctly you wouldn't need to get more money. But as [REDACTED] up the roads around suffolk it'll take millions to rectify your mistakes. traffic lights and planters are NOT the answer.

"If you waste ONE PENNY of this money on green [REDACTED], climate change lies or providing more underused cycle facilities for the cycling mafia, I will have your guts for garters and demand a judicial review.

Public transport support should focus on providing a proper network of basic daily services."

I'm not convinced SCC would put the benefits of new necessary roads, eg, Northern Ipswich bypass ahead of their own Nimbyism.

"I'm not sure Oyster card systems will be that useful for long - many areas are using phone apps instead (although a card would be useful for those without smart phones).

The key road improvement we need is for roads to be maintained - there are huge potholes all over Mid Suffolk. Many smaller lanes are becoming impassable. Residents are frequently loosing car tires due to puncture damage, imposing a big cost. Motorbikes and cyclists are at risk of accidents. Having driven through a number of other rural countries, the difference is stark - our road system seems to be falling apart. "

"I'm surprised at the concept of Oyster card. That has already been superseded in London.

It is extraordinary that it needs a devolution deal to ensure longer term planning"

Immaterial because the rural bus network is beyond recovery.

Important as long term and as long as it improves access to facilities and providers. Would be helpful to join up with neighbouring counties to provide seamless connectivity in region

Important but nowhere near enough and once independent of the Government they will wash their hands of it

Important due to students accessing education.

Important for long term planning and stability.

Important to know that the bus service is reliable in rural communities

Improve the bus service, the bus service is much better in Norfolk

improving bus frequencies and slashing ticket costs is a must. As more people can not or don't feel able to drive. Potholes also need to be fixed asap.

Improving local transport is vital

improving public transport is a high priority

Improving public transport is very important but at what cost. We need a clear and collaborative development plan, not infighting between parties in the council. The plan to directly elect a leader could result in this, particularly if their views are directly opposite to those of the council body.

improving the rural offers and generally reducing carbon emissions would be great and is very important

Improving travel infrastructure - having lived in Greater Manchester, their Bee Network with the tap-on/off system is really helpful and saves you having to get specific tickets or figure out what "zone" you're in

In principle this is great, but is £250,000 going to cover that.

In Suffolk, Transport is a key contributor to UK PLC.

In the big view of things, £250,000 is very little money, and will be virtually a tiny drop in the ocean.

Include Rail in the process as this shouldn't just be about buses

Increase transport services would be good, I use public transport so very useful

Inflation will absorb

Insignificant sum. Local bus services a complete disaster since deregulation.

Insufficient funding to make a great deal of difference where spread over the 30 year period

Integrate rail and bus services across Suffolk. Open new railway stations on current rail lines.

Investment can be made in one go, then yielding returns over the next few years rather than letting inflation erode the value of smaller annual payments.

Involvement in the 'local plan' for housing development only showed me that even when 'local' people are actually involved and oppose a development and postpone it through their campaigning efforts for 3 years - National Policy by government supersedes 'local'. The government is not fixed. We will probably have another political party in charge soon - with different priorities. Look at London - the citizen thief Labour in power there - gets from Tory government - over transport ULEZ etc

Ipswich needs more transport investment.

Is there really evidence from other devolved areas to support these ideas? I believe that following devolvement we will just end up with more over paid bureaucrats wasting more tax payers money.

it allows local residents to budget for transport is a good idea.

It depends how much money is available to be moved from subsidising private cars to public transport. Why mention the £250k? It is of no importance whatsoever.

It enables forward planning.

It goes to their mates whether it's paid in one year or multi year amounts.

It is always more cost effective to be able to see a bigger picture and plan ahead where costs will be required in the future

It is important to look at long term needs and aims. And with more housing developments being built, this would encourage people to take public transport if reliable and affordable transport is an option.

"It is very important to me, and see that the principle is ideal, but having seen the appalling waste of money and resources that currently goes on in the county I fear that the money would just be wasted in a worse way and we could be left with no money towards the end of the period.

Only potholes that are reported are being filled, and often done incredibly badly without taking into account the surrounding tarmac that is breaking up so that the teams need to keep coming back time and again to the same stretch of road, wasting travelling time at the very least, rather than coming out and doing a thorough, long term repair of a problematic section so it is done just once. "

It is vital to have the clear evidence and opinions of those who live and work in affected areas of all and any developments , expansions of areas that already have issues to have the ability to voice there issues and have resolutions applied opposed to talked about or promised then later to be dismissed as has been the case for an ever increasing number of the residents within this county.

It needs to be fairly handled as this is a large rural County with little rural transport. It could be hard to make a difference with this funding.

It seems sensible to have multi year funding but I find it hard to believe that it is a major restriction for long term planning.

It should help us plan.

It will be spent on buses and cycle lanes

it will help to ensure a properly planned and sustained series of improvements, as we have seen in Greater Manchester.

It will never happen

It won't be enough.

It won't fix a single pothole. It's earmarked for eco-Nazi flim-flams

"It would be encouraging if this devolution was accompanied by a transport plan that moves away from car centric models.

This should be provided on the condition it has to be used on schemes which are net zero carbon emitting or objectively improve traffic (by avoiding journeys rather than adding lanes to already busy routes or building new roads through greenfield settings)."

It would be positive to see improved bus routes within Suffolk to aid supporting Suffolk's economy

It would create more sustainable bus routes.

"It would depend on the details - rural bus services are fine but if they are underused there is no point paying for something not used.

I would genuinely want to see more to improve congestion - not vanity projects like the Ipswich Highways travel fit for 21st century which hasn't had the impact it needed by installing more traffic lights in Ipswich, filling in underpasses etc. these are ineffective wastes of money."

"it would enable long term planning

two important issues -

public transport in rural areas

road maintenance"

It would set out a long-term vision and goal that political parties within the county could agree too, so that if there is change of government within the county the day-to-day operations may change but the priority of transport remains fixed.

It'll just be wasted.

It's for the transport companies to make it easy to travel, for the council to oversee, tap on tap off scheme is being made available by the transport companies. At no expense to the council

It's not important to me personally but for older and young people those on lower incomes and in rural locations I can see it is important. Presumably longer term financial certainty means you can secure better value for money for us the taxpayer?

"It's peanuts

"

It's always "jam tomorrow" with SCC. Public transport in Suffolk is a disgrace due to the failings and ineptitude of SCC. SCC is clearly incapable of providing public transport, organising traffic management, reducing emissions pollution, or efficient town planning, so why throw good money after bad?

it's better to plan when there is a multi year agreement

It's disappointing to not see more detailed proposals here. Public transport is poor locally compared with other areas and much needs to be done.

It's important to be able to plan over more than one year but there are other ways to make this possible without devolution.

It's very important as we clearly need to improve transport planning and outcomes. Because the pulling of the Lower Orwell Crossing and the northern Ipswich bypass does not inspire me with confidence, I consider there needs to be a replacement of those at the Executive officer level and cabinet level with responsibility for transport if progress is to be made with the low level of funding provided under the Deal.



"It's very important that the roads in Suffolk are repaired due to the fact they have become dangerous to the walking public. And motorists

"

It's very important that this Administration led by Matthew Hicks does not have even more funds to mismanage - they can't fill potholes - they can't clear weeds and it takes five years to replace missing road signs - until they can prove they can deliver what they are responsible for now they must not be given more !!

It's very important to be able to reduce congestion, what's not important is worrying about net zero targets. Reducing congestions by widening roads, creating extra lanes for turning left at roundabouts and traffic lights to reduce traffic queues would be great, those methods of reducing congestion would be incredibly effective and in turn would reduce idling vehicles, thus shortening journey times which would positively impact emissions, but changing roads to 20 mile an hour speed limits and narrowing roads for cycle lanes is a complete and utter waste of time and should not be done, it will only increase congestion. In many cases especially on new bypass roads, we go to the trouble of making cyclists a separate cycle path and combined footpath away from the road, in many cases cyclists ignore this dedicated safe cycle path and cycle on the road anyway, this kind of extra spending as far as roads are concerned is not necessary. Great Yarmouth has just had a new bridge installed which has two lanes for traffic traveling in either direction, this was a great idea as during busy times the vehicles can choose which lane they need to be in so they can readily filter left or right upon crossing the bridge, in contrast the Gullwing bridge which is just been built in Lowestoft has only one lane of traffic in either direction which is absolutely ludicrous, as a result that £145m Gull Wing bridge actually has less capacity for the movement of traffic than the old 3 lane Bascule bridge in Lowestoft, the person that signed off on that needs to be sacked, what a waste of money. As a result when the Bascule ends up closed for maintenance as it inevitably will, traffic will then move even slower in the town.

Just fill the potholes in the roads.

Just makes more sustainable sense

Keep vital routes open for people who have no other options.

Lack of good transport links is a barrier for individuals wanting to access employment and education

Lack of public transport means more cars on the road and higher pollution. Increased transport options encourages people out to support local events, tourist areas and better employment options.

Lack of public transport seems to be why very few residents use or not suitable for the travel required.

Large projects take multiple years planning and work I would think.. not just one!

"Less public service keeps going on when we will need more

The electric cars are too expensive for many so we need more public services"

Let the public help themselves

let's be sensible and repair pot holes, undo all the bs planters and lane closures do away with pointless bus and cycle lanes

Like it has been proved before that you have a higher profile within Government to start negotiations from stronger positions.

Limited benefit and overall not a great idea to give to an authority who's politicians have consistently under performed

Lived here near 50 Years and have not seen one road improvement by SCC in my area always fob off but plenty in Ipswich

Living in a rural area I know how important public transport is for the young and older residents

Living in a rural area with almost non-existent bus service this would benefit both individuals & increase footfall to the towns.

Living in a rural area, transport is non-existent. 1/2 Million wasted developing a plan for where? Ipswich?

Living in a rural area, we have seen a progressive reduction in public transport to its current level of zero.

Loaded - I don't agree with devolution and the sum mentioned - it is not sufficient.

Local authority should not just be able to do what they want and ignore local residents points of view.

Local government is already making a mess of transport in local Suffolk towns, with permanent road closures leading to heavier traffic, more congestion, and pollution.

Local knowledge would help

Local services for rural communities, combined transport plans with neighbouring areas e.g. Essex, Norfolk and Cambridge and improved options for those who do not have access to cars.

Locally run bus services are a much better idea

Long term certainty of funding is critical to making good decisions especially for transport issues. This is a step in the right direction but Suffolk should seek to rapidly increase devolution in the area to get control of more of the central government transport funding.

Long term planning can still take place with some degree of certainty.

Long term planning essential

Long term planning essential.

Long term planning is a no brainier. It's one of the things that this country doesn't do enough of due to the constraints of Westminster.

long term planning of our local transport needs is essential but the planning process must change and involve all stakeholders and not just immediate residents. Motorists who regularly use roads must be consulted and while LTN's come with well intentioned ambitions we need to

give the electorate what they need and want. Restoring regular bus routes as part of network is essential.

Long term planning would mean that one-off ideas are avoided. As a country dweller I realize that buses are a vast money pit.

Longer term funding is good for planning but again, so long as the overall amount does not reduce significantly from the current annual funding. Feels like infrastructure (mainly roads) are already deteriorating so more will be needed just to restore the existing degradation.

Longer term funding will allow more strategic planning ahead.

Longer term planning around transport funding we'll give great a certain to providers and greater confidence to users, it is also an opportunity to robustly promote services, which is not being the case to date

Longer term planning for transport to support local industry.

Longer term planning helps companies and people, giving security needed for investment and decisions about house-buying

Longer term planning is likely to provide more efficient spending of the public purse and effect travel behaviour change in a more positive way.

Longer term sight is better for business planning

Long-term planning is essential for improvement and development of local public and, in particular, rural public transport systems particularly in view of the need to reduce private vehicles and congestion on roads and thus improve air quality.

Long-term transport infrastructure needs planning, but plans must be realistic and converted to actuality

Look after the travel facility for students and road users. Cycle lanes, fix pop holes

Look at towns that are desperate for a by pass, west of Bury St Edmunds. Brandon needs better roads.

Major projects can take several years to plan and implement and would benefit from longer term investment certainty

Make a plan to satisfy what real people need and evolve it; encourage less car use by having better, cheaper public transport; improve the public rights of way system to get more people fitter - and include all users, not just cyclists and walkers.

Make a strategy that actually addresses the growing emissions from transport. Invest in public transport, cycling and walking as a priority over private car infra.

Make sure it goes into rural areas

Maybe if you make a suitable business case it will be picked up. Norfolk seem to manage it

Maybe Suffolk could manage this. But do we have evidence that they are already equipped with the skills?

Money spent on public transport for future years is a good idea.

More accessible public transport

More buses

More connected especially in the west of the county

More control over road maintenance and provision of rural transport services

More money for road repair is certainly needed, but I doubt whether more people will want to or be able to use public transport.

More needs to be spent on reinstating lost rail routes rather than laying new roads. Bus service continuity will be welcome to enable people to rely on buses instead of cars.

More people using public transport is of course a good thing. It's greener and cheaper.

More people will need public transport, as places like Santon Downham has no busses at all. More elderly people are now giving up there cars, as at a certain age there is no point buying an electric car.

More roads, and less carbon emissions to help travelling in distant areas of Suffolk.

Multi year funding is obviously a benefit. But the main need is for more busses on all routes, even those that don't break even.

Multi year funding is a good idea. Although it needs to be managed and planned for the long term. SCC needs to start by bringing the existing transport infrastructure up to scratch before rolling out new ideas that will likely only benefit urban areas.

Multi year funding makes strategic planning worthwhile but the focus should be on modal shift (ie away from private car to active travel) to reduce carbon emissions and promote health/wellbeing

Multi year funds could improve planning for the future.

Multi year is helpful

Multi year is that 2 years if so not more certainty need make it clearly on the years as understand more years can do bigger projects however major ones gets capital funding if means can't get this capital now then it's a huge negative

Multi year or annual is irrelevant. Make better use of what you have

Multi-year funding is a positive development, however, not if tied to increased budget controls by LA. There is little evidence that SCC has performed well under the current regime, as such, there is little confidence this would improve under the proposal.

Multi-year funding is a positive, in that it allows longer-term investments to be made in transport. But it is no secret that councils everywhere are short of cash, with some going bankrupt. We need to understand what provisions the council will make to ensure that sustainable levels of funding for transport continue to be available in the years when no funding is due from central government.

multi-year funding is essential to allow for proper planning, but the proposals for smart ticketing would only work in larger towns. Need a much greater focus on improving access to services in rural areas - not just bus routes that will be cut again once the funding runs out!

"Multi-year funding is obviously better as it enables you to plan longer-term. Living in a rural area personally, public transport is poor in terms of frequency and affordability so anything to improve this would be beneficial.

"

Multi-year funding packages are generally a good idea.

Multi-year funding settlements are vital for effective strategic planning, budgeting and investment.

Multi-year funding would allow certainty of decision making, rather than short term expensive contract and services.

Multi-year funding would help planning local transport, including rural transport, but a two year funding scheme at £250,000 per year is probably a drop in the ocean unless that is funding to design and set up a scheme which would need to be funded from other funds. The need for public transport is increasingly important but it will be very difficult to encourage car users to abandon their existing type of transport unless there is an alternative comprehensive and viable alternative assured to the future. Difficult to achieve both at the same time.

"Multi-year funding would mean feeling assured that any positive changes made by the council would be here to stay. I often feel that issues with bus times are due to congestion on the roads, particularly due to the one-way systems in place around the city. I understand the need for these one-way systems due to the way the city is built, however putting forward funding to reduce this congestion would have a positive knock-on effect for public transport around the city as well as being positive for car drivers.

The other schemes mentioned here sound incredibly positive, with buses into rural areas giving people without cars the ability for freedom and access to other areas of the county and of the country, without needing to own a car. It also gives people the ability to explore the county and its rural spaces with more freedom.

Knowing these changes could be long term and could increase tourism around Suffolk, and make the whole county more accessible for its inhabitants and any visitors to the county. "

Multi-year transport settlements have huge potential, but the value of this is of utmost importance as this is a sector largely premised on infrastructure delivery where cost uncertainty brings substantive risk. However, this would likely see a step change in the way transport projects are planned, determined and developed - ideally, built from the bottom - up through a more community focused and engagement-led development approach (COM-B model).

Multi-year would at least make planning a bit easier. Oystercards are old technology in London, but ticketing across operators is really important, and centralising data is critical. But again the sums here are pathetic and totally lack aspiration. It's tinkering, not finding solutions.

Must have tangible and real benefits to encourage people to travel from rural areas.

My area has had cutbacks on bus service. #77 Landguard area and #73 Old Felixstowe . Many in these areas rely on public transportation to go to work, school, and especially the elderly to get to doctors appointments or shopping. It has become woefully inadequate!!

My experience suggests that most schemes particularly in Ipswich provide no benefit and add to congestion. If we had less traffic lights we would have less congestion and less pollution.

My son uses school bus services that we pay for. Very happy for this to be cheaper.

Nationalise public transport.

Need to be able to plan transport for the future.

NEED TO CONNECT IPSWICH TO EAST SUFFOLK (SOUTHWOLD, BECCLES ETC)

Need to fix the dire state of the roads , pot holes everywhere , stop wasting money on bike lanes that aren't used by anyone

Need to improve public transport to prevent isolation and enable visits to hospitals etc - particularly for those without cars - ie elderly and women with children.

Need to improve the roads before offering transport schemes or there will be nowhere for transport to go

Need to mend more roads longterm than just patch repairs again and again

Needed for improvement to many roads, especially the Codock to Seven Hills section of the A14, dualling of the A12 to Sax and beyond, Ipswich N Distributor, improvements of S22 around Lowestoft.

"Needs to be joined up thinking.

Too many rural areas ignored.

Again money isn't much.

Surely council suggests needs and not everything is controlled from central government?  
Therefore not sure where the vision would come from"

Never had buses in our rural area - trains should be a lot cheaper, as should car parking

Nice idea though it is, the fact is that much larger sums would be needed to make a reliable, regular public service work. Most of the population of Suffolk lives in market towns and satellite villages. Those commuting to towns for work have no option but to drive because the bus timetables are centred on school runs. Forget using any public transport at night for social visits or leisure activities. It would cost millions to fix this problem and the paltry sums on offer don't scratch the surface.

No confidence you would do any of the things you have mentioned.

No devolution

no obvious downsides and enables longer term planning (Sizewell bypass)

No services now

No to Devolution!

"No to Net Zero and reducing carbon emissions

CO2 is 0.04% of the atmosphere, human activity is responsible for 3% of emissions

If CO2 drops beneath 0.02% plant life dies

"

No, again SCC should not be allowed anywhere near this money. Just look at the current of public throughout the county, especially in the west of the county.

No, you couldn't run it.

No-brainer, this should be standard for all Local Authorities.

Not any improvement

Not enough local buses and not enough restrictions on car use.

Not enough to make any meaningful impact.

not important to me but is to others

Not keen on forced oyster cards being introduced as in London

"Not much faith in the ability to organise and deliver multi year planning in reality unless different professionals involved.

"

Not relevant outside of bSE and Ipswich. Roads need desperate repair but cheap fixes locally. Same pot holes keep reappearing jneeeeks as not repaired properly. Disgraceful waste of funds

Not relevant to me.

Not sure how that would affect budgeting differently as I am not sure how it works at present

Not sure how this would work, considering the cost of living crisis at present, also who would want to do the work needed for this?

Not to waste on cameras and slowing everyone down,, but to improve the roads for motorists so they can get from Ato B quickly and efficiently. A northern bypass for Ipswich is badly needed.

Not with you level of cimpetence

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the |Council are capable of managing this money properly

Officers need greater certainty on funding to be able to plan better.

Oh my there goes my bus pass

OH YES

On a personal basis a local bus service after 6pm and on Sundays would be very welcome.

Once again it should be organised and coordinated uk wide

One of the major causes of underutilisation of skills in rural areas is lack of or poor reliability of transport.

Only if integrated at the regional level. The east speaking with government with one single voice - funding for the east can then be prioritised accordingly across the county's

Only if public transport in Lowestoft area is improved as well

Only way proper investment in new technology/vehicles can happen is with the security of longer terms to write off the investment

Only with longer duration funding and contracts can we pilot and evaluate better transport solutions.

Ooh! Joined up long term planning? Yes please. My village has no bus service at all during school holidays so no-one can use buses to get to work in neighbouring towns. Vital.

Other areas doing this are huge cities and conglomerations; that's why they get noticed.

Other devolution deals are not at County level and provide greater electoral gain to Cent. Govt with an elected mayor. Devolution at this level is unlikely to attract higher profile.. The small monetary benefits do not address the underlying challenges at all.

Our roads are botched and patched up by cheap work which does not last looks terrible and is a waste of money

Our roads are in a disgusting state. Without this funding our town cannot cope with the growth that is continuing.

Our trains and train stations need investment.

Outlying villages should be provided with better transport services

"Oyster card idea is a typical none-starter of current SCC politicians. Really!

Get in outside agencies to run transport. E.g. Derbyshire. Very rural area, similar issues to Suffolk. Great work and actual accountable achievements. Or Lincolnshire is another example.  
"

"Oyster card system is basically redundant at this point - most people will have access to a smart phone to use contactless payment. Invest in the infrastructure, reduce travel costs to encourage people to use public transport and increase the amount of locations within Suffolk that can be accessed by bus.

Improve the service on offer first, then look to change the wheel once funding is secured. "

Oyster cards and carbonised etc are areas that have negative impact on customer pricing and availability of service. Local councilors are not educated enough in these areas.

Oyster card-style smart ticketing is a good idea if the transport was also in place in rural areas

Oyster card-style ticketing would only work where there are buses. 250,000 won't go far over 2 years. Favouritism by government for devolved areas could be a fad and with a general election imminent this could change. Multi-year transport funding would need to be budgeted correctly and not all spent at once

Oyster like contactless payments

Oyster-style smart ticketing would be very welcome, but there is no indication that multi-year funding would mean more money. The only new money is £0.5m over two years, to develop Suffolk's Local Transport Plan. This would also be welcome, but the SCC budget for those years would be increased by just 0.003%.



Past precedents show SCC wouldn't be capable of managing this.

People don't avoid taking the bus because of the cost or the way of paying, they do so because taking the car is quicker and easier and wastes less of their valuable time.

Perhaps you could get councillors to agree a=on what is required for more than one year?

Perhaps you could start with repair the existing roads. The current state are an embarrassment and you should be ashamed of yourselves.

plan for future not piecemeal

Planning is a no brainer!

Please do not waste money on consultants. Make decisions with public input.

Please see my answer concerning devolution as a policy above. There is no reason why the government could not provide longer term budgets to Councils now.

positive step for long term planning

Precisely how SCC envisages addressing Suffolk's premature deaths & poor health due to air pollution must be central to the vision. Quantifying the clean air benefits & measuring their delivery should be objectively & independently assessed (not the usual spin).

Previous track record of road improvement schemes isn't good . Don't waste more money. Reducing congestion won't work . People will always prefer to use there car. Charging a congestion fee etc is only a cash cow as people will pay another tax to use there car

Proper joined-up public transport would ease traffic pressures and pollution, but must be affordable to use - and the infrastructure must be there to support it. Many places in Suffolk are simply not accessible by public transport, or too infrequently to make it an attractive option.

Provide park and ride transport to town centres

Provided the council is able to take a consistent long term approach and not make party political decisions then it sounds good.

Provides continuity

Public transport around Sudbury is terrible

public transport has been ignored for many years and as well as improving the standard of life facilitating easy travel throughout the county will generate a knowledge of Suffolk

Public transport in rural areas is non existent. Elsewhere it is too expensive, particularly the railway system. This should need tackled at national level by renationalising.

Public transport in Suffolk is a joke.the reduction in congestion is a contradiction in terms when very local authority is building houses and allocated land like there is no to morrow

Public transport in Suffolk is currently woeful

Public transport is a joke in most of suffolk if you live in a village there's no chance of getting a bus for work everyday and some don't even have a Saturday service to the nearest town anymore

"Public transport is costly & in some places poor or even non-existent. Rather than building more roads, we should and ought to be making all transport work. For example, lorries running loaded both ways instead of delivering a load then travelling many miles empty, trains & buses better intergrated as well as affordable...buses even run out of service rather than, shock horror, carry fare paying passenger!

Less vehicles means that not only do we need less roads building, it free's up money to improve what roads we do have.

I'm disabled with a mobility issue and public transport in my locality is poor. Vehicle it is then"

Public transport is dirty and expensive

"Public transport is in need of desperate funding and many villages are being left virtually isolated. This in turn fuels the NEED for a car rather than using public transport which could save them money and is more environmentally friendly by lowering the carbon footprint of the individual.

It's also invaluable for elderly residents who may not have a car and need or want to visit the nearest town for shopping or leisure. "

Public transport is so poor that it needs major infrastructure spending and this deal does not address that

Public transport is useful, but I do not know whether the Oyster card system is beneficial or a waste of money...will it positively impact people's lives if their priority is good value for money and regular, reliable public transport?

Public transport must be available to all equally for transport to work, schooling, health and shopping. It should be applied rurally as much as urban to level up the ability to educate and involve persons in local industries.

Public transport provides a sustainable, viable solution to congestion. I would love to see our local transport systems improved and an Oyster style system would bring Suffolk to the 21st century!

Public transport so dire doubt if multi year funding will make any difference.

Public transport that is frequent and reliable will reduce carbon emissions and also ensure that rural communities are not isolated

Quick and better links in Suffolk and outside.

Real needs<sup>7</sup>

Really long term planning is far better that quick fix.

reduce congestion and carbon emissions, introduce Oyster card-style smart ticketing and improve the bus offer in rural areas? Suffolk is a very rural county, I highly doubt our carbon footprint is causing a panic, stop pandering to this false idea of carbon neutral whilst other

countries are sticking their fingers up and cracking on while the UK are wasting money and turning inside out to virtual signal how clever and green we are. Oyster card ticketing, why?? its not needed, fix the [REDACTED] roads and put a few more busses in service you dont need an oyster card for fixing the basics

Reduces uncertainty but also reduces flexibility. See no overall benefit (except to power hungry councillors)

Reducing the number of car journeys is only possible with reliable and affordable public transport.

Repair the [REDACTED] roads instead

Road improvements are necessary and oyster style ticketing is long overdue

Road planning very essential. The taxi scheme for disabled needs revising as only allows few journies now.

Road schemes in Ipswich are poorly implemented and maintained. Some parts of the county are embarrassing

roads and infrastructure first to enable motor vehicles to travel efficiently. less emphasis on bus travel, park and ride schemes and cycle routes.

Roads need constant maintenance and a better transport system in rural areas is vital to keep people connected. Buses should run regularly, in various directions and Be affordable

"Roads need repairing and improving, Ipswich needs a Northern bypass. Too many hours lost and revenue because the Orwell bridge is closed.

"

Rubbish, they have [REDACTED] Ipswich big time with their stupid schemes.

Rural areas in particular need a longer term plan i.e. longer hours for bus services and new bus stations.

Rural areas need a balanced approach to transport needs. Good bus services.and a sensible approach to car access which will promote use of town centres and need bleed them

Rural areas need better public transport. At the moment some areas never see a bus.

Rural areas need transport

Rural bus routes have led to isolation and loss pf access to town centre retail access.

Rural bus services are effectively worthless as-is. People won't stop using their cars unless it's cheaper to take the bus than park.

rural bus services need improving

Rural buses important if in a village, look at bus cuts the past few years. Bridges need rebuilding when old/insufficient capacity.

Rural roads are ruined, public transport only works in towns and carbon emission schemes are another way to tax working people and rural people who don't have a choice of a bus because there aren't any!

Rural transport is vital to levelling up, but again it needs an overall plan which covers all 400 plus towns and parishes e.g. where are the gaps, how might they be filled etc. That should drive the funding and the form it should take. This is as much a district council issue.

"rural transport. villages are cut off and those who cannot drive particularly so.

Do not forget that not everyone uses the internet. Please do not exclude them."

"Rural transportation improvements would be welcome environmentally and to reduce social isolation

Reducing potholes for all modes of transport "

same answer as q5

SCC are not capable of being trusted to use this money wisely.

SCC do not supply a ' fit for purpose ' transport system / policy at the moment . Please do not give them more funds to waste.

SCC does not provide a value for money service at the moment so giving them more funds would be wasting even more of ' our money ' .

SCC have current responsibility and due to a lack of central government funding they are unable to provide adequate services. So this is more Tory [REDACTED]

SCC's handling (and wastefulness) of road repairs is woeful. SSC must NOT get control of this money and waste more.

School transport, SEND transport and more general bus services. Particularly in more rural areas, but don't forget even some towns do not have proper, regular bus services at the moment.

See earlier answers.

See my earlier comments re. local transport provision.

See previous

"See previous answer about roads.

Rural buses are a black hole as they are. Everyone has to have a car in villages to work. Small hopper services, as in Norfolk, would be a better solution.

As for reducing congestion and carbon emissions.... forget it. The traffic calming schemes are universally disliked and if you make car transit difficult without providing alternative parking, business suffers and people will simply move elsewhere. All the cycle schemes are not designed by people who commute by bike, or even ride for more than ten miles a week, and so do not work for even average road cyclists, who want to keep to about 15mph. For that, they need to be in the road, because most cycle infrastructure has too many junctions. Councils

have not made good decisions here - the orange wands in Ipswich are disliked because they are not any protection from a car and if clipped they may send someone over their handlebars.

Cyclists, like motorists, just want good roads where the potholes are fixed, the surface is good, and the lines of sight and junctions sensible and easy to use. The best roads in this county are Roman roads, two millenia later. We can and should be doing much better.

Anyway... the Council has a poor record on this and thus should not be making these decisions."

See previous answers

See previous responses.

Short term decisions are a great weakness of local government

Simple it's very important.

Smart ticketing would be good. I would use the trains more if it were simpler but there are no bus services near enough to me so this is irrelevant to me.

So far I see no evidence that the Conservative MP's and Councillors which have run Suffolk for almost my whole lifetime have any expertise. Buses and trains are worse than ever. Again I would rather wait for a labour government to develop a long term country wide infrastructure plan. We have no Andy Burnhams here who may get things done properly - and even he cannot sort the cross penine train problems so I have no expectation of our current councillors solving any local issues.

So long as scc understands a rural network does not work the same way as an urban network and can't be funded or managed as such. We used to have a bus in our village but years of chronic underfunding has left while villages isolated.

So rather than receive funding annually, you'll receive it over a length of time? £250,000 is not a lot of money in these current times where just re surfacing one Street with new lights would cost that and more.

So the money won't actually go to transport, just used to lobby the government to get more funds?

So we can plan ahead and make the investments needed.

So you can plan ahead

Something NEEDS TO HAPPEN, as for myself in south Suffolk, public transport is appalling!!!

Sounds good in theory, but £500k over two years won't achieve much

Sounds like a much stronger reason in favour of devolution than anything I've read in this survey so far

Sounds like a slippery slope towards congestion charges, low emission zone charging, increased parking charges etc....

Spend more on the roads.

Stop empty busses polluting our towns.

Stop trying to come up with frivolous schemes that waste money and just focus on improving what we already have!

Such funding would allow for greater certainty and stability to support public transport as a viable option for people.

Suffolk can't be trusted

Suffolk council already has control of this, and has not even managed a cross - company bus pass scheme. Anyone wanting to rely on public transport needs to buy several passes each month, making it uneconomical.

Suffolk County Council are incapable of maintaining the current road system. Fix what we have as a matter of urgency for the good of all road users, so businesses and commuters and tourists feel like we care about them transporting good, getting to work etc. Why waste money on a smart oyster type system? Oyster cards are old hat. Everyone uses their phones, even me and I'm old. I gave my oyster up 5 years ago.

Suffolk county council has managed to wreck transport in Suffolk throwing money at them will not help.

Suffolk has been plagued with poor roads, ridiculous traffic measures, uncoordinated road works and closures. Need to accept people use cars.

Suffolk has some of the worst transport links in the country. More control and investment in this area is essential - especially for those who prefer not to or can't drive, such as the elderly, young people, and those with disabilities. Having more investment in bus services, especially in rural parts of the county with poor access to train services, is helpful in the short and long term.

Suffolk has some poor transport links which needs addressing.

Suffolk is a very rural county, public transport is key to ensure people, not just the elderly are cut off.

Suffolk is incapable of planning transport. National contracts will always override local needs.

Suffolk is largely rural and buses and cycling only work efficiently in urban areas, therefore the policy emphasis has to be on using private cars, sufficient town centre parking and minor road maintenance. Any other solution is financially unsustainable.

Suffolk is not London, Manchester or Birmingham we do not have a transport system fit for purpose. we are a very rural area bus services would not run at a constant rate to replace driving . Rail is too costly and does not link areas in the same way as the mentioned areas .

Suffolk is predominantly rural. Good public transport is essential.

Suffolk is very rural and our bus services are constantly being removed and reduced. Need these services to continue and be good to help traffic and pollution as well as access for non drivers

Suffolk road are congested and options to make public transport an option is needed

Suffolk roads surfaces need on going renewal, upgrading but just importantly maintainance of gutter drain to be regularly cleaned and cleared. There used to be a "sludge gulper" type maintenance machine in regular use - why isn't this continued? Clear gully ways; clear drains - less flooding. Clear roadside ditches by landowners and Suffolk County Council

Support creation of more small local bus services such as the Katch service south from Framlingham, to plug the significant number of regular bus service holes in Suffolk.

Surely it takes more than a year to plan and implement an infrastructure project so having it on a multi-year basis would enable better planing and implementation and possibly cost saving.

The £2 bus fares have been great and there could be many more improvements made linking up routes and timetables with rail. Also special buses for festival type events or visits to the sea etc

The ability to engage in longer term transport planning is important as most schemes will require for than single year planning and investment.

The ability to plan long term is crucial. Monies must be inflation linked, otherwise SCC just receives less each year which undermines the concept of being able to plan long term

The ability to plan over the longer term is important and could help a cultural shift if more investment went into cycling infrastructure and subsidising public transport. Disappointed that we need £500,000 for consultants that don't know Suffolk to develop a plan.

THE AMMOUNTS OF MONEY TALKED ABOUT INDICATE S ONLY MINOR PROJECTS

the amount of money is small & for 2 years only, no guarantee negotiating with government would be any advantage, particularly if more councils go down this route

The bus is cheaper than the trains, but the abysmal bus coverage rurally when you want to go anywhere other than Ipswich is terrible. Having infrastructure such as live update timetable feeds at main bus stations in each big town or literally just a bin next to them would make the experience better overall. Also it would be nice if we could use that money to support training new bus drivers too. Bus lanes in workable areas with traffic is something that would significantly increase likelihood of the buses being used more often. Too many times has time been wasted sitting in traffic on the bus into Ipswich , to the point where people just get off and walk the rest into the town. A bus lane priority system in places would solve that.

The bus service in Ipswich is very good. I cannot comment on the rest of the county. Other devolved areas are mainly more urban than Suffolk so there is no point in comparing them.

The bus service in our area is a complete waste of money with a constant procession of empty double deckers buses clogging small lanes and roads

The bus services have greatly declined in recent years and a longterm plan to reverse this would be well received

The challenges of our current transport infrastructure and the year on year approach to funding makes longer term planning with impact very difficult. The longer term funding approach should enable more certainty around plans and this must include making more affordable and easier access for those in rural and coastal areas in relation to work and study

The Conservative led country council have only made our roads worse in the last 20+ years they've been in power, why should the people trust them with increased responsibility?

The council are incapable of maintaining the roads as it is. It contractor is useless and more money or longer term money will not improve incompetence

The council can't budget within year. The thought of them having a bigger budget is terrifying.

The development of long term transportation projects in Suffolk is incredibly important and will benefit the county.

The figures being discussed do not currently meet the funding required to meet any of the rural area transport needs. Whilst this goes towards maintaining a status quo the ability to improve will be limited.

The funding should be used to fix the road surface and potholes before any other scenarios are considered.

The government should give this money to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding of local authorities over the last 14 years. Don't waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The idea of multi-year transport funding is very important, the idea in this deal however is very dated. We are suggesting the use of technology which is 20 years out of date and being phased out in London and elsewhere in favour of single ticketing mobile/credit card payments. Whilst there may be limited evidence of greater success for devolved authorities - this is with a Government that won't exist in 6 months time. Government should just come up with a fairer way of promoting transport solutions nationwide - rather than being encouraged to create "more favourable" routes for planning and gaining funding.

The logic given above is too fanciful to be worth considering.

The money could easily be wasted on projects such as smart ticketing rather than the essentials

"The money involved is insufficient and won't make a difference.

As history shows the SCC cabinet are pretty clueless when it comes to rural transport "

The money is better spent annually

The money on offer simply won't be enough to facilitate what is required

The money will be allocated at the beginning, and I am sure I inflation will eat a big chunk of it before any projects happen.

The multi-year aspect should be valuable, if used wisely.

The oyster card system is the needs explaining more, if it works like the London underground, where you can just tap your card or phone, great idea. If you are supposing pre paid cards, waste of time. Most people use contactless payments anyway, and for those that don't, they wont use pre paid card, so just stick to normal tickets.

"The population in Suffolk is probably older than in other counties

As people age they will need to rely increasingly on public transport, particularly in rural areas"

The road network and conditions in Suffolk are clearly in need of improvement to attract outside investment



The roads are in the worst condition they have been and if you aren't spending money fixing them now I don't see that changing and will probably be wasted on the oyster card nonsense and carbon emissions nonsense

The roads are very congested in the lovely county and generally in poor condition.

The roads badly need repair, the bus service should be run like the new Manchester model.

"The roads in Ipswich are in an atrocious state and repairs/ reconstruction has been going downhill since SCC took back responsibility from IBC.

There are many many roads in need of decent resurfacing. "

The roads scc are currently responsible for are terrible and dangerous, work and repair is shoddy and clearly mismanged. Dont give them any more

The scope for longer term planning and co-ordination of public transport will be improved.

The statement is so weak frankly it is not worth commenting on

The Suffolk transport network is currently appalling and getting worse by the year. Public transport urgently needs millions to provide better services and encourage more people to use it.

the sums involved are pathetic

"The timing and positioning of traffic lights and road layouts in Ipswich are the main cause of traffic jams. I'll bet this isn't even on your list of intended improvements.

The roads are also in an appalling condition with pot holes everywhere.

The cycle lanes are all unused while cyclists pass pedestrians at high speed on the pavements.

Motorists pay huge amounts of tax, yet you wish to ignore the above and provide more buses instead."

The transition from internal-combustion powered transport cannot be left to year-by-year short term decisions

The transport issue is dire. If you don't drive and or have a vehicle you are completely restricted

The transport system in this area has been decimated by local government, why give them a chance to wreck it completely

The young and the elderly are the main users of very local transport.. Urban areas are better served as the demand is greater. Rural areas need improved links to their places of work etc which can be accessed.. Many adults use part car part bus >train. Support in parking so as not to aggravate residential areas.

There is a benefit from certainty of funding, but also a benefit from maintaining flexibility so I am agnostic on this.

There is a definite need to improve the frequency of local bus routes, especially to serve rural areas

There is a likely disadvantage to this in terms of whether multi-year transport funding can use up finite budget irrationally before ahead planning is decided.

There is much that can be done to integrate public transport eg rail/bus through ticketing and comparative pricing between rail and bus. It is less obvious how a smart-card system would work across a mix of urban and rural with very different levels of prioritism.

There seems to be a strong argument favouring multi-year transport funding as it would provide greater stability for the future of road improvement in the county and enhance the availability of central governments funding which would not otherwise be available

They won't run where we need them. They never do. Only if you're a townie.

This allows for longer term forecasting

This amount is a FRACTION of what will be needed now and in the future over 30 years. Think how much inflation has risen in just 10 years.

This amount is not enough to make any significant difference again not index linked

This could actually be a positive, providing long term security for the transport offer but again, it depends on competency

This could be useful. However I don't trust the competence of local government to spend it wisely. Their highways department is not fit for purpose as it is, along with many other SCC departments .

This does make sense. Some decent capital for first two years.

"This feels a smarter option with transport a longer bet. Transport is an important area to me as I prefer to utilise trains or walking and keep driving to a minimum.

An Oyster-style system would be good - the fragmented bus system in the UK is a disaster. The model of private companies running services with no ticket integration means I gave up using buses a number of years ago. I would be more likely to use buses if an integrated ticketing system like Oyster or Bee Network in Manchester were in place."

This has zero value, bus services are terrible, that's why no one uses them if they have any other option available - introducing an oyster card is like putting lipstick on a pig - it's still a pig.

This is a difficult area. With electric vehicles out priced for most people & the viability of home charging, many more will need public transportation, but can it be provided for the masses????

This is a poor deal.

This is a very important subject and needs tackling, but as I don't think the evolution should take place in the first place I see is almost in the relevant question

This is absolutely crucial to be able to have an integrated transport system across Suffolk. All bus and rail companies need to be coordinated and not working in competition with each other.

This is absolutely vital. The scale of systemic change required to deliver systems of public transport that actually meet the needs of real people, and local hard infrastructure that makes our streets safer and acceptable for the average person to consider walking or cycling for short local journeys, needs a longer timescale to enable projects to be delivered in a way that is joined up and strategic.

This is all if, butts and maybe's. The national government is likely to change in the near future and the next governments priorities will be different. The sentence above which includes 'seem to have a higher profile' is not evidence that extra funding will be obtained

This is desperately needed in West Suffolk

This is helpful.

This is imperative

"This is important! However, if we are given more funding, whoever is in charge needs to be replaced so we can actually see benefits of this extra funding.

Also, get rid of the useless bus lane on west end road! Anyone with some common sense can see that all it does is cause more congestion. This is very basic understanding, so if who is in charge cannot see something so obvious, they need replacing!!!!!!"

This is in-line with the UN sustainable development goals which are completely deceptive and go against what is good and true. I don't fall for the nonsense of electric vehicles as the power for those comes from power plants, coal, oil, gas and nuclear anyway. It's an absolute lie. I take offense to the infringement on my privacy that more surveillance will cause. I will not give up my freedoms and I don't support LTNs one bit. No thank you!

This is mostly aimed at aged and young non drivers rurally. Most ordinary people have to drive and do. I do not believe the climate change myth

This is one area where planning for roads and transport could benefit . But not sure it is enough for the poor current road conditions.

This is sadly lacking and in some cases none existent other than big towns. Our small towns are soon to be bigger because of the necessity for more homes to be built, consequently we need more transportation around the local area to enable residents to link up with other villages and towns helping to stop pollution and using more green energy

This is the area in which county can most help districts/borough, as my previous answers indicate - the money must be used wisely for sustainable projects that benefit the greatest number of people

This is very important, more charging ports for EVs and making public transport a more attractive and cost effective option to encourage people to rely less on their cars and be more active in their transport choices.

This isn't a priority

This makes me more and more angry as the questions go on - scrambling around for pots of money that should be come to local areas based on population and need, not how much they want to suck up to the Govt!

This money is pitiful. But green transportation has got to be at the heart of any decisions made.

This on the face of it sounds better, but it might be due to political affiliations, rather than if it's devolved or not. I'm sceptical.

This should be happening anyway and is nothing to do with having an elected "non-mayor".

This should improve scheme planning but by inference negotiating skills need improving should the deal not be accepted. What is the Local Transport Plan? What do get for £500,000? How many consultants?

This sounds good although depends on what it would be spent on and not efficient if we get a council and leader with different transport priorities.

This sounds like a good idea to support long term planning and encourage more people to use public transport. Personally I don't feel we will ever reduce the number of cars on the road now as most people are so dependent on them.

This sounds sensible especially if it helps restore links to more remote areas. Should alternatives to buses also be considered in urban areas?

This type of funding is essential to provide flexibility and greater control of costs.

This will enable the council to plan in advance with confidence and provide transport links between towns and housing developments which are often on the outskirts of towns and villages. People need good transport links not only for work but for doctors, / dentists etc as well as for social activities.

This will help to develop a proper longer term plan and delivery of that for this key part of infrastructure. If a smart card system is proposed for public transport, I hope this will operate in conjunction with adjoining geographies because very many public transport journeys regularly cross those political boundaries

This would be wasted on yet more 20mph areas, cycle lanes and anti car legislation

To be able to plan ahead

To be able to plan on a multi year basis should be standard but again there are concerns of what this is really worth in the medium to long term!

To increase the number of bus services provided in outlying villages.

To little to late

To reduce congestion on roads Suffolk needs better and improved transport services. If multi year transport funding will give better services I am for it. Point is to improve transport services not to increase moneys in someones back pocket.

to support public transport for local communities, especially those in rural areas, and to work on improving air quality particularly in our rural towns and villages

To the people of West Suffolk, it's unlikely that we'll see any improvement on a pretty poor service. Ipswich, and Lowestoft would probably be the only places to benefit.

"Tories must go!

Any Tory project will be a corrupt one. "

"Traffic free areas in large towns with excellent connected transport services

More rural services

Free/low-cost parking"

Transport can be better as rural areas can always receive better links but a shift away from annual payments concerns me somewhat as it could be issues of misallocating funds which would require a multi-year wait. But I still agree somewhat a it could also lead to smarter and more thought out decision making

Transport cannot be secure of every year it has to be negotiated

transport currentlty is rubbish

Transport in rural areas poses as a barrier for residents accessing service, training and job opportunities. Better transport links, smoother services will help remove this barrier.

Transport in Suffolk is desperate for improvement.

"Transport is a big issue locally and nationally. As a county with a lot of rural roads suffering damage due to considerable demand for building new homes near the major a14 link

road, we could benefit from being able to find the creation of a better improvement plan. "

Transport is currently shocking and needs regeneration

Transport is essential in a area like suffolk

Transport is essential in Suffolk especially in rural areas that lack any or many connections but this should also be used to redevelop the massively declining state of the highway infrastructure

Transport is needed. More buses, trains (cheaper)

Transport is one of the most important aspects of a healthy community on a county level

transport is the biggest mess in Suffolk if more money sorts the incompetence then we must do it

Transport is the lifeblood of the economy and life in general. Better Public transport is vital to get Suffolk moving.

transport is woeful in Suffolk so this may help?

Transport links in the county play an important role ensuring our customers are able to conduct their daily business, and important for Suffolk to be seen as a good place to locate to.

Transport needs long term planning

Transport needs some support in terms of public and special needs but the bottom line is when it comes to Suffolk-we need our roads sorted out, fixing of the potholes especially in the through towns such as Sudbury or around villages.

Transport on roads and rail should be coordinated across the country. Suffolk does not suffer congestion in comparison to a number of other areasThe focus should be on access in rural

areas to transport. This would improve access to towns and business would benefit and reduce loneliness, particularly in older people.

Transport projects are begun all over the country. We could do with more of them, but the issue is funding/planning. I can not see how devolution can improve that.

transport should be across counties and joined up

Transport to rural areas are vital! The prices need to be affordable too, especially for the unemployed

Transport whether public or private is a big problem in Suffolk

Transport? Cycle ways? Cycle paths are either non existent or very poor condition. These should be given higher priority when considering transport.

Travel is poorly planned currently

Unimportant unless thinking and planning can only be done in small parts! In which case, recruitment maybe ought to be looked at. Annually or 'multi year, is irrelevant compared to the ability to forward plan.

Using the money to develop a Plan is pointless and a waste of money

Using words like could are generally a precursor for excuses as to why you couldn't or it didn't work out the way we were led to believe

Very important as neglected at the moment in view of all the extra home building in Suffolk and Sizewell C/windfarm projects our roads are so congested - the A12/14 is often blocked so traffic goes through the little villages. Just put a road over the north of Ipswich please!

Very important but once again a failure of national government. All of these things could be done under the existing framework with decent government.

Very important, if funding was more secure this can only be a good thing.

Very important. Travelling from Lowestoft to other parts of Suffolk is very difficult because of the single lane A12, which is congested, will be made worse by HGVs from Lowestoft port to Sizewell C main site, before and after the new link road is built. Perhaps a regular, direct bus service between Lowestoft and Ipswich (linking with Cardinal Park and Stansted connections, college access) and Lowestoft and Bury St. Edmunds is a consideration to reduce the number of cars on the road.

"Very important. The loss of transport in rural

Suffolk is making people even more isolated"

Vital in enabling more coherent planning

Vital. Connectivity is so important. Integration is key – we need to be able to switch seamlessly between bus and train, and the 66 can't leave the Ipswich station forecourt just as arriving train passengers come out the front doors.

viz previous answer

Waste of time and money. I'd rather have another stupid monument erected in the Cornhill....

We all need transport, daily or time to time. With Ulez coming in gradually around the U.K, I think jumping on a electric bus from a park and ride, near a large Town/ City, is a great idea, reducing our carbon footprint, reducing busy traffic in these high volume areas to. And hey hats off to car manufacturer Dacia,the Dacia Spring EV caris out Oct 24 £14995 our. Maybe soon we can all start to move over. £50k for a Tesla was a bit steep.

We are a rural area and devolved counties were sitting at all the tables where it matters, you don't. If I am a volunteer in Suffolk and have to work in norfolk because the are fulfilling their statutory duties, I go to national events on my profession and all bar one council are present. You are missing so if you aren't at the tables of course others will get the money. Norfolk are pulling in money and they are not devolved yet. But the difference. They are at the table, talking, fighting their corner.

We are a rural county and so inproved public transport has to be a good thing

We are very rurally located and could never justify a bus service that could help us

We cannot compare transport policy success of metropolitan councils with proposals for rural Suffolk

"we desperately need the infrastructure to support our

growing and diverse community and support Suffolk's environmental goals. "

"We don't need smart card oyster style systems, contactless payments is the better way to go. Focus on helping older and younger people with appropriate access to contactless.

Focus on active travel. "

We don't drive so buses are very important

We dont need oyster cards as we already have debit/credit cards why cant they be used?

We don't seem to do or get anything with transport so this cannot make it any worse

We have little transport at the moment so why would we think it will change.

We live in rural Suffolk and there are no buses or travel schemes to get to the local market town. One has to use a car! This MUST change.

We need a coordinates transport strategy, especially for people in rural areas with limited access to transport. As a resident of Bury St Edmunds I was unhappy when the Bury St Edmunds-Newmarket-Cambridge bus service was stopped.

We need a good infrastructure. Not new houses. Bury St Edmunds is full to capacity as it is when you see the queues of cars on a normal Saturday. We also need bus services thst work rurally throughout the day, not simply at ridiculous hours like 10.00 and 16.00

We need better public transport to reduce car dependency

We need good transport links, in Ipswich the Martlesham park and ride no longer goes to Railway station. Do not forget people who do not have access to technology. Too many people are being left behind because they do not have the opportunity to use modern tech.

We need more funds year on year due to rising costs not fixed budgets

We need rural bus services, fixed roads and footpaths. Do not waste this on cyclists. Fix the lack of public transport first.

We need to address rural areas that need regular transport into towns and make it accessible for all.

We need to be able to forward plan a fully integrated public transport system.

We need to bring forward transport strategies and remove reliance on cars. This benefits all and as a rural county much needed

We need to do something about the state of our roads before looking at transportation.

We need to have better transport provided for rural areas as well as improved road schemes throughout the county.

We need to invest in transport-bus, cycling, walking and anything sustainable but we shouldn't encourage or make car use easier

We need to know that bus services will continue to run and not drop them on a whim

we need to move away from short term fixes towards longer term solutions - multi-year would address this in part

We seem to have no strategy for transport in Suffolk, is anyone even in charge of it? This might help us plan much better.

We should have multi year funding anyway - so yes this would be great

We used to have this

we would be able to plan for the future

What is needed is a long term strategy

What is the point of spending on an oyster style card? This is an out of date premise

What transport trains are out of reach of older pockets. This is due to privatisation

What transportation

What use is further transport and development when the roads in Suffolk are becoming undriveable and unsafe

What we need in Suffolk towns is the ability to have 'boris bikes' or electric scooters. This would mean affordable transport for many, and a nod to the green agenda too. Most countries have this in their towns and cities, but it's something that Suffolk lacks. I don't know how multi-year funding would make a difference.

When councillors get involved it is a recipe for inefficiency.

When it comes to public transport rural areas are very different to large metropolitan urban areas with higher population density. Public transport needs to be competitive regarding cost/convenience to be workable - this is difficult in largely rural areas.



Where will exactly £250k go. O yes for another dumb wit to sit in the office. Why is this so fake. With today's society and 250k. This isn't going far maybe a weeks worth

While this is vitally important, I seriously question the regional authority's capability to effectively manage this function.

Whilst improvements to transport in rural areas is badly needed there is insufficient information given to be able to assess an answer to this question.

Who can judge our long-term transport requirements

Who in the council knows anything about transport just look at the mess with Little Holland

Who wants an Oyster card!

Why do we need Oyster cards? It's already outmoded

"Why is finding so confusing by Westminster - there should be long term investment of suffolk council owned buses not outsourced to third parties - and these issues do not need devolution just better national governance

"

Why waste money on Oyster card systems. Surely credit cards do a similar job?

Will help with strategic planning.

Will never happen

"Will pay the salary of more minions

to run this!"

With high inflation the deal could result in less money, also I see no reason why the mentioned plans require a multi year deal . Those deals also come to an end

With the Oyster card style idea this shows a complete understanding of the Counties transport needs

Would be better if there was a promise of more money to invest. Important that it's on green transport

Would enable better planning.

Would help give staff the option of public transport and open up work to more people who cannot afford private cars

Would improve quality of life for affected residents.

Would it fund filling in all the potholes and removing vegetation obscuring road signs

Would prefer to use public transport than car. Better for environment, and make towns nicer places to visit

Wouldn't be spent on communities in NE Suffolk

Wouldnt be spent on potholes

Yes, but this is not the right way. There are too many different bus companies. Streamline this to one service provider, but the council needs to retain an interest in the company so that rural routes are as well provided for as those in town.

You are just wasting money

You are having a laugh, in rural Suffolk bus services are few and far between and declining, the amount on offer would not pay the salary of a few bus drivers for a year

You are not capable of delivering services now...

You are unable to provide for rural communities now. My fear is that any extra money will go to urban areas and rural communities will continue to lose out

You barely improve public transport or roads at present, so why bother

You can't even fill in potholes properly how can you be trusted further?

You can't even fix potholes ..why do you think we believe that you would do anything on transport to benefit residents. The bus services are completely inadequate already

You can't manage the annual budget you get- the lack of rural transport proves this. Getting longer term funding will change nothing. No one wants a London/sadiq khan style 'congestion and emission reduction policy' - it's a stealth tax. It's ruined London. Ask Andy Burnham how Manchester is getting on.

You can't manage what you have now!

You can't organise a decent bus service. Give over.

"You cannot trust successive governments to honour any long term financial agreements

Look what they have done with the retirement age

The only reason this is on the table is that it benefits them not us "

You can't forward plan with budget only being allocated on an annual basis. Being able to plan in a joined up way to ensure rural and urban areas are equally supported is important

You can't run an efficient service more money would just mean more money wasted.

"You could not write a more biased survey.

I would trust the Suffolk CC to organise anything "

You don't even fix the roads we've got. You've got no idea how to run a budget, prioritise works or build better infrastructure. You're utterly incompetent.

You don't have a reliable public transport system now what will make it better, if you get this money it'll be frittered away on jollies for the councillors

You have messed up the roads in Ipswich at every chance and vetoed the northern bypass.

You have money for roads and waste it on useless bridges in a zombie mini city like Lowestoft

You need two years to develop a transport plan? that is outrageous and indicative of why you should not control funding. May be you should first fill all the potholes? On Government support, a dependence on that is not a failure of national government, it is a failure of local councils to be innovative about accessing external funding

You need to return bus services that have been cut back, using shuttle buses, regular on time

You should be arrangeing this long term investment now and not needing this deal

Your argument is poor, lots of ifs and buts, no solid benefit to be seen.

Your historic outcomes in this sector are woeful

#### **Q10. The ability for residents to directly elect the Leader for Suffolk County Council in addition to their local County Councillor**

##### **Please Explain**

""Scrutiny"" being the key word here.

But better ""representation"" would be extremely important "

'Leaders' have so far only led the county into despair. Thousands of children failed, despite the ofsted things are still getting worse. There's no way you can trust the 'leaders'

1. If the answer is another politician, you have asked the wrong question. 2 Potentially, a recipe for chaos or gridlock.

29.8% turnout in last week's local elections. These people were elected by party political nuts. Local politics and spending will become extreme = money wasted

4yrly a leader can do irreversable harm!

A bit like a Policing PCC, if they have a personal preference, regardless of how illogical it is they will implement it.

A complete overhaul of local government governance is desperately needed. Failures are prolific and management at times appalling. Fund raising at local level (council Tax) should be taken out of the hands of wasteful local government with a system of funding that better serves a fair form of contribution distribution.

A disaster not needed a gimmick . We need people working together not a dictator

A leader with coop power s could override elected members!

A mayor in all but name. Given the current make up of elected officials across Suffolk, this could risk political paralysis, and an inability to make decisions. Businesses need and want long term certainty whether from local or central government, more importantly for local government under devolution deals.

A non party leader would provide a facility for a choice for the leader to appoint the person with the best experience in the job being offered

A range of voices for decision making in order that the wider picture can be seen is necessary.

A recipe,for disaster. You could have the leader as a member of one group and the majority held by another group.

A recognisable individual with a higher profile may be a stronger voice for Suffolk residents.

A risible idea leading to personality-led politics

A separately elected mayor or equivalent would sound good, but a hybrid separation of leader of the council and council sounds as if it would either just be business as usual or a deadlock between different parties.

A strong and committed individual who seeks to get the best deal for Suffolk is more important than party allegiances (which have got us in a terrible mess). Modelled on Andy Burnham & Ben Houchen.

"A Suffolk wide mayor (elected or non-elected ) will NOT level up.

Ipswich has been Suffolkkated and failed by local government structure for years.

Directly elected leader or not, adding more power to the exactly the same people & broken system is not a solution."

A terrible mistake and waste of time and money

"A waste of money just as the Police and Crime commissioner has been his role has not improved policing. There are 75 elected members already this is more than enough to run things

"

A way to spend more money. From your past record you would get no more done than you do at the moment ie as little as you can get away with.

About time! But could scc not start doing this regardless?

Absolutely! Residents would vote for worthy individuals not party members, they would reflect in their level of commitment in the town not just pen pushers

Accountability is a good thing, in itself and for its tendency to produce better targeted outcomes. There is a danger that policies may be skewed towards older people who are more likely to vote, so it is important to engage younger people. Involve the Youth Forum. Even lower the voting age to 16?

Accountability is key.

accountability is vital to the credibility of a leader

Accountability is vital, as is representation. I advocate proportional voting system to better reflect population

Accountability of Leader to public

"Adding more politics is just going to make matters worse.

"

Again - I do not support the bid

All as corrupt as others.

All [REDACTED] useless.

All councillors are elected, this adds an extra layer of political bureaucracy.

All my answers remain the same. The current council is out of touch with what we want in Suffolk. Why would I want them to have more control. No to devolution

All politicians lie

Allowing a directly elected leader seems more democratic. But I would not want to see this morph into reality a further tier in the local political structure and add an additional highly paid role (like the PCC).

Allows Suffolk Residents to have a say in who the local elected leader will be.

Also to sack after 6 months without pension, perks. There should be more accountability and transparency esp to the public.

Although I do not consider devolution to be a viable proposition, it would be imperative that senior management is fully accountable.

although i have indicated priorities for devolved funding I see no reason for a directly elected leader. Decision making would still rest with the council. There is no need for an extra tier of governance. And we have dignitaries who ably represent Suffolk on formal occasions

Always ignored it's a closed shop of not what you know but who do you know, cronyism in other words.

An elected lead would not be accountable, an employee is!

An extra level of first-past-the-post? Very important to reject this idea! Much prefer a move towards proportional representation of some form

An individual who has Suffolk at their heart, influencing their decisions for this unique County

An unnecessary additional tier of governance involving extra cost

Another election at huge cost for a pathetic turn out. NO THANKYOU. The council should elect its own leader as someone they respect and can work with.

Another election. Still don't know what the occ does. Councils are run by officers not the wealthy retired farmers who are the only ones who have the time to be councillors. Leave it to the professionals. We don't need an elected Mayor by any other name

Another expensive, unwanted, Mayors Office, foisted onto a long suffering tax paying public. Easy to see friction with a Mayor of one political persuasion at odds with an Executive of another. Gates open wide for wokery on an industrial scale.

Another highly paid politician

Another layer of bureaucracy encouraging political games

Another layer of bureaucracy no thanks

Another layer of bureaucracy. Voter apathy leads to some very unsuitable people in sinecures.

Another manager with a high wage and pension contributions

Another unnecessary level of expensive bureaucracy not required. Look what the Police Commissioner has achieved.

Another unnecessary, useless, layer of bureaucracy. Another expensive office with expensive staff - a joy to the foot dragging, lazy, over paid officers councils are already over burdened with

Another way to fudge the issues - another direct election with little democratic value

Another YES man for the party to which they belong rather than someone to actually represents the people who elected them

Anything offering to shake up solo political party thinking has got to be a good thing.

Anything to get rid of the current leader

As a variation of the old saying goes, it doesn't matter who leads the council or how they are chosen- the councillors will still be in charge regardless.

As a young person, Brexit doesn't instil confidence in public voting and having a leader determined by first-past-the-post is a daunting prospect for the future running and prioritisation for Suffolk. Equally, concern the existing system doesn't do 'enough' for Suffolk's climate declaration (among other things), nor funding with our budget as it stands presently.

As all in government seem to be incompetent or very incompetent (eg wasting money on stupid, unnecessary 20 mph projects) I don't think it matters who is elected into power - the candidates we have to choose from don't prove any "good" options!

As council tax payers, I believe that we have a right to have an opinion through voting on who leads our council. Also important for elected members to act for the good of the area they represent and not have to focus on "towing the party line" which may not be to our benefit.

As general public have no information so no idea about leaders capabilities or plans even though I read the press and political articles frequently. How would we know who might be the 'best' person?

As long as it isn't a Conservative/UKIP/Far right or right-leaning person, I would be happy! However, I of course appreciate the right to vote and the ability to vote for the leader for the council is welcomed.

As long as they are sensible and level headed and actually work with and for the people of Suffolk and can get decisions made and supported if they are not aber of the elected party.

as long as they're truly held accountable, we've seen how things are in westminster

As long as this person listens and speaks for the people to really impact on Suffolk

As stated above the person elected would seem to have more powers and influences.

At least there is then some element of choice

At no point in previous years has there been any desire by Suffolk people to directly elect another politician - they just want the ones they already elect to work better. I would be much more in favour of a leader of a Unitary authority in Suffolk - and I wish this was a conversation about the creation of a unitary authority - rather than some kind of Hodge Podge muddle which is this county deal. The risk DELs not being the same as the ruling party is too great, the risk of

not passing budgets and such is too great for what is essentially less than £24 per person per year. Devolution no - Unitary authority and the end of District and Borough Councils - absolutely.

At present there are too many tiers of local government, a slimmed down administration could respond to the needs of the community in a more efficient way.

At present, the role of a Leader of the County Council has the support of the majority of councillors. Without this and if of a different party, this may create gridlock. However if it produces additional funding, then it may be a risk worth taking...

Bad enough now. God knows who we would end up with.

Be better for the public to vote then for the leaders mates to vote them in.

Be great for someone to be able to draw together cross party agreement.

Because of all my reservations already mentioned, this could be a way to counter the negative impact of the councillors who let personal prejudices get in the way of decision-making

Being able to select someone on knowledge and ability rather than which political party they support might help put the people first and not the political parties.

Being able to vote for a local leader means we have more say and he/she will be more accountable. Local Mayors as in WM and GM seem to have more kudos and clout than central government

Best person for the job the most experienced and suitable person should be the leader, it's in everyone's interest especially those working directly under said leader.

Better solutions will be found if you work with residents and local businesses that are values driven

Building trust and transparency in delivery of a councillors commitment, this is key to having local residents voting

But not by first-past-the-post...

But we need to actually know who were voting for not just a leaflet but a full non biased report some how of who and what they plan to do with previous performances in similar roles

By and large I agree that a directly elected leader of the council would be beneficial I have a concern that if the leader was not the same as the majority of councillors their power may be more limited and less effective

Can cause interference in differing political members want different outcome and disagree

Can see very little difference to current structure, won't fundamentally change accountability

Can't see why the system has to change

Can't see what a difference it would make

Chance would be a fine thing. But even if we could once the elected person is in they forget all about those that put them there:

Common sense and the needs of the people need to be addressed more conclusively in all areas

Concerned how this would work

Considering how awful city mayors are, NO.

Costs of this change need to be explained to residents.

Could be confusing for many people, but I don't think it's a bad thing to have a clear elected leader. It increases the profile of both the LA and the area.

Could be good but can also make things worse in my opinion. Unsure on how this would actually work in the real world for Suffolk.

Could lead to cronyism

Council majority should vote in leader, don't think the electorate has the knowledge or interest to do this.

Council members need to be able to vote for whoever they feel, and know, would lead them best. This isn't often who appeals to voters.

Councils are hopeless at doing things

currently it is too much of a closed 'club'

Daft idea. We have problems. Fiddling with process won't fix those.

Decision making should be informed by evidence and not for political gain, so a directly elected Leader with a mixed Cabinet should provide greater benefit. Whilst appropriate scrutiny of decision-making rationale is important, Full Council should not be able to overturn a decision because nothing will be delivered if this will be case.

democracy

Democracy

Democracy calls for as many of us as possible to vote. Any potential leader will have to convince voters, not fellow Councillors.

Democracy is the heart of this country and thus should be protected at all costs, increasing who can elect certain positions is important in this value of our country.

Democracy is the process of delegating decision making. What you propose is fake accountability, and a recipe for administrative paralysis.

democracy!

democracy!

Democratically elected local leader

depends on the attitude of the leader elected. I am intensely disappointed at Babergh DCs decision to impose parking charges in Sudbury despite a unanimous vote against by Sudbury Town council and not support at a public meeting.



Depends on the calibre of who is put forward. Person must be able to represent all residents. The Conservatives in London seem to put forward almost racist people. We don't want that here.

"Depends on the candidate, sometimes the devil you know is better than the one you don't, whoever is elected needs to, a) know the town and its residents, b) live locally to the area served and have an interest in what happens to those that have elected them ( something we don't have at present )

"

Depends on the quality of candidates and whether enough of the public understand the system and who they are voting for.

Depends on who is elected

Depends very much who is likely to stand and what voting system is used. First past the post will always favour the Tories for most of the county.

Depends what authority and influence they have.

Devolution is important for areas such as Suffolk that frequently lose out on funding to larger metropolitan areas.

Devolution will need clear vision and priorities to be successful, the leader will need a clear mandate, but also enough support to develop proposals. Hopefully this will come from the direct election process.

Directly elected leader will give the public much greater confidence that their say at the ballot box is genuinely meaningful

Directly elected leaders allows for a more diverse structure. residents might like to elect a party for their promised terms, however their leader may be less than ideal for them for whatever reason, so to elect a separate leader than the parties in power could allow for better control, ideas, and leadership in general.

Directly elected Mayor's are helpful but it is too early to establish whether such a role in an old shire county area as opposed to a large conurbation is of any particular value

do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

Do not wish it to go through

Does this mean that elected representatives would not be on council - I can understand additional people being added to the council but it is worrying if this means that elected representatives are not there to voice their geographic areas concerns

Doesn't give any real extra powers

Don't agree with elected leader

Don't see the need

Don't want another layer of bureaucracy, money is not well spent at the moment.

don't give it to any local town hall to vote or council as it will be not in the interest of a good vote  
give it to the people in suffolk

Don't devolve

Don't need any more leeches living off our taxes

Don't trust any politician and to be honest the councillors available to select our useless. They waste money with inefficiency and hair brained schemes that either go over budget or fail and then get brushed under the carpet

Don't understand the need for this.

Don't want outsiders depending on the future

Double edged sword... Whilst it's important to remove someone from office that is not doing a good job - spending money where it's not needed or simply not doing anything at all - some may look to remove a decent councillor purely because of their political bias. This could have damaging effects on any improvements in the pipeline...

Dreadful - more grandstanding

due to opposite parties in cabinet vs leader

Due to the built in Conservative majority in the area, the leader will either be a Tory, a populist or both. My wishes are therefore unrepresented.

Elected leaders held accountable to their public

"Electing a leader by first past the post risks a lack of legitimacy if the leader is from a different party to the majority in the council.

To overcome this need some form of alternative vote system"

Electing the person I think is most suitable to lead the council in delivering the priorities is a better option than the councillors electing the leader from amongst their party.

Encourages residents to take responsibility for where they live

End corruption

Enfield's council is run by practically one family and I would not want this to happen

Essential to select the best leader irrespective of party politics and one term in office only (4 years).

Every single member of the council should be elected, I also feel that the proposed deal should be voted on by the public and not by the councillors. I also feel that the current councillors are not held accountable at all at the moment. There needs to be more accountability. I also have a concern over councillor's payment - how much of the additional money is going to be pocketed by the councillors when it should all be going on public spending

everyone knows who mayors are nobody knows who the councillor who offends the fewest conservatives is

Fantastic

Far more democratic - a much better way to proceed

Focus on holding one executive leader accountable is NOT what's needed. Instead we need to stimulate ongoing citizen engagement in the development of policy.

For accountability

Freedom of choice and impartiality

From the local person, you should all work to benefit your County whatever party you are. The wording in this question "would need to work". Sounds like a children's playground. Work together for the best for your County and this question potentially answers why you are in a mess, you can't work together? You have sub committees that are all party, your employees are expected to communicate, work as part of a team to benefit and get the best for the people of Suffolk. The elected members should be no different.

Further 'waste' of my Council Tax .

Get outsiders in to increase traction and accountability that actually has teeth.

Get professional people in, not pretend leaders

Given our current situation I wouldn't trust our local councillors they seem to enjoy ignoring what the locals want and want to complete vanity projects which wastes money and isn't wanted locally

gives more accountability

Giving Suffolk residents the choice is the most important part of the deal.

Good for community involvement

good for local people to be able to choose who is responsible and to be able to hold them to account

"Good idea as currently residents don't get a say in who leads the council.

Also seems like the proposal for Suffolk means that an added layer of bureaucracy is avoided in comparison to areas that have had devolution in the past and where a mayoral authority is added into the mix and adding cost."

Greater accountability.

Greater feel of representation

"Hahahah no postal voting....

It will be rigged "

Half the time they never do what they say they will do anyway. Might as well elect a sheep.

Hardly worth getting excited about

Has not worked for the Police in Suffolk.

Hasn't worked well in the major metropolitan areas

Have concerns that directly elected council leaders and mayors leads to local fiefdoms for politicians.

Having a directly elected leader can and should be better placed to represent our interests in Suffolk.

Having a directly elected leader of the council simply makes no sense for this area - especially as unlike directly elected mayors in places like London or Greater Manchester, this leader has very little power at all. The costs associated with electing a directly elected leader of the council simply are not worth it here - therefore we should maintain that the council itself appoints a leader of the council, not voters. On top of that, we should instead have a proportional voting system for electing councillors in the first place, my preference being the Single Transferable Vote (STV). This would make the council itself more accountable and representative of voters in Suffolk. Currently, under the First-past-the-post system which is used, in the last Suffolk County Council election, the Conservatives got 46.3% of the vote but 73% of the seats. Meanwhile, Labour got 21.3% of the vote but only 6.6% of the seats. Therefore, local-decision making is disproportionately in the hands of the Conservatives, therefore instead of having a directly elected council leader, we should simply use a proportional voting system for electing our councillors.

Having a figurehead to argue and represent the county is important. Direct election needs to be through a representative mechanism with preferences.

Having a local mayor is a joke!

having directly elected representatives that can be held accountable by the electorate is essential for a healthy democracy. The possibility of split party government will also likely be good for governance as it could lead to greater scrutiny and compromise

Having people that understand the people of Suffolk as well as what the county most needs.

Heading for a dictatorship

Help to get rid of the useless ones we have at the moment.

Hmm this smacks of a possible source of jobs for the boys. Open to corruption so not keen at all.

Hope there will be a clear choice of people standing , not anyone that already has a position in any Council

Hopefully further power to remove members who are not performing and seem happy to preside over a failing authority. Accountability and scrutiny? There isn't any.

Hopefully make the council more accountable

Hopefully someone who will look after Suffolk's County Town, Ipswich more than the Council has done previously

how can most of us know who would be best for this role from the bland canvassing leaflets that are issued? This also applies to voting for the Police Commissioner. Perhaps each party can

nominate their preferred candidate and then the public choose from this list. Maybe this is what is already planned?

"How will the candidates be known in order for people like me to be informed in our decision?"

Need someone to fight for a vision of Suffolk which benefits many residents here not just someone who wants a title or to make a career in politics"

However, in Suffolk this would only likely be the same group in control, just like the PCC.

However, the people nominated for such a role are often unknown to the general public. Co-operation between members of different political views should work, but more often than not, it doesn't.

I am a firm believer in local people for the local council seats, none of this moving MPs to safe seats that they have no connection to. It should also help ensure things such as Sizewall power are better kept for Suffolk instead of just being sent into London.

I am completely average to the conservative party as I believe they are not prioritising important issues ...instead they are just interested in finance.....particularly with oil companies. As such I would prefer an apolitical or green/ lib dem elected to this seat

i am concerned that as the county and district/borough council are different political control and the implications and delivery

I am not in favour of a mayor for Suffolk - it's another example of vanity and waste of money - the councilors are only interested in their bit of the county so a Mayor would undoubtedly show preference for his/her area

I am opposed to first passed the post elections where about half the electorate are not represented.

I assume the current leader was elected by County councillors, are you saying they aren't capable of electing the best person for the job?

I believe that if the people of Suffolk have the right to vote for the people who will represent them in council. The only concern I have is "the directly elected leader would be free to choose any elected members to serve in their cabinet" - if this information were available as part of the campaign and was available to the public this would be an important part of decision making for me.

I can see the merit in having a Leader of the Council who does not have the additional duty of representing a particular Ward and the perception of potential conflict of interest that may arise. However I also see potential, under the proposal of a Leader elected directly, for there to be perception that Central Government could unduly influence the nomination of the candidate representing the ruling party at Westminster to "parachute in" a high profile populist with no actual interest in the people of Suffolk.

I can see this getting very challenging from a number of angles and clarity on leadership and direction is key.

I can see this works in urban areas but Suffolk isn't a cohesive area. The county still operates as two identities - west and east Suffolk Also, I don't think the character of the county lends itself to having a high profile political figurehead such as a county mayor.

I cannot see how devolution will encourage better quality individuals to seek office. Are we really going to trust SCC with more money and responsibility?

I cannot see what difference it would make if we vote for the leader or they are chosen by the council.

I do foresee problems with this and hope that councillors do not play politics and their own agenda's rather than what is best for Suffolk.

I do not agree with paying this large amount of money to an elected official. It is a waste just as the PCC has been

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not believe in having an elected figurehead. The existing arrangements should remain in place and the administration continue to be responsible.

I do not consider this a priority.

I do not think any change governance would change things just congest the decision making system we currently have

I do not want the deal. Use the money for the people

I don't agree with devolution

I don't agree with devolution for Suffolk but if it happens I'd want a directly elected council leader.

I don't think it would make much difference. Whoever is in charge is likely out of touch with the reality of the average person

I don't believe some of the councillor follow their local communities. They often live on a different planet and have no idea what is going on.

I don't think the current elected leader has much of a clue about Suffolk life other than his ivory tower one. He stated on local radio some time ago that Suffolk doesn't do landfill. If this is the case why are bin lorries, some travelling many miles, still coming to the landfill at Great Blakenham?

I don't think this will make any difference to how anything works in the county.

I don't want a mayor

I don't want the deal to go through

I doubt it will make any difference except somebody to blame I suppose

I feel that it is important to be represented by a leader elected by the residents, rather than chosen by the council

I feel they should be neutral and not linked to any political party as none can be trusted to be a voice for the people.

I find another level of bureaucracy will add more complexity politically and complicated decision making. Central Gov are just trying to move accountability away from their decisions,

which I don't agree with, but agree that more accountability is needed in local gov, which needs to be funded better for that to happen.

I find this more democratic than the current system

"I firmly believe that ensuring the right person assumes leadership is paramount in any governance structure. While the proposition of a directly elected council leader holds promise in terms of heightened visibility and influence, it prompts us to critically assess the balance between individual leadership and democratic representation.

Opting for a singular leader rather than a voting system warrants scrutiny. It raises concerns about inclusivity, diversity of perspectives, and the representation of our community's interests. The choice of our leader should reflect the collective will and aspirations of Suffolk residents, embodying the essence of democratic principles.

While acknowledging the potential benefits outlined in the proposal, we must carefully deliberate on the implications of entrusting leadership to a sole individual. Striking a balance between effective leadership and democratic accountability is paramount to ensuring the integrity and legitimacy of our local governance."

I guess it could be a good thing to have a say in who our local leader is but the chance of getting anyone who is not in the pocket of the present day lobbies seem remote.

I have concerns that this will just add cost and bureaucracy to the local system but understand that this is a key government requirement to enable direct negotiation.

I have no confidence in our SCC Councillor representing the views of the residents, or getting the local issues brought before Council.

I have real concerns that if the elected leader doesn't have majority support in the council then deadlock will ensue and little or anything will get done

I like the idea but the candidate should not be picked in a smoke filled room in a masonic lodge!

I like the idea of a leader with a strong, personal, democratic mandate from the whole of Suffolk. May improve turnout and get more people interested in local politics.

I like the idea of more democratic opportunities for the public

"I like this idea, in principle. The only issue is the same as in politics in general: the pool in which we get to vote from is often not reflective of our communities and is usually someone from an upper middle class background, detached from what is happening in their communities most of the time. It would be lovely if we could actually select from a pool of people who can come forward, irrelevant of their backgrounds and privileges, people who want to make a difference in their community.

As it stands I'd be happy with a new, elected leader."

"I personally have no interest in electing a head of the council - it should be left to councillors to self-organise. We do not vote directly for a Prime Minister, why are we voting directly for head of the council?

This only encourages populist short-term candidates and the last thing this country needs is more people like that causing long-term damage.

Also the scenario of the leader of the council being from one party whilst another party has a majority feels like sleepwalking into an absolute mess. I acknowledge that is unlikely to happen any time soon but if the political landscape did ever change it would be a concern."

I see no particular benefit to having an elected leader as opposed to elected councillors who chose their leader

I think it is important for there to be a sense of accountability at such a critical position, but I am not sure how well-informed I would be in deciding one candidate over another. Again, I wonder whether party-political bias/preference might play a part in the best candidate not being selected.

I think it is important to have accountable people, but I don't see this as any more important than the current leadership arrangement with the CEO and leader of the council.

I think it would be good for all parties to be able to have someone on the 'council' then no one party is responsible for what the money is spent on, it is discussed and agreed upon by all parties.

I think its more important for the Councillors to elect the leader from within their own numbers, what happens if a leader resigns? another mid term election, current system works well.

"i think people are caring less about politics and political party's  
ive stopped voting"

I think that t the candidate that wins the seat for their political party should run the council in that area

I think the challenge a DEL presents is if they represent a party which is not a majority. Making up a cabinet and getting decisions made may be slowed down which will not be good. Like anything with politics it would be dependent on who/ what party won. There's too many dependable for me to outweigh benefits and cost.

"I think this could cause political uncertainty and difficulties.

people find it confusing enough to become involved in politics so I think having another vote could confuse people."

I think this is a good idea, but its success will depend on whether the elected leader continues to represent voters once in power, the same as it is now

I think this is a red herring, making people believe they have more control, but it won't be so

I think this is the wrong way to choose a leader. A leader needs to come from the group that can achieve a majority in the council. Whereas a directly elected leader could find it very difficult to achieve the stated goals if he cold not get things voted through the council.



I think this should happen whether there is devolution or not

I think this would assist in making all elected members be more accountable as well as provide the opportunity for wider cross party decisions and open up alternative approaches to issues.

I think this would be terrible and lead to conflict of interest within the council making it less able to deliver a coherent plan.

"I wonder whether this would cause unnecessary time wasting. If the Crime Commissioner post is anything to go by, the post becomes tied up in politics.

A disappointing idea"

I worry about populism - aka Brexit. I like the idea of it being apolitical.

I would like a say in the Leader of the Council

I would need to understand what if any powers further devolve from Ipswich Borough to Suffolk County

I would prefer county councillors to elect the leader of the council rather than a public who are largely not interested in council work and therefore not equipped to make judgements.

I would prefer that it is the best person able to do the job rather than a political post.

I would rather a leader display competency rather than the ability to gain electoral support.

If it dilutes the Tory monopoly, great.

If it is a directly elected Mayor as it has worked well in other places.

If it is done well it would be very positive, though I am somewhat sceptical that the reality will be as good as the potential

If the councillor as a whole makes decisions, it is pointless having the leader elected. Far better to let the councillors themselves make that decision.

If the Government really believed in devolving powers, it could devolve them without requiring a directly elected leader.

If the public are going to become more invested and involved in local politics and decision making, then new ways need to be found to engage with them.

If this proposal goes through the people of all of Suffolk should choose but whoever these "councillors" are they need to be experienced and knowledgeable enough to do the job and. It just feather their own nests. Not only should we elect we should have a say over salaries these people award themselves as it's a disgrace how much they earn

If we have to have one.

If you think this is giving power to the people think again. Some idiot would be voted in

Im all for the chance to elect a leader who is offering choices most people want. Running councils on political choices and grudges is outdated

I'm happy and interested in the democratic process that this will create.

Im not sure how the politics of the new system would work - what if the person elected was a different party to the main UK government.

I'm sick pf seeing too many noses in the trough and it would be good to see someone elected who can actually do the job!

Important as quality of leadership paramount.

Important so long as voters are properly informed about who is standing for election to Council roles and their background/suitability well before election takes place.

Important the people choose

Important to get the right leaders but most of us don't know who these people are and don't know anything about them. You can say anything on a flyer

**IMPORTANT TO HOLD LEADERSHIP TO ACCOUNT**

Improved democratic accountability. What power controls will ensure good and consistent governance.

In places such as London the direct election of Mayor has proven cohesive whilst removing the element of 'buggins turn' with parties electing one of their own.

In reality this means a more highly paid Council leader with a bigger ego and a louder voice. Think Sadiq Khan and you see what this gets you

In Suffolk the old people would vote Conservative come what may. This is being pushed by ██████████ Hicks to get himself a better salary and pension for doing even less than he does now.

In the current system, councillors often blame each other as to who is responsible for lack of progress on a particular local issue. In the new system, it will be clear that Leader of the Council will be responsible for all the activities of the Council; it will be easier to know to whom to look for redress, and against whom to vote at the next election.

Increased accountability, better democratic oversight.

Ir might encourage residents to take an interest and participate more in local politics.. Turnout for local elections is often quite low which is never good for a democracy.

Is very important for us to be able to pick the type of person we have dictating where hardworking taxpayers money spent, but we also need to be able to hold them accountable so regular elections would be necessary.

It could be slightly fairer

It could lead to a more direct relationship between the leader and the electorate.

It depends entirely on who the candidates are. All of those who seem likely to put themselves forward appear to be untrustworthy morons.

It depends who it is but at least this way I get a say!

It enables local people to have a direct say on the leader of one of the largest public sector organisations in Suffolk and offer more accountability to and visibility for local people on the county council leader.

It is a way to potentially bring in more diversity of interests and perhaps to challenge political views with more of a bias to the public

It is assumed that all political parties are going to play ball. This will not happen, it doesn't happen now and won't with a different leader.

It is because we need to have a democracy

It is important that parties are able to work together so more opportunity for this is hugely beneficial in a democracy, a consistent party controlling Suffolk isn't beneficial it should be the best people in roles & I'm sure members from other parties would at times be clearly better

It is just another layer of bureaucracy and expense which would be better spent support the people of Suffolk.

It is more democratic to be able to directly elect the Leader

It is very important to believe in the individual, their messages and what is important

It is vital that the residents of Suffolk should be able to choose their leader

It is vital this is part of the deal. We need more scrutiny of SCC councillors, and the ability to have someone who isn't necessarily of the same political persuasion, or even better, someone who isn't a member of a political party, is the ONLY truly democratic part of this 'proposal'. SCC need to be held to account, as do all politicians.

It makes sense for residents to elect the leader they think will make a difference.

it might get more people voting in elections which would make for a stronger democracy

It might lead to a more independent leader not so confined by party politics

It seems to me that the council leader should come from the largest party. It would save a lot of hassle in council meetings. Direct election from only members of the main party or alliance would be ok

It should be the most qualified for the role

It sounds inevitably mean a huge salary. The turnout for crime commissioner vote is extremely low. This is an indicator that we don't want these American style elections that do not sit well with our political system

it will always be a conservative

It will be someone that doesn't live the way 99.9% of people live. It will only benefit the rich. Yet again. It seems this has already been agreed

It will encourage nibbism and allow for local corruption to flourish, as we have already seen in recent decisions made by some councillors

It will help keep the leaders on their toes.

It will make the council leader more accountable to the people of Suffolk

It will raise the profile of the area and increase investment. There needs to be a process to remove if they are unable to work co-operatively - that's my only reservation

It would allow for residents to have both a local voice, through their county councillor, and have a say in the general direction of the county through the leader.

It would be a disaster. SCC have an awful track record.

"It would be a travesty if this is allowed to happen.

There isn't a single part of this that I agree with. "

It would be expected for any public service employee/ councillor to work across political parties for the wellbeing of all the general public they serve.

It would be good to have a leader for Suffolk, who the local people have elected, to ensure our issues are heard

It would be good to have a person who we elect, who will work hard to maintain their own job, by enhancing the county visibly.

It would be good to have a say in who is our local leader.

It would be interesting to see the candidates and whether they are using it as an opportunity for personal gain rather than to support Suffolk.

It would be more satisfactory if the leader for SCC was accountable to the voters.

It would be nice to meet the leader, and to find out what the future holds for places like Brandon and the surrounding Villages.

It would be possible for an official to be democratically elected who would be better able to represent our interests.

"It would be the same grey faces and low turn out so not a representative vote

"

It would follow the politics of the council and is another unnecessary layer.

It would need to be someone who is high profile, ex politician for example. Andy Burnham has done a good job in Manchester but that is a densely populated area unlike Suffolk.

It would provide a democratic voice although dubious and sceptical as to voter turnout

"It would support more areas of the community if the council selection was more diverse with a mix of majority and minority

Decisions may not be as single minded and may come from the little people

As a general public you really feel as if you have no voice and your opinion does not matter

The decisions are pre-made"

It's a gimmick and not needed.

It's an opportunity to challenge the domination of one party

It's got all the makings of a farce that could make decisions difficult to get done leave the leaders selection as it is.

It's important to have an elected leader who understands local infrastructure needs and how they interact.

It's more democratic.

It's a ridiculous idea. The people might elect someone from the party which isn't the majority party on the Council. This could lead to a completely unworkable situation. Present system is better. Though some form of PR for the make up of SCC would be even better.

It's all a smokescreen to fool people into thinking they have more control

It's always going to be a Tory leader, who won't give a [REDACTED] about Ipswich and will punish the town for voting for a Labour council, so will be a bad thing for the town.

It's anti-democratic to allow a local authority to be led by someone who is not a member of the majority group of elected councillors. The danger of political gridlock is all too evident

It's democratic

It's important because gives local residents a chance for their local councillor / leader and bring communities together.

It's important simple, BUT there needs to be much more information about candidates given to voters.

It's important to have the most capable person rather than someone on the basis of their political allegiance.

It's likely that the local leader would represent the majority party, so I can't see it as being significant unless there is a coalition.

It's not my favourite part of the deal. I think there is a danger that people will vote for somebody who is a 'personality' but may not be a good leader, as happened with Boris Johnson and Donald Trump. Experienced councillors would probably choose a better leader than the public and I would favour a committee system with all parties represented in the council's leadership.

It's ridiculous that potentially talented individuals cannot hold the top job because their party does not have a majority. But for this to work best, parties need to put up decent candidates. Most London Mayor elections have been a joke.

It's the best way to ensure our council represents our county.

"It's to Corrupt?"

But do you think you've made that much stupid?"

It's unequivocally better that the people choose rather than bureaucracy... Look at the state of parliament and who is running the country. Nobody wanted or voted for him yet he is the prime minister, it's madness.

I've never agreed with how our prime minister is elected from the party he is a part of, it doesn't seem democratic at all since it should be the people that elect them even if they step down. At

least if we get to elect our council leader it would be a great win for democracy and more power to the people.

I've no idea why politicians are so scared of this, worried about losing your cushy cabinet member roles when you can't blackmail the leader to win your support?

I've not been impressed with other directly appointed leaders. It's another political game. Nor do I think it is useful to have a different political leader to the party in charge, recipe for obstruction and no action

Just a duplication of the current system of the local government

Just additional expenses as no doubt they will require a very high salary and expenses

Just adds another layer of bureaucracy

Just another group to deny any culpability

Just another layer of bureaucracy with more inherent costs. The voting system is all wrong anyway and we should have proportional representation which means less polarisation of views more joined up thinking

Just another layer of expensive bureaucracy

Just another role who gets paid. You dont need multiple senior layers

Just another salary to burden the taxpayer with.

Just another useless bureaucrat

Just like the PCC, it sounds like a waste of money. And given the political demographics of Suffolk, it's inconceivable that anyone other than a Conservative leader would be elected and would appoint a Conservative cabinet...just as the PCC is always going to be Conservative. That's not a political criticism, but the simple demographics mean that there would be no change in leadership to the current state, but there would be additional administration, electoral costs, etc. Additionally, I would assume the elected leader would be paid more.

Just more costly admin.

Just more expense and another layer of government just like police commissioners and the staff

"Just NO

You don't respect local opiniin anyway"

Keep politics out of local government

Leader needs to change.

Leader of council will be concerned with pan-county issues while district councillors are concerned with more local issues. Some overlap but also some differences

Leader should be neutral Tory's have ruined Suffolk

Leader would instinctively choose party mates. Skills won't matter.

Leave things as they are no need for this

Let the council choose their own leader

Let's just keep party politics out of local politics.

Let's face it, we're damned if we do and damned if we don't.

"Like the idea

Never work"

Living on the fringes of the county Suffolk county council tend to forget us now so what difference will a directly elected person make?

Local decision making is important but that does not necessary require a directly elected leader. I have not identified in this information how other elected members can contribute to checks, controls and scrutiny, some of which may come too late and "after the horse has bolted".

Local decision making will shape local priorities, rather than having command and control from Westminster.

local democracy

Local democracy is vital

Local government should be apolitical, working together for the good of the local people, not against each other for political party rivalry.

local knowledge very important

Local mayors seem to have been a success. But i worry that they may not be enough safeguards to prevent abuse. The reference in SCCs consultation documents to the tess valley investment zone is unfortunate as that project, and the local mayors vote in it, is mired in controversy, and is under an investigation commissioned by Michael Gove

Local people have no say - much like the 'election ' of the PCC.

Local people should be allowed to choose who they would like to be represented by

Local populations know who knows best how to run local services and what is important to local communities

Low calibre of local politicians.

Matt Hancock should be in jail.

May allow for a more collegiate and strategic approach rather than decision making on party lines.

Mayors Like Andys Street & Burnham have been instrumental in being held to account for levelling up their combined authorities and have been great at putting those places within the public consciousness.

Meaningless addition to present system

Means the public will have more of a voice.

members of the public should be able to freely choose who runs the council and not have the choice made for them

Metro mayors work not sure this system would help a large county. The brief is too large and would be difficult to deliver .

Might get independently-minded candidates rather than it being party political all the time

Might result in a more representative leader

More accountability can only be a good thing

More bureaucracy equals less efficiency, well known fact

More choice

More cost added to the system. Potential conflict with party politics getting involved.

More counterbidity

More democratic and can point a single point for Government to deal with over a period of time. The people world hopefully feel more of a connection with the leader.

More direct accountability

More important are the qualities and motivations of the leader and cabinet rather than the process.

More jobs for the boys!

More layers of bureaucracy.

More Local input.

More money wasted on someone at the top

More people just seems like a load of extra cost when the opposite is needed.

"More red tape

"

More representative.

More say for residents

Most of us see or hear nothing about the thoughts, behaviour, or actions of any councillors. How are we supposed to make a meaningful choice of any potential leaders. Look at the current situation.

Most people don't understand how the council already works. This added complexity doesn't appear to create an efficient, engaging platform for local people, businesses and politicians to interface and create positive changes.

Most voters will not know who they are voting for

My preferences are totally ignored now based upon the first past the post voting regime



My view is SCC should be looking at devolved services run well and cease. The system is grossly inefficient and does not give value for money.

My votes don't really count as it's such a Tory area - even the MEPs were shameful. Wouldn't want to see one of them getting in on the act and making us all appear like swivel eyed loons.

Need accountability yes but what will be the cost be? They will then have their own office and staff...again taking money from the people of Suffolk without adding any benefit. Who will pay for this role, another fee to be added tot the Council tax ?

Need more accountability.

Need to have the correct leader to take Suffolk forward

Need to know more

negative thing. moving to like an american system... not interested in electing a mini president

Never trust the electorate.

New face, same old problems.

nice to think we would have a leader elected by the people and who sincerely has Suffolk's interests at their heart. However politics will always be involved so concerned things would take longer to agree or not move forward due to political differences. As long as they do a good job don't really care either way how they become Leader.

no comment

No devolution

No effect

No improvement

no mayors - they have sole responsibilities and too much power - they decide who votes and how many votes they get- you are selling us to corruption

No more opportunities for people to be unaccountable in their roles. We pay for this role, the public should be able to have influence over it.

No politician ever engages with me or seeks my opinion on anything. When i apprach them there are dismissive.

No thank you. I cannot see any candidate having any ideas apart from solar panels and house building. It would be an expensive waste

No, not another level of Govt!

No, waste of money and time.

None of them are any good as it is, so any candidate put forward would just be a political puppet doing as they are told

No-one ever listens to what people want to say. Government and councils talk but never act

No-one votes for the PCC and his office costs £1M each year. This will be a similar waste of money - probably more.

Nope! Nobody from SCC is competent enough.

Not a huge fan of the 'mayoral' type system. Different political parties rarely work together well and end up point scoring with each other. It could make it difficult to get decisions made or projects agreed.

Not a very good idea to have a leader who does not have the support of the majority of the council

"Not because they have been elected but because they are of strong character and competence and have the ability to drive this project to a satisfactory destination. I am unsure that such a person is in a current elected position.

The elected leader must have no political party allegiance."

Not fully familiar with nuances here.

Not important if the leader is as remote as the Leader of SCC is to residents of Ipswich.

Not needed

Not sure about this, could be a disaster I think.

Not sure how this helps. There's barely any interest in current government. No one running really represents the people that are voting. Usually only out to line their own pockets.

"Not sure in reality if this will be any different in terms of the real situation will probably in practice end up the same person ie leader of the majority party but....

not a big issue for me but may be for some to feel they have more control over the leader. "

"Not sure that Suffolk residents would be that interested in yet another election.

Why not introduce a different system of electing a Leader, by having a sort of citizens assembly of local people, who would be provided with information and an opportunity to ask relevant questions, and maybe local business people and community leaders and some councillors representing all parties who could debate the question of who would be the best leader and vote on an outcome?"

Not sure that the best people want to stand or get elected if they do

Not while a Green Party is the leader as listen to them will bankrupt the country

O no Nono no no no no.

One political leader is much the same as the next. All governed by the economy.

Only if the voting system is changed, first past the post is not a good democratic system

Only if they are legally liable for corruption and failure to act

Only important if they actually look at what the area needs and listens to People

Other devolution deals are not at County level and provide greater electoral gain doer Cent. Govt with an elected mayor, at this level is unlikely to attract higher profile and to call this devloution is a sop which does not address for unitary rationalisation of councils services in

Suffolk to drive greater democratic participation and genuine localism. The small funding benefits do not address the underlying challenges at all

Otherwise, residents have little or no political influence over their councillors. At the moment, I feel that council priorities are mistaken, and in addition, the council does not celebrate the wealth of natural beauty and the knowledge of the residents of this county.

Our council tax says I £400+ goes on a police commissioner, a position that didn't exist until recent years and is a waste of money. The percentage of people who turn out to vote is minimal elections another waste of money. We do not need another expense and another overpaid official

Over the years our leader has not always been in tune with the people.

Party affiliation matters.

Party politics shouldn't influence the actions of a council elected to serve the community.

people cant be bothered to vote for MP's how do you expect people to vote for a leader of SCC and or LCC. This idea smacks of cronyism and sounds dangerous as it is open to abuse of power, bribery (which is already rife within SCC) and jobs for the boys

People don't understand the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner role. I feel this wouldn't be much different

People don't vote as it is... They have lost faith... Too many elections for positions that should not exist, ie Police Commissioner

People elect leadership figures. It would make mandates clearer.

People in one town aren't going to know councillors from another in order to make an informed vote. Cliques of councillors will ensure they give preference to friends and contacts ref expenditure choices

people need to hold such figures of authority accountable, too many just persuade their own gains

People not involved/aware of local politics will not even know what this even means. Alot of money and time being put into this and not many people will know what it means to them.

People running Suffolk must be elected by the people!

People should be able to vote for the County Leader.

People should have a say.

Person and ability of that person to look, negotiate and manage future development is for all of us the most important. Belonging to a party is secondary's.

"Please see my answer concerning devolution as a policy above. This role is an unnecessary cost burden. Centralised planning and delivery of local services costs less in overheads and bureaucracy.

"

Pointless extra layer

Pointless question

pointless was of money

Politicians are basically all the same. This is just another level of bureaucracy.

Politicians would need to work together. Otherwise a town versus country split could derail the whole initiative.

Politics don't interest the younger generation so it will be the same people making the same decisions

Politics should not come into this leader and a person elected on merit is more suitable, The electorate then have the right to remove them every four years if they so wish.

Politics should play no part in local Government leadership. The role of Leader should be undertaken by an individual with the best competence to deliver value to the residents of Suffolk. Elections risk voting in the best electioneer rather than a highly competent leader

Poor idea - we need a functioning Count council if different parties control the council and the leader nothing will be achieved .

Poor voting figures so open to abuse

Potential for increased engagement with local gov and quixotic mixes which have the potential for greater innovation

Present system needs changing. Go back to the original committee system for all councillors to participate

Presents risk but also huge opportunity

Pros and cons for this approach

Provided one can elect a competent business minded leader

Providing that the individual is held accountable to the same scrutiny that councillors are it is more democratic to have an elected head of the council rather than that duty being left to the councillors, as they could go against the wishes of their constituents and vote for someone who would not benefit the council or the county as a whole.

"Public appetite for these elections is v poor and low turnouts would be inevitable.

Net result is that ordinary people don't get the leaders they want."

"QUOTE FROM RONALD REGAN ' BIGGEST LIE EVER IS ""I'M FROM THE GOVERNMENT & I'M HERE TO HELP"" ' .

LESS GOVERNMENT

LESS WASTE

LESS SNOOTS IN THE TROUGH"

Raised profile, more accountable. (I don't know who the current leader is)

Really don't know much about this. Hopefully a Leader voted for by Suffolk residents would be someone who knows Suffolk, it's demography and it's needs.

Recipe for failure if contradictory policies and constipation of needed action. Do we need another set of narcissists?

Reduce councillors who don't live in Suffolk

Reorganising the deck chairs the Titanic

Residents need to directly elect leaders.

Residents should have a say and more power on who their council leader is.

Residents should have say

Residents would never be informed enough to make such choices

Ridiculous if not the same party, they should put a short list forward for public vote

Scary. in essence a popularity contest based on the assumption the people of Suffolk have enough knowledge to make an informed choice when voting.

SCC already waste too much of my money.

SCC is inept from top to bottom, as a fish rots from the head, so too is SCC rotten due to inept leadership and a useless executive. Get rid of the whole rotten edifice.

SCC is too big an area to represent local people

Scrap cabinet govt. Don't need elected Mayor's or leader. Power should be shared & involve all local councillors not focused in the hands of a few party hacks. They all need to work together in the public interest.

See earlier answers.

See previous

Seems like a good way to make the council less efficient - deadlocks, back biting and trivial point scoring would push good governance out the window. As it is, the County Council and Ipswich Borough barely work together ( or give that impression), to the detriment of everyone, including people who don't live in Ipswich.

Seems like better checks and balances if they are not guaranteed to be part of the same party as the councillors.

Seems pointless; if they're appointed from a minority party the chance of them building a consensus is low. Would require more active voter participation than currently happens.

seems to work well elsewhere, though mainly in large conurbations.

Seems to work well in the English regions that have devolved, although Suffolk would be on a much smaller scale.

Sensible to elect all.

Separate process to elect leader and councillors puts it all in the political realm. Less about skill and cooperative working than political gain and status.

Should be a Mayor

should be non political

Should provide greater stability and wider participation

Small think of opportunity that someone that isn't an out of touch Tory might head the council

Small political factions will hijack the agenda

So long as it is open to all to both stand and vote.

So long as they do the job and look after the community and do as they were elected to do!!

So many people want cllr hicks gone

So they have their say in the matter. Have a choice to vote that way.

Someone who gets the job done not just the party the farmers of Suffolk want

Someone who is chosen by the people for the position

Sounds fair.

Sounds like a recipe for political deadlock rather like the US congress who are directly responsible for Russian advances in Avdiivka & elsewhere.

Spend less on unnecessary post holders and more on Suffolk residents. Less bureaucracy and less spending on politicians and officers, more spending on voters.

Strongly disagree with this suggestion

Subject to a P.R. vote system

Suffolk County Council has failed (literally on some inspections), is run by a generation of pensioners who are out of touch with the modern world, lack ambition and creativity. A directly elected Mayor may help break this stranglehold.

Suffolk does not represent the Ipswich urban area.

Suffolk has had some very second rate leaders selected on a Buggins turn basis - direct election will be a risk but one worth running

Suffolk has long suffered from receiving an unfair, small slice of the cake. Unfortunately we are now suffering from having too many politicians showing nothing but self interest in the actions that they take. This divisive Idea of splitting England into mini kingdoms, instead of having its own parliament, unlike the other three constituent countries, is plainly wrong.

Suffolk is such a vast county. Cannot see how any leader is going to be truly representative regardless of political persuasion.

Terrible idea

That way more people will be aware of those in power locally and hopefully more likely to hold them to account and get rid of them when they inevitably become useless

The "leaders" are a large part of the problem. Strutting around calling each other "councillor" etc. Just use your name - you're no more important than any other employee.

"The ability to directly elect the SCC Leader could be very positive, in the way that directly elected Mayors have become important leaders elsewhere in England. But it could also be very negative, if the Leader is unable to find sufficient common ground with a majority of elected members.

Two things stand out from the devolution deal document:

1. The directly elected Leader is actually a Mayor, but for some reason the term 'Mayor' is not being used. It would have been helpful if this had been acknowledged in the consultation document, and the reason for doing so had been explained.
2. The dates set out in the consultation document have slipped by a year, from those included in the devolution deal document. This is important, because some of these dates now go beyond the latest date for a General Election. "

The ability to give more power to the people seems beneficial as it would allow people to actually vote for someone where there is a consensus that they offer the best for Suffolk and this is better than councillors selecting the leader as some of electorate didn't vote for them, so there being more direct approach to voting for the leader of the county council seems more democratic

The behaviour of some of the directly elected mayors does not encourage me to support this proposal. Picking their own cabinet can result in them being surrounded by only people who agree with their every proposal, regardless of the true merits of each case. The authority of the whole council is important and, to judge from elsewhere, this would be diminished by having a directly elected leader and his/her hand-picked cabinet.

The council leader is a joke and not in touch with what people need or want

The councillors are there to represent the public and not their political party. The electorate should decide who is best to lead the council

The County Council seems like jobs for the boys/girls. The local councillors work much harder

"The current leaders have managed to get the county into huge debt so maybe the public should get a vote.

"

The current systems and governance do not work, but it is not clear that this will improve things. Where possible we should aim to ensure that councillors have to work to keep their seats (rather than being 'safe'), there should be term limits and mechanisms for ensuring that residents can question councillors on a regular basis.

The current two tiered approach to local government is flawed and should be sorted out before any increase in powers that devolution will bring.

The deal stands or falls by this condition. Let it fall. Remember what a total farce the directly elected Police and Crime Commissioner has been.

The disadvantage would be that if an individual were elected who didn't have the support of the majority of councillors, then it might be difficult to get things done. I'm unclear at the moment how that might be remedied. E.g a vote of no confidence if things get too bad.

The election of the council should be by proportionate representation and the parties should agree the leader amongst themselves when necessary i.e. in coalition

The electorate chooses the councillors. A mayoral type of election for the leader just changes the political structure - does not enhance democracy

"The electorate would need to know who they're voting for, their skills etc. Four years is a good time to understand the role.

Would like to know a bit more about how it's better than current situation "

The experience of "local mayors" seems to be working well. Go for it!!!

The gains from devolution should not be limited by the charisma of the individual elected as leader - the stakes are too high

The general public will only get to vote for whoever the political parties decide who they want.

The grubby Tories won't like this as they are scared of their grubby hands losing control which must mean it is a good thing but they will still win it of course

The head of an organisation may take their responsibilities more serious if they thought they might not be voted back into the position

The idea of directly elected leaders is appealing. However, under the current First Past the Post electoral system, it is profoundly undemocratic!

The ideal leader should be elected by local residents

The leader is a gutless figurehead beholden to the wishes of their party.

The leader is not as important as getting the work done to improve the county.

"The leader needs to be known to the councillors as he/she needs to be exactly that.

I don't believe we, as the public, know enough about an individual's leadership qualities to elect them."

The leader of the council is a key role and residents should have a say in who takes this position.

The leader should be decided by the people to stop councillors voting in mates or party sympathisers. Sadly our leader is not politically neutral.

The leader should be non-political as should mayor's.

The leader's role is vital to the success of the county. With the current low standing of politicians in general, this role must be filled by someone with the highest levels of integrity and morality.

The level of accountability with an elected leader who has a manifesto is far higher than the current model. However, please note there is a major gap in accountability because health services are not contiguous with our county boundary.

The majority of this primarily aging rural county will vote conservative regardless of individual councillor's past record.

The method is more important than the ability

The model of salaried Councillor's has failed.



The most concerning thing about the question is how it highlights that the level of accountability of local government will not change from its current low level.

The need for Suffolk residents to be able to make the Leader accountable.

the options would I assume be limited to the usual contenders with party political backing and funding, making it little change

The problem arises when local opposes central government - look at the cancelation of the train line has meant for Manchester local mayor and local people there. This government has a preference for local mayors - maybe the next won't

The process to elect anyone is thoroughly undemocratic anyway so it will change nothing. The FPTP system is outdated and rigged in favour of a powerful minority, rather than giving proper representation to All residents. We need electoral reform not new Political positions elected the old way.

The public already are not fully engaged in local politics. The evidence of the electoral turn out for the PCC supports the view that people appear not to understand or aren't interested in these local elected roles. An elected leader is another layer of local government not needed.

The public get top vote for politicians so it makes sense to do the same for local county councillors.

The public is already too big

The public needs to decide

The residents of Suffolk will be in charge of their leader and elected leaders should work in the interest of the electorate.

The role is already accountable and should be non political.

"The role of the Council

While it is true that the current role of Leader on the Council is significantly more powerful than most people (including many Councillors!) realise, the Leader is currently dependent on the support of the majority of Councillors to maintain their position. Some may feel that this weakens the ability of the Leader to make decisions, but that is the essence of democracy, and removing that need for majority support is likely to lead to perverse or unjustifiable decisions, as many would argue it has done in places such as Teesside.

The Council as a whole is supposed to retain the power to pass or reject the Budget, but while rejecting the budget would create some publicity, it would be impossible under the proposed arrangements for anyone other than the Leader to create an alternative budget. This is a recipe for either acquiescence or gridlock.

For the most part, citizens stand as candidates for the Council because they want to help create a better County. They may have differing views on how to do this, and they may have differing levels of personal ambition, but if they do not believe there is any realistic chance that they will have any meaningful impact on the County's policies, the most capable candidates, and those with the greatest integrity, will simply not stand.

The proposals will create a “County Council” which becomes, to all real intent, a Scrutiny Committee. Most voters already believe Councillors are powerless and voting for them is pointless – these proposals will simply reinforce that view.

#### Likely Outcome of the Election in 2025

We cannot be certain what the outcome of elections in 2025 will be. However, we know what the outcome of councillor elections across Suffolk was in 2023, and it is not an unreasonable guess that the results in 2025 will not be dissimilar.

Although an accurate representation of what would have happened, if 2023 had been a County Council election rather than District and Borough Council elections, is complicated by various factors including incompatible boundaries, varying sizes of electorates per councillor in the various Districts, multiple wards with split votes between parties, and the forthcoming boundary changes for the County Council Divisions, it is possible to make a rough estimate of the number of County Councillors that would have been elected for each party on the basis of the votes cast in May 2023. I have also, separately, aggregated the raw vote per party (using only the highest scoring candidate for each party in those wards with multiple seats). Such a desktop exercise can only give an indication of what might have happened, but provides a useful guide to what might very well happen in 2025.

The result is stark. No party would have anything even approaching an overall majority. With 23 Conservative, 21 Labour, 16 Green and 10 Liberal Democrat Councillors, the County Council with its current powers would clearly need to be a coalition. Which parties would form that coalition would be a matter for the councillors of each party to decide, but one would expect that decision to be based on mutual principles and concerns, and based at least partly on the offer that those parties had made to the voters. There is nothing inherently undemocratic about coalitions – indeed, as they would almost certainly command the support of a significant majority of the voters between them, and would be able to select those policies from each partner that were most likely to be popular, coalitions are likely to be significantly MORE responsive to the views of the electorate.

However, under the proposed arrangements, and if the votes in the elections in 2025 are similar to the votes cast in 2023, the Leader candidate with the most votes would be elected, and that candidate is likely to be the Conservative candidate, with 36% of the vote but 100% of the power. All of the Cabinet members would most likely be Conservatives. The 67% of Councillors representing other parties would be virtually powerless. The 64% of Suffolk voters who had voted for a Leader other than the Conservative candidate would see their votes entirely disregarded.

"

The rural areas always have the deciding votes

The Suffolk mindset is so potty that this Will make no difference. Political differences in the county are completely negligee and all councillors are basically there for themselves, despite what they say, possibly even what they believe. I do not believe a single one of them, or any of the MPs in the county could care a jot about the average citizen. They are all in it for themselves. The public having a specific choice in who actually leads it would make no difference at all, especially as there is no explanation or description about whether a publicly chosen 'leader'

would have any additional clout. This seems to be an additional election issue that would cost additional money. What a waste.

There are massive issues with voting a representative who then has licence to make all decisions over a period of time. There needs to be a new form of direct democracy where everyone is able to have an influence over all issues as they arise.

There is as much corruption, bias and influence in local politics as there is in Westminster. This system doesn't make us any more secure, or our politicians any more honest, or the ability to hold them to account any easier.

"There is too many people elected now with too many layers of excessively complicated administrative procedures.

There is a unnecessary bureaucracy in local government already even down to Parish Council level as in Oulton Broad"

There may be a considerable disparity between the choices made by the councils and those made by the residents.

There should be 2 people acting as co-leaders for balance and greater transparency/fairness.

There should be NO ties to a party for the elected leader. The election of the leader should be open to members of the public

There should not be another tier of administration. This system will rely on the majority in council being of the same political persuasion as the elected leader. If it is not, chaos will ensue.

There's too much to do without having constant battles which is likely should this occur

They are public servants, therefore it's the vote of the public that should have the final say!!!!, not in house voting by the corrupt ignorant clowns running the show

They never answer when you contact them anyway so no point

They should be working for the people of Suffolk not a political party. We should have an independent Mayor(ess)

"they will be overpaid whoever it is

"

They're all as dodgy, greedy, elderly and bias as the next.

They're all corrupt.

Think it's important that political division doesn't prevent or slow decision making. If we had a different political leader to the majority of councillors this might cause issues with decision making

Think this will end up being a career opportunity for established cllrs and not impact significantly on public having democracy working. More factionalism and positions of influence going to those already in the majority party. Will possibly cause more divisions and slow down decision making.

This appointment must be given to those who get the jobs done, focus on natural work teams (so when the next leader comes along things don't get changed or undone wasting funds) focus on sustainability

This can lead to stalemate in decision making and is a very bad idea

This can still very achieved within the current structure.

This could be catastrophic. We could end up with a leader not from the elected party and also cabinet from a party who has not been elected by residents given the leader has full control over choosing it. There could also be more internal conflict, confused decision making and delays in making decisions

This could be costly

"This could help to centre more power governing our community locally, though I'm a little uncertain of direct election as things could turn to populist popularity contest elections

I think that candidates for this position should have a minimum provable length of residence in suffolk before standing, at least 5 years but probably longer"

This could undermine democracy in Suffolk, especially if one party did not have an overall majority. It may prove even more difficult to get anything done. It also gives the power to the mayor to pick his own cabinet and this could not be representative of how people voted for their councillors. Also, we are a rural county and this type of devolution has been largely tried out in urban areas.

This does sound like offering greater say to the voters about who the council leader will be.

This element is the clincher - why the deal should be rejected. A directly-elected leader would be a disaster with the potential for a leader to come from a different party to the majority of councillors - leading to four years of paralysis and atrophy in the council chamber. However much was being offered, this factor is enough to demand that the proposal is thrown out.

This gives a long overdue vote to the electorate.

This has to be the worst part of the deal with the Government. Introducing an unnecessary, destabilising, and entirely partisan level of politics to oversee practically no additional money per person per year - with only the promise that "there would be more deals" with a government you can't already get money out of - is foolish. This project talks about a 30-year lifespan of money - that's 7 (at least) elected leaders, all of whom will have wildly differing plans and ideas. Watering down the impact of this tiny amount of money further. Also, the notion that 1 person somehow represents Suffolk better for £16m a year... when the Cabinet Member for Adult Care is already de facto responsible for a budget of £352m a year is crazy. This whole idea falls off the back of other silly Government ideas like Police and Crime commissioners being able to manage local policing better than Police Authorities and local council-run panels. It wasn't true in 2012 - and it isn't true in 2024 - it is just politicians making jobs (and titles) for themselves. The additional cost of having a successful council leader step down if they stood for both council and leadership is bizarre. Why on Earth a directly elected leader can't also be a councillor with a division is beyond me - they only have £16m to spend and it isn't as if the current leader doesn't also manage a division. It will also add cost as there will have to be another election in that division... madness! This deal is a Mayor by proxy - we didn't want one in 2016, and we don't want one now - all we want a better and more fair settlement from the

Government to help the existing council, its Cabinet, and its leader serve the people of Suffolk. If any deal should be being consulted upon, it is for a full Unitary Council in Suffolk - where real savings can be made, and real joint decisions can be had.

This helps involve local people in decision making. a DEL should work on behalf of residents and not be a political appointment.

This is a back door mayor, so I don't really understand the benefit

THIS IS A BIASED QUESTION. DISGUSTING!

This is a bizarre model that does not enhance our democracy. The elected leader is de facto subject to the support of the elected Council and not voters.

This is a dreadful idea, it would be a complete waste of money, that should instead be spent on local services. The Conservative government has a preference for it, so they want to foist it on us, but there is no mandate for them to do so. In the dieing days of this Conservative government, this is the last thing they should be wasting time and money on. Stop this now!

This is a good idea, as only a local would know what need doing in the area

This is a really bad idea as it centralises power and we should be pushing that government listens to needs without watering down democracy. There are also a lot of examples where a political impasse stalls budgets and a system that could result in a divided approach with a toxic power dynamic seems like a very unstable option and although they are national or larger areas, it would introduce dynamics which has led to problems in the US, Belgium and Northern Ireland for example.

This is a terrible idea. Absolutely awful. It removes any level of accountability, imposes a directly elected Mayor on us (call it whatever you [REDACTED] like but Mayor Hicks is what we'll call him), and means you can't fire the leader of the council except by an election. We do not do directly elected leaders - the Mayors are exceptions - and we don't have a directly elected PM. It is conceivable that the Mayor would be of a different party to the majority of members - a recipe for doing nothing for four years. Absolutely no no no no no.

This is a terrible idea. What on earth are you thinking?

This is a very negative aspect and could result in a decision making impasse if the directly elected leader does not have the support of the majority of elected councillors

This is an insane idea - what happens if the leader and the council are from different parties? What happens then? Nothing presumably - this is one of the reasons that I think this proposal is insane

This is an utterly pointless idea - a better approach would be to use a different electoral system to improve accountability. In practise most of the time the leader will be chosen by Suffolk Conservatives not the population of the county

This is BS and bureaucracy. What is the cost? Give us a mayor with teeth like greater Manchester or don't bother. Is this Tory agenda worth the bother? Is the money actually that much over the time span. Will the govt renege like on so many other funding promises?

This is democracy

This is gerrymandering to ensure the Conservatives still rule Suffolk despite facing evisceration at both the GE and in next year's County elections

This is hoodwinking the residents of Suffolk and using democracy cheaply. What percentage on the electoral roll currently vote for a Police and Crime Commissioner? How can an individual possibly know with meaning who to vote for? What skills would be required? County Councils are remote places for most of us in everyday life. Unlike national politics they get very little media coverage. Unlike a general election, potential candidates are hardly likely to hold surgeries nor interview residents on the doorstep. This is a mockery of a democracy and in reality is likely to appoint someone to a role which carries a mind-blowingly large salary for the mere 4 years they are in office. Moreover, unlike an MP I will not be able to remove my democratically elected leader during his/her 4 year tenure. Where will be the accountability of office? Hopefully, you will get my gist.

This is not as important to me as the financial elements of the deal. However, it is arguably a more democratic process, so that residents may be able to choose the leader they want, even if the overall control of the Council sits with a party they did not vote for.

This is only thing that would be benefit of this proposal. However currently 'accountability and scrutiny' of the current leader is questionable. When Ofsted highlight for a third report SEND provision is failing and nothing is done, you move councillors into different roles protecting them from accountability. This is supposed to reflect the high standard and 'accountability and scrutiny' currently displayed?

This is potentially tricky but could make for a very representative council if managed well

This is the least important thing so far. It would be very unlikely to drive local democracy, especially as Suffolk is very much a one party state. Turnout would be abysmal and many voters would feel disenfranchised which could potentially drive down turnout in more important elections.

This is the most exciting part of the devolution deal - it will increase accountability - and give a leader an individual mandate to create change. It should also see a higher turn out on polling day.

This is the most ridiculous part of devolution. How could a leader potentially from a different party from the majority of the council possibly work? Decisions would be made by a minority. It shouldn't happen

This is the only policy I agree with and should be the only change happening. No devolution. Just this one single change.

This is the only positive aspect of the plan - at present the leader of the council is not elected to that role by the public and is not able to be held accountable as he simply follows the Ipswich MPs example and blocks people on email or social media and does not respond !!

This is unnecessary because the winning party in an election should be able to select their own leader and cabinet. Anything else would create conflict, confusion and division. If Party A won the election with a sizeable majority but the leader was elected from Party B how could they lead the Council with little support from the council body?

This is very confusing and puts the leader in a difficult position plus I don't think residents in Suffolk will understand this fully and therefore not properly consider their vote.

This is very important as it provides the opportunity to put in place a competent leader with sufficient capability to work with all political groupings. Any directly elected leader should have, as elsewhere, the title of mayor and sufficient clout to make things happen. The current leader arrangements at Suffolk County Council do not provide the leader with much clout.

This level of review and governance can therefore be altered towards a more corporate mandate allowing a clearer focus towards balancing the political with the financial model and thus ensuring the aims are not about voter confidence but about ensuring the future is incorporated into the decision process.

This may be an instance of "be careful what you wish for". Some parameters for the role must be in place.

THIS MAY REDUCE LIKELIHOOD OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL BEING OVERLY POLITICISED

This must not be a jobs for mates scenario and should be impersonal and for the good of the community.

This option seems to be more representative of residents' choices.

This other elements of devolution could be delivered without this. The risk of this resulting in an undemocratic system (where the County Council cabinet does not reflect the mix of Councillors elected to it) also seems rather high.

This provide more accountability & fairness

This puts power in a small group of hands and local councillor could have little or no influence. Scrutiny powers will need to be strong but I doubt that.

This really is not that important to me but thank goodness there will not be a whole 'structure' of new employees sitting under it and the staffing of the council remains broadly the same. So I'm neutral when it comes to a directly elected leader. However, it's not like we even vote for a prime minister so why they are harping on about 'mayors' or 'leaders' in devolution is pointless really. I can't quite see how any work will be done if we have an elected leader who is a different 'colour' to the majority of elected members, but it certainly will be interesting.

This seems like a good idea but I do have concerns about the motivation of those wishing to take on such a role and the practicality of successful delivery against the party political background.

this should and could happen under the existing system

This should be a good democratic model in that the electorate get to decide who is in charge but I look at the utterly useless Police and Crime Commissioner position which has the lowest voter turnouts and delivers no connectivity or transparency. In such a set up much will depend upon the personal charisma of the elected person.

This should be the democratic procedure anyway

This sort of democracy tends to produce unexpected results

This very much depends on the parameters set during the election process. Will it be impartial? Will the sitting authority be able to use the councils resources? Again, incorrectly phrased.

This will be a bureaucratic exercise adding an another layer of paperwork and cost for very little gain. Why not use the money this would cost to improve existing services?

This will become political based on party lines , people have no faith in politicians why would having an elected leader mss as ke any difference

This will increase accountability which is a good thing

This will mean that political parties will need to work together for the best of local communities

This will promote local accountability by those in power

"This will result in chaos and waste time with petty arguments

Giving one person control is not democracy"

This would add an additional layer (at a cost) to a system that is continually misunderstood, this would add confusion and could potentially generate a farce if the 'elected leader' was directly in opposition to the County Cabinet

This would be different but having a clear leader would be of a benefit. The concern would be around if the leader was different from the majority of councilors

This would either be a one horse race (as with the Police Commissioner) or lead to a dysfunctional cabinet.

This would not work very well at all. The ability for a directly-elected leader to be different from the majority party would create a system where decision making is frustrated. There would also be questions over scrutiny of the directly elected leader if they were to choose some people from their own party for cabinet positions if other parties were larger.

**THIS WOULD OPEN THE DOOR TO FAVOURITISM AND CORRUPTION**

This would provide a higher level of democracy in a system where many feel let down because of a reactionary vision rather than a proactive approach to local decisions making. Local matters being dealt locally is the way forward.

This would result in all decisions being weighted and determined by one person who will be swayed on a 5 year cycle with reference to populism. not what is in the best interest of all the county via representatives elected by wards etc

This wouldn't change a thing we would still end up disserpointed .

To be able to understand and think through how we want a leader, and their future projects within Suffolk. Instead of a sole group deciding.

To elect someone accountable for their actions. With ambition

To reinforce accountability at the highest level of country wide decision making

to what extent would the peoples vote count

Too important to be devolved. The proposed structure looks like a recipe for stalemate!

Too many highly paid councillors already. We need less governance and money spent on front line services, not supporting the gravy train councillor allowances.

"Tories must go!

Tories are all self-interest corrupt politicians.



They must spend time to reorganise themselves. "

Totally against this idea. You could end up with a leader and cabinet that are from a minority party(s) which would end up spending most of their time and energy in political conflict with the majority party. This is a crazy idea

Transparency and accountability.

Transparency, integrity and honesty from a Personal Statement

Trivial. How on earth can we know who would do the best job as leader any more than we do when electing the Police Commissioner.

Unable to answer the question because of the way it is phrased. It is actually extremely important to me that this form of governance is not implemented. The possibility of a leader being elected who does not represent the majority of councillors is a recipe for weak and ineffectual governance.

Unless there is money to support campaigns...we will just get a nomination from each party as now

Unlikely to make a material difference. Still likely to be based on the party structure and the cabinet will get filled up with cronies from the winning party

Unsure what political consequences are of this.

Using normal people in touch with reality! Electing every year making sure they are still with it?

Very Important as I do not think this is a good or an efficient way to spend the funds available to SCC. The current SCC wastes too much of their funds and to give them even more would be throwing even more money at them to waste.

Very important if devolution is agreed.

Very strongly disagree with this approach. It prevents accountability at the most local level, and costs the taxpayer excessively. Very likely that the same role as the present Leader undertakes would be done but in an unnecessarily complex bureaucracy.

Vital to the success of the programme

VITALLY IMPORTANT. Suffolk needs a leader who listens, not one driven by his own agenda

Voters/tax payers should be able to elect every person whose salary they pay.

Waste of money

Waste of money and more bureaucracy

Waste of money on yet another election

"We all elect enough leaders who rarely get to enact the decisions they promised when elected. The country certainly needs no more of them.

Spend the money pensioning existing politicians off and deleting their roles."

We are about to elect a new PCC for Suffolk, so why not the leader of the County Council? People like the opportunity to be included in decision making, to feel "part of".

We are not a region. It won't make any difference.

We as residents need to have the power to elect those that will represent us the public in delivering money to areas of need. People should be able to elect those that promise to deliver in areas the public feel need support.

We do not need an additional level of bureaucracy in Suffolk.

We don't need any more members or leaders of SCC, it's an unnecessary additional cost.

We don't elect the PM do we - not sure it will work and may result in an unworkable council. Trusting the electorate to choose means we would have to know their proven track record so costly electioneering.

We don't need anymore quangos

We don't want a Mayor. Call it what you like it's a Mayor.

WE don't want some political hack on a Buggins turn basis. To have a chance to hear who is up for the job and to be able to make an informed choice would be good.

We have a national vote and presently the party who wins has there leader as PM. On this base we would have a second d vote who would be PM. Ridiculous!

We have a toothless police commissioner who is costing us £450 a year per household. I do not want further layers of government at any level. A directly elected council leader will not add any benefit to us as ratepayers and cost us more

We have councillors, elected at local level to represent us, but over the last few years they seem to representing Suffolk County Council more than the views of the people. Such direction can only come from the top. What not ask the people to vote on the pay rises the exec receive based on their performance as well. Which ever way it goes leaders and those round the table will do what they want rather than allow the public to decide. Will you reject devolution if the majority are against?

"We have enough elections and most people do not bother to vote in local elections, unfortunately.

I do not believe this extra layer would provide value for money. "

We have had a sitting MP represent us for many years now who has achieved exactly nothing.

We have seen a lack of leadership and a follow the party line attitude from elected and non elected members. We need someone capable and with vision.

We know local people standing for election. They know the local problems to. Or where improvements or refreshing is required.

We live in a democracy so we should be able to directly elect our Leader.

We live in a democracy. This should be extended to local government. The leader of Suffolk County Council is an important person with great responsibility. So he should be elected, this also helps to keep him accountable to the people of Suffolk for his actions.

We might get an actual Conservative rather than a Liberal Democrat in a blue tie.

We might get someone good who is in it for the right reasons not another bald male pale stale councillor in their 60s

We need strong charismatic personalities to stand for election that can get the attention of government. I also like the idea that they can pick from the best brains elected as councillors rather than be restricted to particular political parties.

"We need a mayor for East Anglia - a mayor for Suffolk is a nonsense if neighbouring councils don't have one.

(Who dreamt up this nonsense?)"

we need a strong leader who can lobby for our region and unite the differing political elements that will otherwise have the potential to undermine deliverability

We need effective leadership not money spending wasters!

We need good people with integrity, a willingness to listen, to create a co-operative enthusiasm and to incorporate the best ideas to make improvements for all of society, and especially to help people out of poverty.

We need input

We need less beurocracy not more. Sack people. Reduce services.

We need local leadership not some remote 'head'

We need the best person for the position regardless of politics.

We need to get the majority of the electorate to actually vote as many are under the impression that it's only a two dog race. For the many that do not vote for whatever reason are effectively saying we do not trust the system and these votes should be counted as 'none of the above' along with getting rid of first past the post voting.

"We need to have someone with a high profile and greater influence than what we have under the present scheme/system.

"

We need to stop tory corruption at every level.

We never really know much about our local council now so profile needs to be raised

We operate parliamentary systems where parties elect leaders. This should be the same until a full scale consitutional review is conducted - The police commissioner structure has led to less accountability not more and I think this will do the same. Suffolk is not the place to attract charismatic leaders and I would be concerned about who a directly elected leader may be.

We should be able to elect the Leader of SCC, so if they are not doing a good job the people decide.

We should decide on whom is the leader. It shouldn't be down to the councillors to decide. They should all also be held accountable to the same standards as those employed by any local government.

We want strong leadership for Suffolk with ambition and aspiration with education at the heart of decision making. We would not want to see this election process leading to greater bureaucracy and confusion and we would want to see all parties recognising and accepting the need to work together to ensure the success of the deal regardless of which party the leader comes from.

We'll just be give a preferred candidate, waste of time and ballot paper

"What a stupid idea so we can elect the best voice in the room or the one with the most money used to promote themselves seems far to American to me

The person with the most money or loudest voice wins would you vote for Trump "

What a waste of funding, resources and time. The current system is much cheaper and more democratic. The proposed system would reduce choice - only those willing to subject themselves to wider election would be prepared to stand. Stagnation would be the likely result of a leader from the non-majority party, unable to get through the council anything they had won an election on. Spending on elections is already high, with low turn out for local election. I don't want this.

What difference will this make anyway

What happens to district and boroughs with this system not a mention. Looks like a mayor in disguise.

What next a mayor? Yet another level of government and wasted expenditure.

What we don't need is another elected politician on a big fat salary with a final salary pension acting like a glorified Prime Minister or second rate first minister.

What's the point? Haverhill has a town council that's powerless. St Edmundsbury council only care about Bury.

While this is an important principle, I doubt if it would make much difference in practice, politicians being politicians, along with their habit of selecting appointees as 'jobs for the boys'!

Who are these people without qualifications to run a tea party

Who ever is in does not earn their massive salary as long as no issues affect them.

Who knows what you might end up with? Sadiq Khan?

Who would nominate the proposed Direct Leader?

Who would the council be accountable to? Four years is a long time to wait if the council isn't making changes that the people want or voted for.

Why as they never listen to the people that actually have to elect them!

Why elect someone to follow party digma

Why make it more complicated? Most electors are not bothered. Look at the turnout at the polls!

Why not a mayor? Good mayors could cross political boundaries.

Will promte disorder in an already chaotic cabinet management scam

Will provide continuity rather than changing with the make up of the council following council elections.

Will they be accountable for their actions?

Will they be accountable too?

With 30% turnouts totally irrelevant.

With a realistic wage in line with Civil Service pay scales

With the greater local control comes greater accountability

Without knowing the individuals priorities it would be difficult to directly elect a leader - and I suspect internal politics may detract from decision making. The priority must be the good and benefit of the community.

Would an American model work better where they are directly appointed due to their knowledge expertise rather than just councillors?

Would be concerned that a councillor elected from a different political party than the majority party of the council would unduly influence decision making/policies with their cabinet. We want more effective, collaborative councils - not less!

Would create a strong focus on the office and accountability for decision making.

Would help to reduce the "old boy" effect

Would this potentially cause problems if the leader has a different political outlook to the bulk of the council?

Yes another layer of bureaucracy. We already have District and County Councils and Police Commissioners. This make clear that extra funding will be used for inefficient additional layers of local government.

Yes but we would need candidates that will shake things up and get rid of this self serving wasteful system we have right now

Yet another cost without benefit !! .

Yet another election incurring extra expenses expenses

Yet another layer of beaurocracy, wasting more tax payers money.

Yet another layer of over management of local government. Waste of money in terms of salary and all the additional costs of running election to appoint the person.

You already justified the reasoning expertly in the explanation

You can only have true accountability if the person is elected and tax payers have the opportunity to reject them at elections.

you could land up with a council of members that does not reflect the election, are we talking of a mayor that is impartial? The system doesn't seem to be very logical

You do what you want once elected so this is a pointless question

You don't listen to local problems you are only interested in serving your own political party, putting that first before the needs of the county you only need to look at how you treated Cllr Murray over the recent Ofsted SEND report.

You must remain accountable to the people you serve.

You need direct accountability

You should always ask the people to whom you owe support to represent. Remember you work for the people and carry out our instructions. All councillors should be independent. Parties are the problem.

Your current leader in a law unto himself and backs his councillor pals. Having a 'publicly elected' leader won't change that ethos or improve anything for Suffolk residents. In exactly the same way as our 'publicly elected' MP's are a law unto themselves and only have their noses in the troughs that best serve them, so would a publicly elected leader for SCC. Matt Hancock anyone?

**Q11. Overall, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Suffolk County Council should accept the proposed deal, including the change to a directly elected leader, which is a requirement of the deal?**

**Please Explain**

£16M per annum for the next 30 years is a very small proportion of the SCC annual budget and will only decrease in real terms. The directly elected leader in the context of a large rural community is irrelevant.

"1 - it's not new money it's just moved, I can't see it leading to any improvements for Suffolk

2 - potential for council decisions being made by the council's minority groups due to a directly elected leader not being compatible with a Cabinet system

3 - too much power in the hands of one person"

A chance to vote for the person most aligned with the needs and values of local people must be an improvement on current system

A directly-elected leader would be a disaster for the reasons outlined above.

A good thing but only if it is ring fenced for improvements.

a great idea which means the Tories will turn it down they don't know a good idea when they fall over one

a more democratic way to proceed.

A single leader is the opposite of diverse democratic representation.

A waste of Public money.

A wasteful exercise from a government that has run out of ideas.

A/a

Absolutely not, this has been a totally unacceptable consultation - as a former survey consultant I would say that this has been a horrible, manipulative experience.

"Absolutely not. Unequivocally, no. The Council is too parochial, political, and thick.

Don't waste more time and taxpayer monies."

Again I refer to previous answers. SCC should their own house out before even contemplating taking on more responsibility.

Again not sure it would work for everyone at least London doesn't have favourites

Agree to be more independent at local level.

Agree with devolved funding & local control disagree with elected Mayor/Leader...

AGREED SUBJECT TO ANNUAL REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE

"Agreed, so long as the funding is used for more progressive policies on things that affect all of us then I see it as a net good thing.

My only concern would be the money being spent on other areas than what is funded by central government now. "

All change costs money to implement and I have not learned anything which would indicate that improvements would be enough to welcome the change.

All for democracy and elections. Councillors need to be held to account for their actions

all of the reasons above

All sounds like a disaster waiting to happen

Already answered, should be the best person for the role

Although I agree, I am not convinced the Deal will provide sufficient funding to make a noticeable difference. Being a bit cynical, it also seems to me that this Deal has been aimed at keeping Suffolk under Conservative control as a bit of political promise along the lines of dangling a carrot in front of the usual conservative voting suspects.

Although none of the seem capable of focusing on business and spend far too much time arguing around the politics

Although the deal has already been done and this is just a paper exercise. Suffolk cannot use it's money wisely now, it will never use any extra to the people's advantage.

Although the overall Devolution deal is relatively modest, it is an important first step in giving the county a greater voice nationally,

Another layer of bureaucracy. Just like the PCC, a waste of time and money. ...has anything improved...no...!

Another layer of expensive bureaucracy with relatively minimal funding return. The possibility of a political impasse between an elected leader and the ruling party is real and potentially crippling. This is an urban solution to a problem that doesn't exist. SCC should review current

practices and procedures with a view to improvement before embarking on fruitlessly engaging in unnecessary innovation.

Anything which brings about a shakeup of local politics is to be encouraged

Apart from waving a big fat carrot, this proposal offers little change, leaving the same group of self-serving people in place. Within the council we have a handful of good people, but it's not enough.

As you will gather from my previous comments my view is our country is in serious trouble. The Tories have deliberately reduced our democratic representation and I suspect this will do the same. It's too late for this to happen. I want PR an elected upper house and then this replicated at local level - at that point devolution may have value as more of us will be properly represented.

As above

As above

as above - it's not clear how well run, efficient the council is now, or is it on the brink like Birmingham/Nottingham. ie is SCC capable and how much influence or control would a mayor have over the budget?

As above answer to 8

As above democracy will die if not exercised

As above.

As above. I just don't have enough faith that Suffolk will do better than the current way of working. Suffolk sadly has shown a history of focusing on Suffolk and not taking part in the larger world of East Anglia, England and the UK.

As above. SCC have shown themselves to be inadequate and inefficient. I do not agree that they are fit to be given more powers. There is no benefit to us as ratepayers

as before depends on the elected representative truly representing the views of the electorate rather than riding rough shod despite overwhelming views.

As I don't want the council to have any more power

As long as change is forthcoming and it's not more of the same lining their own pockets

As long as it stays as one leader and not two

As long as the council is actually committed to working with local partners (and not just their own supporters / donors), then I feel this would be beneficial for Suffolk.

As number question 8.

As previously stated it would allow Suffolk Councillors to decide what is best for Suffolk residents

As said above

As the government would be sum whatever aggrieved and subtly taking revenge.



As usual, money is driving this, not what it means for residents. The inefficient services will carry on as the same people will be there. Stop wasting money on surveys and up your game, then ask.

At the moment all your decisions are the wrong ones. So nothing will change in the future.

At the moment there seems to be some good happening but a lot of resources wasted - a devolved council May work better but hopefully not worse.

Because in its current format, the county council is not fit to do such a job, it can't do the job as we stand, and I don't expect it to change.

Because SCC has not proved itself trustworthy or value for money. Electing a centralised mayor would make the distance between people and their governance even greater

Because you couldn't run ivy up a wall

Better to take decisions locally than centrally.

Bit of a no brainer, don't you think?

Blame for all issues would be deflected to local government and funding will not keep up. no one keeps their promises.

Both have benefits and negatives, and have different risks associated with them

But it has to be strategically thought out with no assumptions as to who will gain contracts to improve our County.

But it is important that Central Government can be held to account. The pollution of the rivers in Suffolk is a disaster caused by Ms Coffey / Ms Truss.

By accepting you are reducing central government's responsibilities. The problem with all infrastructure is that over the years it been de centralised which has made it very difficult to have a national policy

Centralised government does not work anymore, the MPs are too distant from local issues.

Change in local government means extra spending

Change in the right direction would be good. I think the funding is low and I'm not sure how much difference it would make in real terms. I am also concerned that it is all open to abuse but this is a fact without devolution on the cards. I also do not wish vast sums to be poured into Ipswich without a great deal of thought and planning. It is in a sorry state as a County Town and the temptation to focus heavily on the regeneration to the detriment of the wider County would be huge. I feel that this is a huge concern.

Changing one useless system for another

Community participation is the heart of democracy

Concerned that SCC will get the smaller end of the payment form the government.

Concerns over funding, staff costs and money being spent poorly.

Considering the facts, the Suffolk County Council would have more money to use

Council of any flavour cannot be trusted. Money pit.

Council services run into ground under Conservatives. The county needs more flexibility in leadership that reflects what the majority of citizens want, not just a foregone conclusion thanks to the electoral boundary re writing under Thatcher

Councillors disappear into a fog of no responsibility after election anyway!

County Deal enables local control over important decision making. I think it has the potential to really benefit Suffolk. There are a few dependable with this but if managed well I think it will be very good for the County.

■ idea.

Currently the head of Suffolk County Council does not listen nor heed to the electret

Cut council tax. Cut waste. Spend less of our money.

Cut the staff, cut the woke budgets, spend this money on roads and business. Elect a proper sensible bloke and we may get somewhere.

Deal making is for gamblers not serious honest politicians who want to improve the lives of the local community.

Decide to do it well; don't let petty politics get in the way of making any changes for good, however small. Get good people with integrity and diverse experience, not just politicians.

Decision-making is likely to be more beneficial for Suffolk if determined by representatives of Suffolk.

Decisions are best made at a local level and not 100 miles away

Democracy!

Dependant upon voting system ie a majority vote essential = more than 50% of total vote

Details, Is the direct election to be FPTP? How long is the leader elected for? Can they be dislodged?

Devolution could be a good thing. This proposed deal is a very poor offer

Devolution is a good idea for the major conurbations, but makes no sense at all for predominately rural areas.

Devolution is a sugar coated lie that will further destroy this country. No.

Devolution is proven to work, we need to be ambitious

Devolved government brings decision making closer to the people and hopefully raises their involvement in local issues

"Devolving power away from Westminster is always good

But the money is tiny

We are still hamstrung by tight finance rules which give few options for raising money and innovation

Unlikely to help Ipswich "

Dial two corrupt

disagree, the options above don't cover this

Do not accept ! . The people of Suffolk do not want a directly elected leader . To accept the proposal would be another ' fat cat wage / gold plated pension ' without any benefit .

Do not accept it. They are pushing this because it probably suits them in the long term.

Do not agree with devolution

Do not agree with devolution

do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

do we need another official

Don't be gutless! Put your trust in democracy for once

Don't believe it will be spent wisely and besides, many councils are bankrupt, so I feel we are wasting money and not getting value for money or listened to.

Dont devolve

Dont know enough about it yet. Just bandying about the figure of "over half a billion pounds investment for Suffolk" makes me suspicious that its just for immediate monetary reasons. That figure is actually a very small amount when its diluted down to last 30 years and to cover all the needs across the whole of Suffolk. So it cant be the money that is the main reason

don't know enough about local politics to judge

don't think they capable of handling it for the good of all.

Don't want another local dictator who think they are God.

England should have it's own parliament. It should NOT be split into mini constituencies, and have totally different directions of development from each other. England should be kept as a united, properly managed country. We've suffered from too much decision in the last few years.

Extra funding is always welcome (eg investment fund) but there is no guarantee that it will be spent any more wisely / unwisely than at present. The same comment applies to devolved funds

Fed up with a deal for this a deal for that, nothing ever seems to come from anything evolving politics.

"For all of the proposed items that would be devolved they are all things where it makes sense that local delivery has the potential to be far in meeting the needs of Suffolk in a better way than national delivery.

Also like the idea of residents being able to elect the council leader as this should be up to residents not a small number of people from the party with the most councillors."

For all reasons already outlined

for all reasons stated about more "Suffolk local" services and development and greater local accountability

For all the above, previously mentioned reasons

For all the reasons given above

"For all the reasons given above.

Same SCC that can't manage potholes and modest problems won't become some super efficient authority. It will another layer of bureaucracy and a whole new layer of well paid functionaries. No thanks."

"For all the reasons I mentioned.

Autonomy will serve the town directly without having to refer to higher power not really in loved in the town "

For all the reasons stated in my response, I believe that this is not a silver bullet and will not greatly help Suffolk residents.

"For reasons given in previous answers. For Heaven's sake lets have things financed and decided locally, and reduce the dead beaurocratic hand of central Government. Central government of course has its place, but it's too slow and cumbersome for all issues.

"

for transport and alone it is worth it

General incompetence makes me doubt the budget would be spent wisely

Generally I'm in favour of devolution, but I would rather see party politics kept out of it. Success needs people to work together. The deal is dependent on knowing what Suffolk needs/wants and that requires a plan. Better it's demand driven as opposed to what HMG wants to give up.

Get some decent people who have experience and knowledge of how to run a succesful business with good staff levels of satisfaction and I MAY vote

Given that I have no confidence in the current SCC Councillor representing the area properly and effectively. I do not believe that SCC should accept the proposal as it will exacerbate the existing problems. Get the problems sorted first then perhaps.

Given that the alternative is status quo, and no improvement in funding or accountability, it is important that we support the deal.

Given the current state of the British government in Westminster, just about every part of England outside of London should have more devolved powers to govern itself. Local communities know themselves better than cosmopolitan bureaucrats. This deal seems a step in that direction and may help to preserve our home in this county

Given the examples of the negative impact of devolution in other areas in the country I think this is an extremely poor idea and not best for Suffolk residents

Given the performance of the current government, which is, in my view, abysmal, I would strongly question the agenda behind this offer. They have done nothing to improve the lives of people in Suffolk for the last 14 years.

Gives too much power to the county. Powers and money should be devolved to the districts and Ipswich borough, not to the county.

Got to be better than what we have.

greater accountability, more localised decision making

Having answered the previous sections positively, why would I be anything other than in favour of the whole package? We can all work together for a better Suffolk.

Having more control will allow us to bespoke how we utilise the money to improve Suffolk. This can only be a good thing

**HOLD OUR POLITICIANS TO ACCOUNT. DEFEND SUFFOLKS INTERESTS**

How many times must I answer? Devolution is wrong.

Hugely important as it will help shape the counties future

I

I agree as on balance it seems to be a positive move. However, there is not really much choice with no alternative on the table.

I agree it sounds good but I strongly disagree they should have anyone in their cabinet that has not been elected

I agree that being given additional powers is a good thing, as local leaders have the knowledge of the county in a way central government does not. I think the amount being devolved in the grand scheme of things is not much, but any should be welcomed as long as it doesn't mean less is invested in those areas than it would if central government were still to control those areas. The largest area I disagree with is the directly elected leader. The possibility of having a leader of a different party to the largest party elected would cause problems for accountability, scrutiny and appearance, and wouldn't sit very well for a leader to be leading a cabinet of members from a different party or parties. This part of the devolution deal should be scrapped.

I agree that we should be progressing devolution negotiations, but the deal on the table is not good enough and won't make a lasting difference to our county

I agree we should control our tax with people we elect

I agree with all aspects of the deal proposed except the conditionality of the Leader being elected directly, if this were not a condition, then I would strongly agree that SCC should accept the deal. If the Government is so convinced that direct election of Leaders is so crucial, then why is it not also supportive of the notion of the Prime Minister being elected directly? It is deeply inconsistent of the Government to impose one set of rules on local government whilst making their own separate set of rules for themselves, and this is just another symptom of the Government exercising an excessive level of control over local government.

I agree with all the components of the deal, however this consultation hant made clear what else we could have, or what the alternatives are.

I agree with the change to a directly elected leader, and on the multi year financing, however, I disagree with the greater devolution in terms of local finances as I believe they wont be spent as effectively as centralise would spend.

I agree with the concept but wonder whether an enlarged area, say Suffolk, Norfolk and Cambridgeshire, wouldn't be an altogether stronger city region?

I am deeply concerned about the additional costs involved in administering the funds that come with this deal, especially as the costs will be largely in wages. Wages have two characteristics: they are costs that rise in line with or above inflation, and they are long-term commitments. Most of the funds being granted are not-indexed linked, and others are short-term, even one-off. My concern is that the growing shortfall required to administer the scheme will end up being borne by the average Suffolk resident. This might indeed be a great deal, but not for people who live here.

I am disappointed that so much time and money has been wasted on this 'self aggrandisement' idea, when the resources could have been better spent on providing struggling services to the tax and community charges payers.

I am fully supportive of decentralisation.

I am in favour of powers being devolved from Westminster. Local decision making for local issues makes sense.

I am not against Suffolk having devolution, but this should be done in conjunction with creating a Unitary Authority for Ipswich.

"I am not happy with their performance to date on local infrastructure, traffic management and money wasted on endless consultations

"

I am not, and never have been, a particularly political person. Have no strong feelings on the topic.

I am opposed to a directly elected leader

I am split with the pros and cons - I dont think overall its a good enough deal financially

I am sure you will have made your decision and are simply ticking boxes by consulting on it. A directly elected Mayor is not a price worth paying for the deal. We have seen such disasters of governance, and confusion over accountability, across the nation, providing poor value for taxpayers and overcomplicating simple local government.

I am unsure

I am wholly in favour of greater local decision-making but I have concerns about SCC being equipped to deliver this in a way which offers maximum benefit for the people of Suffolk.

I believe in local representation. County councils are too big and not connected to local residents. East Suffolk already has an Economic development team to support businesses.

Duplicate expense if the county set up one too. It could really work if you do it smartly. Try not to follow Surreys lead.

I believe it could be incredibly beneficial to Suffolk, but it will only work if the council consult with the people of Suffolk about where the tax money is spent. The council needs to have a complete transparency about where money has been spent and what money is going to be spent and where so the taxpayer can hold the council accountable, if we believe our money is being wasted we should be able to make it known.

I believe that devolution would serve only to enrich the current members of the council rather than benefit local services.

I believe that this deal would bring a lot of positivity to Suffolk and would give the council more autonomy, and the people of Suffolk more of a voice over what happens with their county. It would make me as a citizen feel more heard and more assured that the things I want to change in the county are changed.

I believe this would be a good deal for the people in Suffolk in being able to make more decisions on what will affect the people of Suffolk.

I can see few disadvantages and many advantages in Suffolk accepting the proposed deal

I can see why it has come up, I don't know what the funding is now either? It is important for local people to have that ability to reinvest in the areas that need it, here in Suffolk to. It just sounds a harsh amount £16m a year for the whole of Suffolk, from Lowestoft all the way to Ipswich and out to Bury St Edmunds way. It's quite vast. Can it really be done for that figure? But do like that sound of us here in Suffolk, spending/investing in our Counties needs.

I disagree with the concept

I do believe in a county controlled clearly by one party should have so much power to decide on such huge budgets, also the levels of staff isn't sufficient or the expertise there to deliver these budgets as councillors, also you do not listen to the public currently so this would be a huge concern for more vanity projects

I do not approve of the council being given additional responsibilities and funding until this administration can prove they can deliver the ones they already have !!

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not think that SCC have the capacity to make a success of devolution. They have cost us millions in failed projects and ultimately devolution would cost us more. I say a resounding NO

I do not think that we can afford to accept I can see our council spending millions on outside consultants etc and I really do not think the expertise is there to do it.

I do not think there is anyone capable of doing the job.

I do not trust political parties. Only out for themselves and their friends in high places not the people who vote.

I do not trust Suffolk county council to make changes. I agree with electing a new leader but do not agree with this proposal otherwise. I still await seeing meaningful changes and impact in

desperately needed sectors of Suffolk and I cannot see this proposal guarantees any of the change needed.

I do not understand the finer details so unable to strongly agree, but in principle this feels like to right direction of travel

I do not want local politicians to have more powers to interfere with the details of my life - look at Welsh 20 mph speed limits and London ULEZ for examples of what happens when local politicians have the powers to foist restrictions on communities even when people don't want it.

I don't agree with devolution

I don't agree with devolvement, where will it ever end it's just breaking up UK. Gives power to the wrong people who are just going to squander the money

I don't agree with the proposed deal

I don't care how local government is run, as long as you stop all the talking and get on with doing. Sick and tired of endless initiatives for Haverhill which never amount to anything.

"I don't have confidence in the leadership of Suffolk currently.

I wake up everyday and feel like this town is form shadow of its self."

I don't think the Council has the best track record to manage these matters.

I don't think, going on previous results of the council, that they are able or qualified to take on the responsibility of the altered status.

I don't want it and believe this is a power grab from people whom I do not trust

I don't want it because those in power aren't trustworthy

I don't agree with devolution.

I don't agree with the devolution deal full stop. I do not consent. I say NO

I don't agree with the government shirking their responsibility

I don't know enough to make that judgement.

I don't know that Suffolk is an ideal unit for this sort of devolution, it's not a coherent regional identity in the way the Met Boroughs are. But it's the deal on the table and it's really important that decisions are more local.

I don't see that there is any proof that devolution has worked anywhere. It usually seems to put more control in to less qualified people.

I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

I don't think, with the populations current confidence in politics, this would be the best thing for the county. There needs to be better education for young people around politics before we introduce more votes for leader of council. Otherwise younger people may be even less likely to vote as it will become more confusing. Therefore being underrepresented politically and investment not necessarily being implemented in the best way for all.



I don't want a mayor

I don't want the deal to go through

I feel it's not the golden egg it may seem

I feel there are pros and cons, and have not yet seen much that would persuade me that this way of doing things will definitely bring the many positive changes suggested.

I fully believe that the changes, powers and funding offered in the deal can be better leveraged by SCC to provide a safer, more productive and sustainable future to the development of the county and its residents. I'm excited by the prospect of a more local point of view for investment funding and have faith that SCC can uphold the responsibility.

I have little faith in government or the councils, every year incompetence grows greater and greater. The real issues are ignored (housing being available and affordable for example) meanwhile unimportant "issues" are forced into the zeitgeist.

I have no faith that there would be any benefit to the taxpaying Suffolk people at all, but fear it may get worse if this went forward

I just don't think sometimes change is needed and it's the current leader who is pushing this and they may or may not be here. Is it right for Suffolk? do the benefits outweigh the changes being made to governance. I think the Council is well run and steady and I personally feel this will unsettle and cause more issues that it reaps rewards which will either not come in the end or will alter somewhere along the line.

I like the sound of this giving normal folk the opportunity to make decisions that affect us all.

I live in an urban hub and have seen a decline in service provision especially within Highway funding where so many more vehicles use Ipswich Roads ( vehicles per mile of road ) with an unfair distribution of budgets. Highway funding used to be administered by Ipswich District under an Agency arrangement until this was taken back by Suffolk whereupon funding decreased. I can see Education and other services following this same pattern.

I oppose devolution and the extra tier of government that it brings

I personally disagree with this model of devolution. What has worked for big cities won't necessarily work for rural counties.

I really cannot understand why this is necessary.

I refer you to my earlier explanation.

I see nothing in that that is actually likely to create any improvement

I still don't have enough information to make a statement and would like to see public meetings on the topic. Unless Ipswich received a proportionate spend as a country town and largest population, it would be hard for me to agree

I strongly agree to this proposal. It would provide accountability and a figurehead for people in the county. At the moment I don't know who the county council leader is, but I know who the mayor of the West Midlands, Greater Manchester, Greater London etc is because they have a heightened profile across the county. Similarly, I like the idea of the leader being free from party

control, being able to appoint Cabinet members from across the council, I think this would be conciliatory and bring councillors together in the interest of the people of Suffolk.

I strongly agree with devolution but not with the idea of directly elected leaders. I feel it is a nod to pseudo democracy but not a good route to take.

I strongly disagree with this 'proposal' as a resident of Ipswich, and believe vital funds would benefit more prosperous parts of the county than the county town. This is especially the case with a Tory led council. The only thing that makes this at all palatable is an independently elected leader.

I SUPPORT DECENTRALISATION IN PRINCIPLE WITH APPROPRIATE CHECKS AND BALANCES IN PLACE

I think control of funding is important for a county which is possibly perceived as purely rural and somewhat ignored is very important and to gain some prestige as a result would be an excellent by-product.

I think devolution would be a positive step forward to giving Suffolk more control over its funding and also allow for positive changes to be made to the area more effectively.

I think if Suffolk stopped having sycophants for councillors and got people who actually were worth having, and a ban was placed on councillors upping their own pay, until their pay reflected average earnings, then there would be no need for devolution at this level. Time these local politicians climbed out of their own [REDACTED] and took a look at the reality for everyone else. Giving them more money to play with will only result in more waste. More projects that make less than 1% difference. Putting money available in the right places would be a better use of it. Which councillors have the gumption to do that especially when there is no photo op? I'll vote for that imaginary figure.

I think it is an opportunity for development. An additional and very serious responsibility for the councillors, who should be people of the highest calibre, scrupulously honest and with a vision for the future.

I think it will give the council what is currently the best option to provide the best services to Suffolk

I think it would be good for Suffolk if the right caliber of personnel can be found to manage this

I think it would be of benefit to all Suffolk residents and businesses

I think Suffolk County Council should accept the proposed deal, including the change to a directly elected leader.

I think the extra money would be wasted or get eaten up by moving funds to social care which the council currently mismanages. I also don't believe it wise to borrow and use the money to pay the interest....how would the capital be repaid?

I think this deal has the best interest possible for Suffolk and will be beneficial to the county as the measures this deal states allows us to have far greater control of how our funding is spent which can directly target what is most important for the county and its people

I think this would lead to arguments and resistance from all the elected councilors.

I think we should accept so we have a seat at the table to further interact with Government in the future and potentially renegotiate if possible. I'm not fully in agreement with the deal on the table but I feel like if we say 'no' we will just be ignored in the future.

I think you are trying to hand power over to someone else for a pay off and change your constitution in the process.

I think, overall, the deal will provide net benefit to the county.

I totally disagree with a devolution deal for Suffolk. Our current county council is failing the general population and is not fit for purpose

I want to support devolution. But not this deal. It's weak, poorly funded and lacking ambition. Do devolution properly, or not at all. This is pathetic.

I would agree if the sums of money sounded in any way realistic but this, sadly, feels like tinkering at the edges. I'm disappointed overall and need to be convinced this is not just window dressing.

I would have liked to see more debate and proposals around the specifics of the priorities of a devolved administration in making this response.

I would hope the opportunity would encourage greater public engagement in local politics and leadership

I would prefer Ipswich to become a Unitary Council.

I would prefer the finance was allocated by the people of Suffolk to meet the county's needs but am concerned that the Leader of SCC post will become too political and a waste of a salary.

I would say that the current Council has not demonstrated skills required to manage and deliver this project

I would want to know about the negatives to this deal; what funding would be lost?

I'm for change to the political system. Localised government should have the power to decide and regulate how they govern their communities.

Ideally this should have been a combined East Anglian Authority between Norfolk & Suffolk with one mayor, such as Derby&Notts. But if that's not on the cards then I am fully in support of this deal

If it doesn't work can SCC revert back to being as it is now?

If leader is of different party, this will lead to political decisions coming first and consensus not being reached on certain matters

If no other options are on the table then it's difficult to know if this would work. It would need to have people to be accountable for all spending decisions at the very start of this process

If Suffolk has a directly elected leader there must be a means to unseat them too. However on balance I believe the devolved budget and a directly elected Leader could be a benefit to Suffolk.

If the deal goes ahead local people need to be consulted more of what's going on in their area or it will make no difference.

If the government is forcing the directly awarded leader on to Suffolk, Suffolk should make it clear that this is their condition and not something we would chose.

If the only benefit is being able to vote on who the council leader is, this devolution is not worth it. I do not understand why all the proposed benefits can not be brought in without devolution.

if the process is managed efficiently it would be very positive, but it has a risk of poor implementation

If they don't accept it, then they are short changing the people of this county and should all resign.

If this government is pushing for it, there has to be a catch somewhere doesn't there?

If we do not accept the DEL we will not achieve a Devolution Deal, without devo we will be overlooked and more vulnerable to centralised decision making.

"If you can't write a survey that's not so bias then you have to wonder what's in it for the people writing it?

Larger salaries and alliances?

No thank you."

If you want to improve community and regional opportunities, you've got to start working with them in a more effective way and gain their trust.

ignore the deal, and elect your own leader. No funding required

Important for the region to have a powerful leader

"In my view, the extent of devolution offered is not enough to justify the deal's requirement that SCC should have a directly elected Leader. The fact that, in all but name, this Leader is actually a Mayor has not been explained, and the possible constitutional consequences (both positive and negative) have been insufficiently explained.

The timing of this deal is now unfortunate, to say the least. It is not possible fully to implement the deal before the upcoming General Election. And, if as seems very possible, a different Government is formed after the General Election, then the devolution rules could well change. So, might it not be better to wait, and to reconsider the situation at a later date?"

In principle, each area in this country has differing needs, so should also have the ability to make decision based on those needs.

In the overall scheme of things this is a very small step, but a process that needs to be started and encouraged.

Increased annual revenue funding, albeit a relatively small sum is helpful, but I oppose the loss of centrally funded FE sector for the reasons previously stated and the other proposals are of little value and/or no known benefit

Insufficient information too late. This survey expires in 10 days on 26 May. Why was it not brought to our attention in March? Information could easily have been included with the new council tax notifications for 2024/25.

Invest in building a future with more jobs opportunities, invest in accomodating people, invest in council housing and not rely on private sector to think of a solution or expect the private sector to build affordable housing when they are a profit oriented entity

Investment that helps the people in the smaller towns would benefit Suffolk greatly

it brings hope for a better future for suffolk

It depends entirely on the people. Most of them are [REDACTED] useless! 🙄

It does rather depend on the quality and experience of councillors elected, but could give a a chance for a strong leader in the mould of local mayors elsewhere

It doesn't seem to be a great deal, with only limited devolution and funding, but on balance some devolution is better than none.

it gives local residents the power to vote potential leaders and have their say on local matters, help business and have controller and opinions of local residents to where money should be spent

it gives the region the ability to drive its own future focussing on the priorities that are best for us

It is a bad deal for Suffolk.

It is all smoke and mirrors from a Tory government wishing to cover up their long term under funding of local government by adding more bureaucracy and cost to hide their corrupt activities

It is important for the buck to stop with someone in particular! If there is local accountability and a named individual responsible for leading developments, then there is the prospect of a dynamic and well targeted process of change.

It is just wrong for it to be Suffolk only and will damage East Anglia in the long run.

It is obvious that central government is only offering devolution in order to absolve itself of any responsibility for appalling public services and to distance itself politically. The deal is not financially viable, if it were the government would not be offering it. Also we are thankfully close to a general election and a new government, this offer should be declined and Suffolk can wait for a new proposal from a competent and functional new government.

It is rare that govt give away money for something. The fact they are in this case suggests it suits them, without any reference to the residents

It is sensible enough in principle, even if the practice is likely to fall short due to the wrong type of people standing for election.

"It literally doesn't matter, does it!

None of you actually care unless your pockets are filled. "

It looks a better option than we currently have,

it must be better to have control by the residents of the county who live here and are better placed to see what is required

It seems to be a now or never deal so I think we should bite the bullet and go for it.

It seems to have more benefits than disbenefits - but I am concerned about the checks and balances when the County Council is so staunchly conservative and the town councils tend to be Labour. In fighting and petty bickering needs to stop.

It should be voted on by the public, it is not Suffolk County Council's decision to make. If they do accept it without a public vote that is a gross abuse of power. Without a full plan in place which has not been shown to the public yet there is nothing to vote on or accept yet.

It sounds exciting but needs to be done well, with integrity and without personal points scoring! I don't always have much faith in people's ability to put self interest to one side.

it sounds like a great opportunity to invest in onward planning at a level not currently possible.

it sounds so good for the future of Suffolk

It unlocks a wealth of future possibilities, provides immediate opportunity and offers a profile and influence for Suffolk that would otherwise be impossible.

It will all depend on the cost of new office against benefits. The police commissioner office costs a lot but can't see what benefits are

It will be mismanaged, expensive to operate, and the benefits to the people of Suffolk will never materialise.

It will be what it will be. We fill these things in but from reading the consultation, it's a done deal anyway. This is just lip service.

It will hopefully give Suffolk a stronger profile than it has currently.

It will lead to spending cuts over time as inflation goes up but the amount received is fixed for 5 years

It will only be used to further line pockets of those in power.

It will simply lead to an increase of salary to 'attract the right calibre of individual', when experience across the country shows this isn't the case. In effect, it will cost the taxpayer more to achieve less, a common theme in local government.

It won't change anything, bad decisions will still be made just with more money to waste.

It would be good to have a local mayor to deal with what's important to Suffolk

It would be nice to see some proof that SCC can work with IBC to re-energise the town first. Not many of the 75 councillors actually live in Ipswich our County town.

It's a good way forward and models have been successful in other areas

"It's a shambles of a decision.

A poor financial deal

SCC doesn't know there is a West Suffolk this will make it worse "

It's all good

It's almost pointless the people of Suffolk voting against this as it will go ahead anyway. As with most consultations it is simply paying lip service for a pre concluded outcome

It's been hard to find much detail in local media and on line about the pro's and cons, other than the SCC Conservative Party proposal. What I read from some District Councils and other political Parties is vague and general, but I'm not detecting much enthusiasm or feeling it will significantly address Suffolk's needs.

It's still a con

It's underfunded and a bad solution for our needs

It's a bribe. Funding should be available for all councils without conditions

It's a cheat. They're just offloading responsibility, so they can steal the money needed to fix the problems. The offered cash is far less than would actually be required.

It's a gimmick to take our gaze away from the root causes of the crisis in Public services (see answers to previous questions).

It's a no brainer. More money, more power, more democracy. All local.

It's a shabby bit of mock-democratic window-dressing by a government that knows it's going to lose the next General Election. True devolution would hand full revenue-raising powers for local matters to locally-elected bodies, and would enable residents to have a much greater say in how their communities are run. This proposal is nothing like true devolution!

It's an opportunity for Suffolk residents to have more of a say in how we want our county to be run. It's an opportunity for us to have a role in the regeneration of the area

It's essentially a choice to accept a boost to the county's financial resources or not, so it would be odd to turn it down. However, genuine devolution should be as much about the shift in power as the financial adjustment

It's not devolution. It's a small handout to Councils that will remain under firm Government financial control.

It's not needed and there are more important things to worry about

"It's so generous of the Government to give the Suffolk tax payer back a tiny percentage of the large tax bill they pay compulsorily in the first place.

What we don't need is another fat cat elected politician taking our hard earned money."

Just get on and create a single tier of local government in Suffolk and not shuffle the deck chairs on the Titanic as it sinks

Just look at London, crime rate though the roof plus other issues

Just more jobs for the boys

"Just more layers of managers. It will need like the NHS or police with ever more administrators and fewer people doing front line work.

Central government want you to take the burden so they can not be held responsible. Leave well alone and don't be fooled by the money."

Lack of explanation of risks. Lack of inclusion of health services. Lack of imagination in the consultation text. These documents do not give me confidence in your leadership and therefore I'm not keen to see your scope increase, especially in the current climate.

Lack of trust in the abysmal service provided by local politicians

leader should be elected

Less government is more

Less layers of staff to pay for

Let local people make local decisions.

Let Suffolk elect who they want to 'steer the ship' going forward, of course you will not be able to please everyone!!

Let the people chose the leader

"Let the people of Suffolk decide.

The demise of everything that has happened under the present regime has been a monumental embarrassment."

Lets ensure local people can govern their County - they live and work in it, experiencing the results of the decisions they make

levelling up bill is designed around the structure of charter cities by TITUS GEBEL- a far right nazi associated man- tax payers alliance love them too- the people begin tufton street, vote leave and the levelling up bill- wake up and read this stuff

Like I have previously stated, I wouldn't trust you lot with £4.80 let alone £480m

Local control should better meet local needs

Local councillors know their area (or should know their area) and it makes sense for more areas to be devolved to local government.

Local decision making is likely to make better decisions

local decision making will ensure that local problems are dealt with effectively

Local people need to make the decisions for the local community.

Look what has happened to London with a powerful elected mayor pushing his own agenda

Manchester is a real inspiration regarding devolution, Suffolk can too make a real change if this deal is accepted

Money and power.

More and more beaurocracy and wasting tax payers money. There are already far too many politicians and jobsworths, we don't need more, we just need the people already in post to do their jobs properly.

more control for Suffolk

More control over local matters



More cost to the local taxpayer as central government is reducing NI so money will have to be sourced through other routes or even more cuts

More detailed explanation of all future proposals required

More devolution not needed

more information required directly in relation to the directly elected leader

More money to be spent by the area for the area

more money, more democratic control

"More power to the people and local council is always a win in my book so I see no downsides to this proposal. Lets just hope they don't become as corrupt as the government.

I really do hope this improves the prosperity and standard of living for Suffolk and our people."

"More power would mean more waste . I do not have the confidence in the council they could financially run their own funding competently.You waste money enough now , don't deal with things which are important to the general public.

A definite NO from me

"

More salary and pension contributions for another totally useless, chinless weasel. What a waste of money.

More self determination and an elected leader are attractive. The risk is the way the funding will depreciate over the longer term and the challenge will be to negotiate a more realistic amount in 20 years time - its a risk but not impossible so perhaps we should see this as the start of a journey.

My concern is about the accountability of Suffolk County Council. There's already a lot of dishonesty, terrible decision-making and an inability to negotiate good deals for the county. There is nothing you have said here that has convinced me that this will improve should we devolve.

"my concern would be the Councils's ability to manage the funds and make the right and timeous decisions.

Currently they seem unable to do so with the funds available.

"

My only concern is that the climate emergency issues may be lost at a local level. These need to be at the top of the requirements for everything the council do.

"My understanding of the information provided suggests that having a directly elected leader would ""open to door"" to an additional £200 million or thereabouts over 30 years

- this excludes the £282 million of the £480 million ""that would be coming to Suffolk anyway"";

- some of the funding identified appears to be short term only - e.g. 1 or 2 years only,

- inflation over 30 years will significantly eroded the value of this package unless index linking or other suitable measures makes suitable provision."

Need the right person in that role

Need to balance the bureaucracy v the actual impact. Which is really unclear. You've not explained the impact it would make to the ordinary persons life. So why bother? This gov speaks about devolution but makes local areas spend precious resource bidding for tiny pots of money. It's not the right time. Next year = new government.

Need to negotiate a higher allocation

Needs more adult funding as values too low

"Never in the history of all the problems faced in Suffolk has the answer been ""More elections - more politicians"" - The money on offer is far too small to even consider changing the democratic structure that exists. It risks creating division, and divisiveness, with the leader chasing headlines and overshadowing every other elected member - and for what? £22.33 per person per year? (reducing yearly with population growth)

No thanks.

"

"No ...

Just another enormous wage for another useless person that is only interested in themselves and their buddies "

No devolution.. the money is a pittance

No local government by unelected people from outside the county.

No one cares...

"No one is opposed to more decentralized powers, but extra powers will only magnify the power of Suffolk's rural county & districts OVER urban Ipswich.

Ipswich is the historic catalyst for 65% of Suffolk's GVA, yet now has next to no authority or voice within Suffolk at county or regional level, and rural districts completely controlling growth or blocking its infrastructure and highways growth.

If Suffolk wants levelling up, it must get its house in order first. "

"No practical benefits to Suffolk.

Trivial amounts of money involved, little real authority is being devolved, the scheme itself will be withdrawn next year and the SCC leadership team (as past failures show) will squander any small benefit that could have accrued."

No significant change is proposed I feel

No to devolution

No to Devolution!

No you're far to incompetent and waged money on lunacy already

No, see earlier answer.

Not a good deal Suffolk at all. Typical Tory run us into the ground policy. Let the people elect the leader with no tricks about ID requirements

Not against devolution in general, however, the sum involved is insufficient, especially as the council is already running at a loss. Judging by other countries with strong devolution (e.g. Germany), devolution works for counties/states with lots of industry, big businesses and income strong households. None of which Suffolk has in order to generate sufficient additional income for the council.

Not certain there is enough information regarding the merits or disadvantages of the proposal. Who is responsible for having proposed it and the reasons?

Not certain, over the years the electorate has not always been given a balanced view of proposals. This council document is going to place a good slate on this proposal.

Not convinced at all that SCC would manage this effectively. Especially after the shocking SEND review!

Not convinced that it will make a material difference to me

Not enough money and therefore unworkable.

"Not if it had to include directly elected leader

"

Not required

"Not sure Suffolk is ready for this yet.

Currently Suffolk split into smaller areas to allow local solutions..... see little benefit except for the bigger towns (especially if town has deprivation). So much money wasted e.g. Woodbridge road restructuring proposal."

Not the right time and the government will be happy to delegate and then blame when it goes wrong after the initial funding sweetener.

nothing is perfect but turning this down would be crazy

Now is not the right time with an election due. It reeks of a Conservative government trying to make sure they still maintain some influence in the Tory-stronghold regions

Of course we should be able to directly elect the leader!

On balance this only about moving the furniture as the ship sinks.

On balance, if this is an agreement which genuinely brings additional funding to Suffolk I support it. If it simply recycles government funding to SCC but the county would have received it in any case then I would not support the agreement. If there is a requirement for a directly elected leader to access this funding, then why not do as other areas have done and be more radical and opt for a directly elected mayor? This could lead to a reduction in SCC Portfolio

Holdings, do away with the post of council leader, streamline decision making and make that one individual directly accountable to the electorate. Choosing to negotiate for an elected council leader feels like a way of SCC doing all that it can to preserve itself rather than considering what could have been best for the wider county. A missed opportunity!

On the provision that it for Suffolk's public sector leaders to ensure that the opportunities and future opportunities from devolution. are secured for all Suffolk residents, businesses, places and communities.

On the surface it seems like a positive step forward for Suffolk's future.

One tier system in principle must be better than a 2 tier system of local authority structure long term

our county is sleepwalking into decline we might reverse that with this

Overall do not agree.

Overall I agree, the elected leader needs more explanation

Overall I would disagree, particularly as the leadership issue is a condition..too open to abuse.

"Overall, a devolved Suffolk can act as a more independent body than the rest of the current struggling UK.

The government do the best that they can to keep up with every county, every council, and make sure they have what they need, but there's only so much they can do or even know.

If Suffolk were to be run locally, it's run by Suffolk, for Suffolk, has its own best interests in mind and how to best get there. It acts as a semi-independent body, and can thrive in the way it knows best. It's the best thing that can happen for the people given the elected parties can keep up themselves.

Accepting the deal would be a vital step in securing Suffolk's future as a thriving and successful county as it has been throughout its history."

Overall, it could make a huge positive impact for the local area, spending can be routed where it needs to go and it is decided on by those running the area, not those in central government, who may not know what actually is happening on the ground.

people living in Suffolk will, in my opinion be worse off. The money on offer sounds a lot but in fact it is a drop in the ocean, our taxes will go up, and there will be a lack of accountability. This is just adding another layer of government that will have to be paid for. **YOU ONLY HAVE TO LOOK AT THE DISASTER OF DEVOLVED GOV IN SCOTLAND AND WALES to see why this is a VERY BAD IDEA**

Please do something to simplify local government and cut costs. This change would only make things worse.

Please don't do it. It would be a terrible mistake as evidenced by the fact it's not worked anywhere else. If central government are offering it, it's got to be because it's to their advantage. Don't fall into their trap.

Please don't. You are being tricked into this by the promise of money you will badly manage. The government just want less responsibility and will hang us out to dry when you fail at delivering any of these devolved elements.

Please see above - this is a one off opportunity for Suffolk and we miss it at our peril.

Please see my answer concerning devolution as a policy above. Rather than devolve responsibility to Councils, who they can then blame when something goes wrong, central government should be accountable to the electorate for common standards of services and standards across the country. We are one country, not a loose confederation of cities and councils inhabiting the same island.

"Pointless process, which I would not be surprised to learn has cost an 'arm and a leg' to produce and put forward.

Absolute waste of time from a council which does not seem to know where it is going or how to get anywhere."

Politicians tend to put their political parties first. A directly elected leader would put the people first and would be free to pick cabinet members based on skill not party.

Poor deal with limited funding. Typical hotpotch mess dressed up as devolution,

Power to the people should create more interest and positive impact to unsure voters/general public who seem disenchanted with all political systems.

Probably disagree for the reason in no.8 answer

Provided safeguards are in place to ensure robust planning and decision making involving citizens for critical stages of this.

Public spending closer to the end user

Put it in the hands of the public

Read what I have already written

Reasons already given, but you would need to sell the elected leader benefit more

Reasons already stated. It has been obvious from comments on your post that SCC are not trusted to hold even more power

Recommend that we hold out for a more generous financial settlement

Reject the whole thing and just do your current jobs properly and efficiently.

Same as above. It would encourage more transparency I hope.

Same as above. The funding, of course, is appealing (and needed across the board of services), but the potential ripple effect of a leader elected directly by the people of Suffolk could have hugely beneficial or disastrous outcomes for the county's climate change 'priorities'!

Same as Reason 8.

SCC does not have the commercial competence.

SCC does spend the currently available funds in an ' efficient / value for ' way by any means at present. To give SCC even more money would be to ' waste ' even more of the Tax Payers hard earned money .

SCC has much to do, with the disappearance of the LEP. Further devolution on this limited scale just diverts efforts - into things like producing videos about devolution....

Sc is terrible.

SCC needs to improve and subsequently show it can be financially responsible before devolution.

Sc should not be given more of tax payers money to use for extremely high wages, to fund vanity projects or to pay for silly things that actually makes situations worse!

See above

See above

See above

See above

See above answers.

See above totally disagree

See above.

See above. I also feel this questionnaire is skewed to produce the answers required.

See above. Not sure where the money is supposed to come from but it has to come from somewhere else. Is an excuse to pass responsibility for central government's underinvestment on to the local councils.

See all my previous comments

See answer to 8, waste of money that you don't have

See answer to previous questioj

See me reason above

See my last answer!

See my previous answwres

See previous

See previous answer. Better devolution is available

See previous answers

See previous comment

See previous comments

see previous comments

See previous comments

See previous reply

"Seems to me the Council just want this so they have an extra bit of power. They do not fully and properly discharge their current duties. There's no really sound reason for devolution, even less so for an elected leader, for reasons already explained in the previous question.

And by the way, there has been no publicity about this as far as I am concerned, just happened to spot it today in a BBC news item. Pretty poor show, perhaps you hope it to go through on the nod "

Should agree but should do more for Ipswich instead of ignoring it

Should hold out for a better deal

So long as whoever is in charge follows what people want and don't just steamroller their ideas through it would be ok.

So much of this deal is sugar coated bribery! Hoping that enough people in Suffolk can see through the nonsense

So the residents of Suffolk can live more freely. And choose. Overall it is best for Suffolk.

Some autonomy is better than none

Sop to the politically illiterate. So many have no idea of current council responsibilities so this will not help.

Sounds generally good, but would hope that the council would not only look inward and would also collaborate with neighbouring councils and the national government, even on devolved matters, to realise benefits of centralisation where appropriate.

Stands to reason why we should....Suffolk/East of England has a better idea of what goes on within, in this case, Suffolk rather than a pen pusher in that swirling cesspit of filth commonly known as London.....ghastly place.

Strongly disagree most vehemently for all the reasons written thus far.

Subject to the reservations above and with the safeguards to be able to remove any mayor who acts corruptly or unreasonably fails to cooperate with councillors

Sudbury gets nothing and we might get something from this

Sufficient funding, Inflation linked is crucial. Otherwise it just becomes a government good wheeze. One would like to see a commensurate reduction in government civil service staffing in Whitehall so that overall devolution is not costing much (if any) more

Suffolk appears to be short changed in terms of the funding when compared to other areas. No real thought has been put forward as to what devolution would actually mean. Whilst there may be a short term windfall, it is likely that this would be exhausted relatively quickly or spent in the wrong areas. Post 19 education funding would drop by 5%. Whilst regeneration powers and multi year transport funding is a good idea, I'm not convinced that the extra bureaucracy and politicisation of major decisions is a good trade off.

suffolk based authorities will be held to account more effectively than national.

Suffolk County Council cannot run itself effectively as it is. What chance trusting them with this budget and decision making while paying lip service to listening to the residents? They are unfit to be entrusted with this.

Suffolk County Council couldn't be trusted with any more money or responsibility.

Suffolk county Council do not, have not, shown any interest in improving the town of Newmarket or improving the lives of those living there. Decades of poor decisions and communication are well documented. I would prefer more devolution and the splitting of Suffolk, but any change is better than the status quo.

Suffolk county council squander and waste too much money now, and only look after their rich mates outside Ipswich. They have constantly and continually ignored the needs of the majority of Ipswich residents who just so happen to also live in Suffolk, while pandering to the rich outside. This bunch of incompetent corrupt wasters must not be given more power and control over budgets, as they are incapable of administering fairly what they already control.

Suffolk County Council's current performance doesn't convince me that giving them more responsibility is a good idea.

Suffolk don't have the skills

Suffolk gets nothing so lets take this

Suffolk has always been left behind so good to be at the forefront

Suffolk has been left behind for years by central government when handing out cash. We are one of the most deprived areas of the country yet we are nearly always overlooked.

"Suffolk needs a proper leader, that is without question.

On recent performance Suffolk County Council is failing its residents. Giving the Council greater powers can only be a mistake."

Suffolk people know what is needed to deliver a fair and equal access to facilities that are taken for granted by city dwellers.. First and foremost of which is an effective transport system.

Suffolk residents and businesses know better than anyone else what is required locally

Suffolk should get the investment without being blackmailed into yet another level of government. We should have national standards not more postcode lotteries. We certainly do not need more centralisation of power in Ipswich. Neither do we need more options for central government to blame others for their failings - or excuses for continuing to underfund education, health, infrastructure and transportation in our area as has been true for many decades.

Suffolk would benefit from an elected representative with greater control over local finances.

Terrible idea for the county

The answer is in the previous answer given.

the areas the council could have more control could be carried out under the current structure. The money seems to diminish over time through inflation. The election process seems to cause



problems over electoral preferences & allegiances eg Tory majority, Green leader, members made up from other parties?

The benefits are huge and local government far more competent than central government

The benefits outweigh any political concerns about a directly elected leader who comes from a different party to the majority group.

The benefits outweigh the negatives IF handled correctly... This could be a good move for the county, but it must be done properly.

The benefits seem pathetically small and won't really make any difference to residents

The benefits seem small and superficial. It doesn't offer any improvements to Electoral representation. It feels like a 'Trap' from Central governments to allow areas to run out of money then throw up their hands and say "whoops, not our problem anymore"

the bribe of 480m is nothing more than moving cash around

The concern is that the monies will be spent unwisely on bonuses and unwanted schemes without proper consultation and audits

The control of funding and the extra funding we receive is definitely beneficial, without a doubt. However, I think it is pointless that our county has to have a directly elected council leader in return for this - a pointless idea which will only cost us more financially to run local elections whilst not getting a satisfactory return from it - if we were to have a directly elected council leader, that leader should have more powers than the current council leader appointed by councillors.

The council is rubbish at the moment this will just cost more and improve nothing

The country is already too fragmented with regional governments doing their own thing to the detriment of the nation as a whole. No to more devolution.

the current performance of the County Council makes me believe that they will not make the right decisions particularly in education

The current SCC could not 'run a bath' and at the same time waste more money than they are provided with. NO, NO, NO to further devolution.

The current structure is a shambles, throwing more money and more 'management' isn't the answer

The Deal is inadequately informed and the pros and cons are not transparent, to be able to answer this question. The information is biased

The deal is not good for Suffolk.

The deal is not sufficiently meaningful and the political reality is that devolution should wait until after the next general election. The scope of the deal should reflect health and social care, housing and environment. Negotiations and political will failed to deliver a meaningful deal for Suffolk and wider opportunities in East Anglia. Whilst the deal talks about scope to expand the deal in future there is too great a risk this is treated as settled with the focus on window dressing areas and not fundamental democratic reform and local influence on key public services.

the deal seems to be yet another central government ploy to divest itself of any responsibility and leading local decision makers to accept a risky long term budget allocation

The deal will take money from the people of Suffolk

The existing council is not fit for purpose. It needs a complete overhaul before it can be trusted with public money which it currently squanders.

The finance is not sufficient and could leave us with more problems than we have now!

The financial impact is minimum / really reform should be focused on unitary local government - county council split down into two large district councils / poor idea to elect a separate leader

The funding figures appear anaemic and another case of Suffolk not receiving the sums it deserves.

The funding is too low to achieve major changes.

"The funding on offer is very welcome, but it is unclear if this is extra funding on top of existing funding or replacement funding. If it is replacement funding what is the difference between the two?"

I am also opposed to the need for a directly elected leader as a requirement to access the funding. I see this as a source of conflict and division. How would the council resolve a situation where the leader of the council & their cabinet were not from the same party that won the council election?"

The government should give this money to the council anyway to mitigate the gross underfunding of local authorities over the last 14 years. Don't waste money on changing the system of choosing the leader of the council.

The history of devolution does not inspire confidence in its efficacy

"The idea isn't sold to me. More bureaucracy. More waste. Less money going to root causes.

I'd like to see LESS local government, not more over-inflated egos wanting to build monuments to gain their immortality. "

The immediate financial gain is not significant enough to make a real difference in any particular field. The funds are not index linked and a separately elected leader could generate considerable difficulties and additional expense

The local politicians that I have seen are not fit for purpose

The money on offer is too small, and whilst it is being advertised as the start of future deals - there is no evidence that such deals will ever materialise due to Government's changing and the fact that if the DEL is not the same party as the government in power, that future deals will be harder not easier. I am also worried about the option to borrow against this money, and the impact of this borrowing on taxpayers in Suffolk. If this were a consultation on Unitary Suffolk - I would be very much in favour - but as it is, this Frankenstein's Monster, awkward mutation of Mayoral deals to try and fit rural shire counties, is not the answer to the problem of getting a more decentralised UK.

The money sounds a lot, but when looked at relative to the work of SCC it isn't. An elected council leader makes no sense.

The more democratic the election of local authority the better the leadership and management of county-wide policy. Perhaps I along with hundreds of other people in their 20's won't feel the need to flee the county in hopes of somewhere more prosperous if we were able to elect local representatives for each role democratically instead of letting a minority of voters and councillors have way more power than democratically ethical.

The offer is small from central government and the governance model is power concentrating in a small group of hands. It does not mean locals having more say.

The opportunity to directly elect the council leader.

The papers do not clearly lay out the pros AND cons of such a deal and therefore does not allow for an informed decision. An appalling piece of "consultation".

The perceived benefits are not compelling. Examples like London have seen disgraceful political grandstanding, at the expense of the residents.

The period from Thatcher to Major and beyond saw too much centralization. We need to start undoing those changes.

The proposal for devolution will be similar to that of Academy's for schools. Short term it looks positive but long term it will be disastrous. There will be a gradual loss of funding over the years meaning that residents will have increases in council tax to make up the deficit. This means that low income families fall further into debt and those that can afford to move away will.

The proposed budgets are too low to have any effect. Just adding more complexity to the political process here won't help the people and businesses in Suffolk.

The proposed deal has some potentially significant benefits. I wonder if the County Council administrative teams have the wit and the skill to be able to deliver the eventual objectives, what with working from home, etc.

The proposed deal would enable local matters to be made by people who live/work in Suffolk

The public perception of the council is quite low, so a dramatic shake up is needed to restore confidence.

The requirement of change to a directly elected leader is a major drawback to an otherwise reasonably attractive deal. It is likely to increase the extent to which the priorities for Ipswich are likely to be held much more important than the views and needs in the rest of the County.

The responsible and considered thing to do would be to postpone this decision until the upcoming national election.

The status quo leaves a lot to be desired so this new process should be progressive & effective for the county of Suffolk & it's residents.

The uncertainty of future discussions and no further information on alternatives I find negative. I think Suffolk County Council should accept the deal, surely funding and decision making made locally benefits the bigger picture and the county's economy.

The way this council work. Suffolk would be bankrupt within 2 years. And privatisation would run across the border helped by those in control to benefit there pockets

There are marginal benefits over a fraction of the budget to then have a more toxic approach to governance that could cause significant issues / result in a cabinet without a representative mandate.

There are Pros and Cons to this deal. It hasn't proven to be a success with other devolved County Councils which have made headlines for being bankrupt due to poor decisions and lack of research into investments. I don't have much trust at the moment in the Council managing a bigger budget. Our council tax has increased for the Police commissioner and I haven't seen any improvements from year on year tax increases. West Suffolk Council have invested in purchasing commercial property and spent an extortionate amount of money on renovating The Post Office and the shop units are still vacant as well as the completed works having snagging problems. Suffolk County Council have tried to push a planning application through for a mix Brownfield and Greenfield site that hasn't got sustainable road infrastructure and on an aquifer in a remote rural area where surrounding villages have surface water issues. I was absolutely appalled by how the planning application had been allowed to go so far in the planning process when not all the data was forthcoming especially from the transport highways and the applicant's customer. Do I want to give more power to individuals to make decisions like this, when constraints are blatantly ignored and a total disregard for the feedback from 100s of comments through the planning process...No.

There are undoubted advantages to more local accountability. However, the idea of having a leader who does not represent the views of the majority of the population is a huge negative.

There doesn't seem to be enough information about how some of the proposed ideas would be funded; the funding element is too small and not index linked. The potential for this to result in a clash between the leader and the elected Councillors seems rather high. I don't think enough effort has been made to explain the less positive aspects of this to people; the video seems to be 'selling' it rather than informing people of the pros and cons in an unbiased way. I think there should be more time given to communicate this.

There is an unnecessary bureaucracy in local government already even down to Parish Council level as in Oulton Broad

There is no credible evidence that the kind of devolution proposed is working for the benefit of the majority of the population affected.

"There is no need for this, it's just more expense and the impact of inflation on the money is an unknown.

I don't think it's necessary or smart."

There is not enough expertise in the County Council to use this money wisely.

There must be a very clear benefit for the community but the additional funding doesn't appear to be great over the period indicated. That said it is difficult to comment without knowing the overall SCC financial position.

There should be an East Anglian deal instead of a Suffolk deal.

There will be more wasteful use of the available money

These answers will make no difference to the outcome - Suffolk County Council will do what they want regardless. More consultations, more money wasted.

they could not cope

They couldn't run a █████ up in a brewery!

Things would only get worse

Think central government needs to be involved.

This benefits no one but those who come under the payroll of Suffolk Council. The public do not want this

This could be a good opportunity for Suffolk providing that there is transparency and that local people are informed and involved in all important decisions.

This deal should be REFUSED wholly and completely.

This deal would be great for Suffolk and its residents as it gains extra investment and greater democratic choice. But it is also a great deal for the council as it increase the funding and opportunities of the council and as such increases its powers and presence in the county.

This is a deal that has been negotiated with a Conservative government. Accepting this deal in a General Election year is a gamble, when so much could change in Westminster. Could a labour-led government offer better terms? Not sure. But this is perhaps not the best timing for negotiating such a transformative deal

This is a good step in the right direction.

This is a self serving policy that simply enables interested parties to manipulate outcomes for their own benefit

This is a terrible deal. It's no real money, no accountability, and all down to the arrogance of Mayor Hicks. DO NOT DO THIS.

This is a terrible deal. Not enough money and the directly elected leader. Lack of accountability.

This is all smoke and mirrors. Not proper devolution and risks a leader of the council being elected that noone wants to work with .

This is being rushed at and not thought through. If I were a cynic I would say it's the only way the Tories can keep control given the way thi is are going. If devolution is to bee done properly it needs consideration, proper funding g and should be apolitical.

This is critical in making Suffolk sustainable for the future

"This is the first I have heard of this. I pay council tax, you have my email address, but this came up on YouTube?

Outrageous and it doesn't bode well for any future "

This proposed deal appears to have the people of Suffolk in mind and wants their wishes and voices heard. By having this elected head of the council. It could and should improve the dialogue between the different political parties and have everybody work for the betterment of the county and not just for their personal prestige.

This question is ambiguous. Nowhere doe sit give and agree/disagree

This seem like they could be positive and good plans if properly implemented, and we require accountable democratic government in Suffolk.

This should be rejected. But it won't be because you'll just ignore this entire consultation and do what you want to do, thus proving the utter pointlessness of getting involved.

This way, the leader of the council can be elected by the people rather than a popularity contest within councillors.

This will cost residents and businesses a lot more than is being promised. It's a failed Tory policy from a failed Tory government. Suffolk deserves better.

This would be an opportunity for Suffolk to take greater control of its funding and make decisions relevant to local needs.

Time to move forward.

Times are changing. Government wastes money. Maybe we could do better although will need strong systems to avoid fraud. Especially with such large sums.

To be honest to elect the leader should be here already, the council needs new blood from around the county and please give the people of suffolk the chance to lose some of the unelected embarrassing faces that turn up heading for example cycling infrastructure improvements for ipswich when they live in Saxmundham and couldn't ride a bike in a million years, just one example of the laughing stock we need to say goodbye too

To small a sum, it will have little impact. Even low inflation will eat at such a sum over a few years never mind 30 years. The government has never been so strapped for cash, so how can this deal be good for Suffolk?

Tonight a task for unqualified people would lead to a disaster. Look at Little Holland

Too complex for most boters to make informed choices

"Too many imponderables. I'd like to see evidence that the SCC is competent to govern Suffolk well before we went down this route. Come back and ask again when Suffolk is recognised as a well run council.

I know several SCC employees and they are \*very\* unhappy and feel unsupported."

Too many other failures of this system and Suffolk should not join them

Too much power for the SCC, don't trust them to make good decisions about our county. Very worried about the county having so much control.

"Tories must go!

Tories are all self-interest corrupt politicians.

They must spend time to reorganise themselves. "

"Totally unnecessary.

"

Totally unneeded, we should be acting as a nation and more inspiringly as a world rather than keep breaking down into smaller and smaller groups driving divisions.

Transparency in all aspects of finance is needed to appease the public for the best interest of the residents of each and every area of the county and not spend predominantly on wages for those that do not achieve public requirements for the people.

Transparency, integrity and honesty from a Personal Statement

Un-need bureaucracy. We do not need the expense of more politicians.

viz complete representation sent as email attachment

Wary of this

Waste of money

"Waste of money, time and effort. The financial benefits are tiny compared to overall costs of running services. The election of an elected leader will cost significantly more than necessary and they will represent even less than they might under the current system (winning 40% of a turn out of less than 30% of the population means they represent 12% of the population of Suffolk at most - no different to now).

"

Waste of time proposal, not required or wanted by the public and what little extra money is on the table will do nothing in the long term to improve Suffolk, promote investment or add job to the region.

Waste of time the money on offer is not significant if you look at it over 30 years

Way too much corruption evident in central government.

We all know what happens when you get a little [REDACTED] like Khan or Burnham or Passmore in charge. Costs everyone a fortune and diverts money from the real problem into a department that should never exist

we are concerned about the devaluation over the long period of time. Perhaps reviews of the funding can be incorporated into the deal. We are also concerned about the poor judgement and competency in the past by councils that have invested in obviously bad projects eg shopping malls.

we as citizens should be responsible for those that govern us

We don't need the proposed deal as SCC cannot manage the current funding.

We don't need to increase the complexity of county governance.....it needs to be pared back to basics and more joined up.

We don't want worse services and wasted money

We have been too centralised in the UK for too long and local democracy is an essential ingredient in the number of democratic reforms we need to have in this country to have more accountable government both locally and nationally.

We have seen devolution in other areas of the country and sadly powers and money haven't come to fruition. Yes it would give people of Suffolk a voice but seems to me another layer of bureaucracy and red tape. Look at the PCC office. Turnouts low, and a PCC whose primary

focus is on rural crime as opposed to the significant issues and crime facing less affluent areas and urbanised areas

We must have elected representatives

We need a new leader ASAP before this one totally destroys our towns

We need improvement but will this provide it?

We need more say in everything concerning our town.

"We pay national taxes to fund nationally planned and delivered services (hopefully) based on the election manifesto of the party in office. Partial devolution does not benefit a nation, nor the people in a small area of it, as it adds a level of bureaucracy and costs with no real benefit.

Note: for example devolved Suffolk voters may not agree to solar farms on its agricultural land, but as this is deemed of 'national importance' central government will make the decisions.

Devolution is not a democratic process unless it is a full Home Rule s"

We should disagree as the inevitable conflict will arise between a predicted Labour government and a Conservative directly elected leader in Suffolk. I know the East Ipswich suffers because deprivation, for SCC is not a priority. Ipswich Council work appallingly badly from my experience together.

We should have the ability to elect the person who will make these important decisions on the public's behalf.

We will lose out long time money wise and a one person dictator will be more distant to people

We, the taxpayer, do not require more politicians, we need people with experience to lead us, people who can make hard decisions not motivated by personal greed

We're better off, and stand more chance of getting our roads repaired, and other important measures taken care of, with our local MPs, and Westminster government taking the responsibilities. Suffolk only exists around Ipswich, as far as the current council is concerned.

What is needed is co-terminus boundaries with health and NHS services and Unitary rationalisation of councils, so that health, social care and housing provision can be better aligned. Unitary devolution would increase a sense of localism and democratic accountability and enable citizen participation and elected member accountability to operate at meaningful neighbourhood levels.

What's the point it's badly managed at the moment and that won't change but will cost more in administration and consultancy

While I greatly prefer Conservative over Labour it appears that SCC don't listen to the Suffolk public and use underhand means to justify unpopular decisions because that's what they want to do.

While I'd like a change in leadership we have a democratic process to follow which I hope will do this, I don't think an independent leader would be as effective either. I don't agree with devolution. It's just another way to bunch funding together to make big figures but the long term impact is a net reduction of funding while giving and incompetent group more authority to make bigger mistakes.



Whitehall is not interested in our local economy - we are better placed to make those decisions.

Why are the Gov encouraging this? Have we got the staff and expertise to manage it

Why change? They just costs money that is needed elsewhere.

Why not just give local councils money and let them get on with job?

Why on earth should the SCC unilaterally accept this tiny bribe from a failed National Government or any National Government for that matter on behalf of all the taxpayers of Suffolk. Put it to a referendum!

Why wouldn't the council accept it? Whether we voters notice any improvements under the new system is a different matter. I doubt it.

Will in honesty this make any difference to services in suffolk.

Without elected leader which is just another cost burden

Would appreciate clarity on type of election, if necessary, fptp or some form of stv?

Would need to fully understand if the budget is reasonable and if it'll leave us worse later

"Wrong wrong wrong

Lip service "

Yes, do it.

Yes, for the benefit for Suffolk people to have better services, transport and business opportunities. Not for political benefits.

Yet another possibility of a ' job for my mate '.

You are as useless as this survey

You are literally all we have left as the government on a national scale has failed us young people, you can only make change if you are funded so go get your funding!

"You don't need more power...you could remove Cllr Hicks now, but you won't!

"

You have not made a compelling case. Your proposal is more form than content. In the development world we would call this "isomorphic mimicry", where structures that arguably look good, and sound modern, are set up but are not invested with any power. You need instead to speak plainly and truthfully addressing the real threats and opportunities we face, instead of engaging in pointless "showboating".

You keep putting out these questionnaires hoping to eventually get the answer you want, how many times do the electorate have to say NO!

You may have already gathered from my previous answers that I think this is a waste of money and a waste of manhour resources in thinking about this. Devolved Wales and Scotland no longer work together with England to get things done, just squabble. Do we now want England to internally fight with itself?

**Q12. Do you have any other comments or anything else we should consider about the proposed deal? This includes any positive or negative impacts on you.**

4 years of one leader currently can change according to political group wishes (incompetence, poor decisions). Leader not mayor, little extra funding, no new powers. So why?

480mil over those years is NOT a lot of money and so we need safeguards that it's not wasted and deals done are triply subject to oversight and public account scrutiny.

A complete review across local government is desperately need - much overlap of work between county and district - different agendas - failing residents

A few years ago I attended a Suffolk officers think- group. Almost all those there were Suffolk incomers who had chosen to move to Suffolk for lifestyle/ low crime/ environment/ lower house prices. So why would these strategic leaders want to rock their family world by changing things in Suffolk?? Plans for growth and change were being played lip service to, as the reality of change, should it be driven through would be unpalatable to the people 'in charge'. Perhaps better then to get things driven through by people from outside Suffolk who don't have a personal stake in the outcomes.

"A first move to public funds spent in Suffolk

Controlled by Suffolk"

A fixed 30 year deal with no inflation taken into account is absolutely ridiculous and accepting it would be wrong

Act don't talk about it. Just do it and do things properly.

Administrative decentralization is just asking for complete chaos. Then with the Globe in chaos and then comes the BANKING CRISIS WHO NEEDS SUFFOLK DEVOLUTION JUST ANOTHER COMPLETE WASTE OF MONEY.

Adult social care is broken. This needs to be fixed.

AN ELECTED LEADER SHOULD HAVE POWER TO PREVENT OVER-SPENDING

any extra tier of government takes money away from services: government may "fund" devolution but the cost of running it will come from regular council monies. A vanity project for the leaders.

Any initiatives, whether local or national, always impact negatively on working people who have to pick up the tab.

Anything that offers more local control rather than from London should be a good thing.

As a parish councillor, the biggest local problems are pot holes and transport. If the proposed deal helps that, I'm all for it.

As I've said above, this process is essentially a sham, and SCC councillors should not be taken in by it - it doesn't begin to solve any of the problems facing Suffolk today

"As long as we don't have more narcissistic leadership from people who are completely out of touch with people's lives I'm in favour!

Please can leaders be assessed before being put forward as candidates to ensure that they actually care about people who live in their area! "

As mentioned, given SCC previous record more involvement by local residents in decision making, especially for large expense projects.

As part of the older generation I have always believed in devolved decision making and recognise that the funding must follow. But parameters are needed too, guide lines for a Cabinet, which should be balanced politically

"Ask the government for more money

"

Assuming devolution goes ahead then maybe further devolution of powers on the welfare system could be looked at. A lot of the time national policy in this area puts in place programmes and policies that don't work very well and in the worst cases can actively harm people. For example, there is a strong body of evidence showing that benefit sanctions are harmful to health and actually have the opposite effect to what they aim to achieve. Often the impacts of this most affect local government (e.g., sanctions might lead to council tax arrears or homelessness or demand on local services) so if you could have local control then you could design something that works both for residents and also reduces demand on local public services.

"At the end of the day the "additional money" that would come to Suffolk would be spent three times over, just like it is in any other government project. "We can do this and we can do they..." is the cry from the proponents of the scheme. The reality is that the first thing they do is put a team together to look at data and research what they can do. The Mayor will need a new administration and new important and impressive looking offices to house them all. The first couple of year's additional income will be swallowed up on this vanity before anything is actually done to improve the lives of Suffolk residents. Meanwhile, central government will want more of our money to pay for it all. When it hurts them too much, it'll be a cue to raise council taxes or to authorise the Mayor's office to raise funds by relaxing borrowing rules allowing them to remortgage the properties they currently have.

It's the start of the road to council bankruptcy. Look out for Suffolk on the list of future Section 114s if this goes ahead. "

At the end of the day the success of this will lay with those elected and how the funds are managed. Cut down on waste both in time and money in any future plans, please.

"At the present time, what needs to improve is

Central funding from government

Structure for Scrutiny and Council spending"

Being a lifetime yet young resident of Ipswich and Suffolk, this is likely one of the best offers we could receive. To act more independently of the central government authority means more control. Our own goals, our own ways of achieving them, and if we can coordinate with other

counties and the country itself, Suffolk can better support itself, others, and be supported in its endeavours. It can thrive.

Better discounts & services for the elderly

better public transport as an alternative to cars

Beware the inevitable conditions, targets and KPIs that will be attached to the "deal".

Bin it quickly and put the money into running services

Bring in a stronger negotiation team.

Build an Ipswich Northern Bypass now!

"Build football cages, tennis courts, gym parks, skateboard

parks, more coaching availability etc... engage the youth, use ITFC Promotion to EPL by promoting these ventures."

Can only see positive outcomes.

Can we work to improve public dental care for the county?

"Can't see how having a directly elected leader will work and be of any benefit.

If it did then what is the purpose of all the other elected councillors? "

Can't help feeling I will end up out of pocket or with even worse services.

central government divesting their responsibilities by paying a pittance to the locals

"Central government trying to out another layer of administrators between themselves and the public. Just eating public money on vanity projects for the council.

"

Change, with a focus on cost effective services which will help local business to thrive must be the focus.

Cheaper public transport would help the town, as well as investment in making d and entertainment affordable so businesses stop closing down.

Close collaboration with district and town councils would be essential

Combine with Norfolk for a better and more simple structure. It would ultimately be more cost effective and efficient for local government.

concern local councils are not qualified to make big investment decisions, as evidenced in the last 2 years with other councils. Given the council are struggling to create a vision for the town centre (which has gone downhill, it's awful) my confidence is not high.

Concerned that this will reduce overall funding for essential infrastructure and services in the long term

"Conservatives out.

Matt Hancock can go back to the jungle and stay there.

Yellow brick road in newmarket is a crime hotspot and needs attention.

Conservatives have been pillaging public funds straight into their pockets far too long."

Consider involving younger people in having their say on issues , 16 year olds via schools/colleges.

Consider what the people say with open and transparent communication

Consultations are fine as long as they are listened to

Cost to us taxpayers, especially those of us on a low or fixed income. (Pensioner)

"Could we please rationalise and modernise our Parish Councils

If regional leadership moves to the next level, so should community leadership!"

Council needs to focus on reducing council tax, not investing more money that could ruin the council like so many others have been

Councillors should be professional competent employees whose job is to spend our taxes on necessary projects!

Current council performance poor. (Suffolk Highways a good example) Changes and new management should improve the situation.

Cut council tax. Stop spending our money on idiocy.

Cut the number of councillors by half and cut their allowances by half as well. That would be a start but I fear devolution will empower councillors to give themselves God like status with them then demanding MP salaries.

Decisions about funding are best made by locally elected representatives with the knowledge of the needs of the people in their area. Devolution will also ensure more certainty regarding funding and planning to meet long term objectives.

"Definitely a no no. Don't do it, you will end up with less local government.

DONT"

Democratic decisions in this country don't make me feel particularly empowered. We need visionary politicians with a taken for implementing and running initiatives that improve life for the community as a whole. We don't see that often.

Devolution is a nightmare, just look at Scotland and Wales. That should be all you need to know that it is a disaster. We don't need more people thinking they are prime minister of a principality wasting more money on high salaries and the cost of their entourage that they will deem necessary.

DEVOLUTION NOT NEEDED, IT'S JUST MORE JOBS FOR THE BOYS

Devolution will cause catastrophic negative change to the decision making process and make a mockery of the democratic process given that the people could elect one party and end up with a leader and cabinet from another

Devolution will just be a case of more spending on the needless parts of government, namely the politicians. Will devolution result in less national MP's , I suspect the answer is no, therefore no cost saving.

Devolving compulsory purchase powers may lead to more needless disruption of livelihoods since the central government made a huge mess of hs2 using compulsory purchase, how would the council taking these decisions be any better?

Directly elected leader is the main drawback. Other powers and funding are positive.

Do all you can to see this happens, it's a fantastic opportunity.

Do better, to many times areas seemed to be overlooked because it is someone else's problem. Problems with traffic, you think the solution is reduce the cars and lorries when building a better infrastructure is the solution and developing businesses.

Do not agree with devolution in terms of directly elected council leader

Do not devolve

Do not do it!!!!

Do not take this deal and DO NOT devolve power. It's a poor deal and how its currently managed is sufficient

Do not want things to be local

Do we really have an option? I suspect not.

Don't buy it what will Suffolk loose ??? It all sounds far to simplistic and far to business centred not enough emphasis on social aspects or benefits for Suffolk residents apart from a bus pass which we already have

Don't do it

Don't do it

Don't join the WHO OR WEF

don't design the services for the minority - the vast majority of services that SCC deliver don't benefit me or most people like me. Devolution offers a way of changing this and providing a better service to more of your residents

dont do it you waste loads of money as it is you will just waste even more in Ipswich

Don't do it you will never be able to run it just more woke rubbish

Don't forget rural Suffolk. Care homes, with the population getting older provision needs to be made for more carers and if needed care homes.

Don't forget Sudbury!

Don't waste the money on Green initiatives, which seem to do a great job of enriching ideologues. Ask cyclists, stock car racers, motorbike clubs, how they would improve the roads. Build redundant capacity into sewage infrastructure to deal with unforeseen events.

Don't waste your time and our money

Drop the act, we don't want more fascism. Fix the roads. Cut out taxes if you're not going to actually help us rural folk. If you don't, your time is limited.

End waste, cull the council non hands on workforce , ban ESG and woke nonsense. Just be like a business not a cash cow for non jobs

Expensive waste of money

Feel that whatever we answer is rarely taken into consideration.

Fgs stop wasting our, tax payers, cash on this sort of tripe.

Find ways to truly engage with citizens. This questionnaire, with its narrative driven by a particular analysis & perspective, does not treat us as adults. It is paternalistic. It is clear you have already decided what our answer should be. This isn't a mutually respectful conversation.

Fix the broken planning

Fix the only important issue, affordable and realistic housing for all.

fixing potholes should come back in-house and not be subcontracted out. How is it efficient for a subcontractor to only fix pot holes that have been reported, versus fixing all the pot holes in the same road and nearby roads at the same time? Surely having repairs done in one go is more economical than sending out repairers repeatedly to the same road.

"For example > I have emailed Councillor Matthew Hicks, and some of his underlings, on several times on issues important not just to me but to the whole of Suffolk and NOT ONCE HAVE I EVER HAD A REPLY, OR A RESPONCE, IN ANY SHAPE OR FORM.

THAT TO ME IS JUST UNEXCEPTABLE AND JUST GOES TO SHOW THAT THE PRESENT INDIVIDUALS IN OFFICE DON'T CARE ENOUGH ABOUT OUR LOVELY COUNTY THAT WE LIVE IN AND ARE UNACCOUNTABLE!?!?!?"

For me I think Devolution is the way forward, it will give 'independence' to Suffolk so that 'Suffolk' can look after the residents of Suffolk.

For the love of God, dont do it

Forget it.it just gives more power to inefficient councillors

Forget the whole idea,stop outsourcing services, and get staff back in the office where they can be supervised, effectively ending remote working, and get back to talking and discussion to people rather sending emails

Funding is often concentrated in the major towns with rural towns and parishes ignored. The East Suffolk Coast has so many energy projects coming its way, and will need support when they all disappear and the boom bust sinks in.

Funding to improve roads across Suffolk. I have to pay to ensure my car is safe to be driven on the roads and therefore I expect the roads to be in a condition that they do not damage my car. It works both ways!!!

General idea is good, but we need to understand how much central government would wish to retain control if they don't like the decisions made

Generally I think it's a good idea, subject to clarity about how to manage any potential impasse between the elected leader and the the council at large.

Get it done before government realise there is no money

Get rid of the cabinet system - it does not provide enough scrutiny of the majority party.

Get rid of the fat cats - they are a disgrace

Get the basics right and stop [REDACTED] taxpayers money away on Net Zero garbage and other vanity projects

Get train back to Haverhill and other areas, more doctors and dentists

Get your act together first. Devolution can be good or bad; at the moment I have absolutely no faith that SCC have the skills to deliver devolution for the benefit of Suffolk residents

give the power to local and local councillors to directly influence government to let local residents govern their views and where money goes

Go for it a good idea

Good luck!

Good to see SCC thinking about these matters. However, I would prefer to see more action on issues such as rural transport, health and wellbeing, integrated healthcare, etc. Devolution will divert time and attention from such other issues as well as the important need for better and clearer relations with Level 2 Councils.

Greater ability and ease of public transport would reduce need for use of cars. Better systems for save biking.

Green space improvement including litter bins at all entrances to the water meadows to reduce dog poo & dog poo bags all over the meadows, along with beer cans, bottles etc.

Have more ordinary people making decisions and not just councillors with pet projects, the traffic lights in Kesgrave that were removed and the Kobra system that a councillor insisted on regardless of value for money.

Having seen how a federal system works well in Germany,, this deal doesn't go far enough the amounts of money being talked about are peanuts,, but it's a start!

Having yet another layer of elected 'leaders' is a waste of resources and does not serve the residents of Suffolk. It will cost them.

Hope it doesn't happen as Suffolk County Council aren't capable of managing the additional responsibility.



Hopefully brings Ipswich residents a better environment and considered more in future road improvements

Hopefully Suffolk will gain more finances to control in the areas that are in decline.

Hopefully, this change will hasten a Unitary Suffolk Authority, bringing all local government under one roof.

How about a little more investment in the west of the county, there is life west of BSE!

How about an open meeting at Ipswich Town Hall or other large location within Suffolk and invite the people of Suffolk to attend, and then see via a face to face event what the people think of this. Not saying I don't trust your surveys but in order to have full transparency it is the best and only way to being fully transparent.

How are the general public of Suffolk aware of this proposal? There has been very little marketing about it. Every person to whom I have mentioned the topic has no idea about it.

How can we ensure that we get quality candidates. What safeguards are there to prevent bankruptcies etc?

How do we get more 😊

How many local government officials working on this

I am a little worried that it will mean that the cabinet will be all of the same thought pool of the elected leader which might lead to there being more blind spots and less accountability and challenge to decision making

I am deeply concerned that the survey questions have been favourably loaded!

I am disgusted that all of Suffolk's residents have not been properly consulted about this. What about residents who do not have access to the internet or who buy a newspaper? This should have been sent out to all households with both the benefits AND potential negatives clearly and impartially identified to allow for an informed response. This has been presented in a very one-sided way - "Suffolk can have lots of money if you vote yes" - but in reality, this "deal" could leave Suffolk worse off and mopping up after this for years and years to come. I actually think this smacks of "Empire Building" for the current CEO and Leader of the Council.

I am disgusted that this consultation has not been highlighted to all residents of Suffolk. Everyone I talk to does not know of its existence and how to take part. I only found out by a chance meeting!

I am fed up of central Government taking an approach of "divide and conquer" to all tiers of local government below Westminster. Why is there no coherent nationwide strategy for devolution nationwide? Why has Suffolk been singled out? Is this all a plot by the Parliamentary Tory Party to install an incoherent and patchwork postcode lottery of local government intended to discredit local councils and give oxygen to campaigns by hardline conservatives, anarchists and conspiracy theorists to further demasculate local government and further centralise power at Westminster? Why haven't SCC opposed the conditionality of having a directly elected Leader imposed and why haven't they campaigned for the decision on this aspect to be made by local electors?

I am hopeful that the normal people of Suffolk can make choices that directly impact so many.

"I believe that we should devolve as The East of England as a whole as I have mentioned before. Look at East West Rail which should come into the region at Cambridge which could have benefits for destinations such as Felixstowe and Lowestoft along with the wider area. I would like to see the rurality of Suffolk/East of England not be ruined by new roads, buildings, too many people whilst we can improve our environment, transport links, employment, health, education and economy.

( Lowestoft, has anyone thought of twinning it with Chernobyl and Jaywick..... 😊 )"

I believe the proposed deal is unworkable. Not in the best interests of the residents of Suffolk.

"I believe the whole idea is intended to persuade people they have control, but they will not.

Let's not forget Brexit, and how we would all be better off and have more say. How wrong was that"

I can positively say I don't want the council to have the opportunity to spend money on pet projects they can't afford.

I can see that in principle the Devolution Deal could provide certain benefits for residents and businesses. However, I'm not convinced about the level of funding nor do I have particular confidence in the, allegedly, competency of executive officers and members of the existing cabinet to carry through the Deal. The current CEO of SCC comes across, allegedly, as invisible and barely engaging with the people and businesses served by them and their executive teams.

I cannot imagine anything more damaging for Suffolk than devolution. Current leadership is poor, the issues around school transport, SEND provision, road upkeep and general failings prove this. Had SCC been effective my response would be different but again, SCC cannot manage the current situation so I have no hope they would be able to do a better job in the future with or without an independent leader.

I can't see any negative consequences of having a devolution deal.

I do hope that Ipswich would be allowed to have its own say. Since it lost its independence back in the 70s, Ipswich's economy has stagnated and development has grown leaving Ipswich misbalanced. This deal needs to fix this inequality across our largest county town and upgrade the network across the county as a whole. I worry the new authority would simply cause further stagnation when it comes to someone fixing an issue.

I do not agree with the proposed deal

I do not believe devolution is in the best interest for the people of Suffolk.

I do not favour devolution, I'm sure we already had this same discussion but you didn't like the outcome. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

I do not support the devolution proposals

I do not support this proposal.

I do not want a local government - I do not want people who have not been in main stream politics or banking to make decisions or handle that amount of money - I want to know that

pensioners will be taken care of and rates will not jump 100% to pay for this I also need to know how much they will be paying themselves and that there is good accountability as in a third party not a friend or business partner checking finance - I totally disagree with this devolvement!

I do not want the deal. It will add an extra layer of bureaucracy and take money from the people of Suffolk

I don't agree with devolution. SCC can't deal with the budgets and responsibilities properly at the moment so should not be getting more power/money

I don't believe local government within Suffolk has earned the right for more powers, quite the opposite, and I can't see what difference this will make. £16m per year is not a lot for the grand plans the consultation document outlines...and that's before accounting for inflation.

I don't believe that you will take any notice of this consultation and that the decision is already made. Merging of local authorities in Suffolk was not a popular option but look where we are now !!!

"I don't know that this deal is necessarily perfect but it's a step in the direction that the governance of this country should be going in.

In future suffolk itself should have more power over local laws and taxes"

I don't think this will make any difference. It will still be more about politics than anything else unless the representatives are independents and that is unlikely to happen

I don't want it

I dont believe I or my company will see any difference.

i dont know

I don't know much about it, but I'm suspicious that anything that this government wants to do isn't for our good, but for their own good.

I don't personally expect much change, but local government will benefit the area as a whole.

"I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

Northern bypass now."

"I don't think that Suffolk CC has a wide enough view of the needs of the County to support this.

You don't care about anything outside Ipswich, you are doing nothing to preserve our Countryside and Rural way of life - it's a race to the bottom, to turn Suffolk into another version of the Midlands and I have no interest in it.

Just stop trying to power grab and get focused on the stewardship and effective management of what you already have."

"I don't think the council is in a viable position to do this. Financially the books dont add up and your turning the area into what resembles an underdeveloped country. Our roads are awful, I don't know the last time they were resurfaced. The works on the A14 between Bury St Edmunds and Stowmarket are a joke, the standard of completed road is shocking.

The council is closing a vital service in housing related support so homeless people will not have the support they desperately need to get back on their feet. People working in HRS area are so underpaid compared to council staff and are facing prospect of unemployment.

The council is a disgrace, it can't manage the books now and provide a decent service for its residents, this idea scares me as we are the ones who will suffer, not the highly overpaid leader of the council. "

I don't think they care for anyone but themselves and don't listen whoever is in charge

I don't want a mayor

I fear that this devolution could take power away from individuals and allow other, less democratic, bodies to have a direct influence over local matters.

I feel like Suffolk isn't treated with much respect by Government (well local government across the country is generally treated with disdain by MPs and the civil service). We're surrounded by counties that have better deals - but I feel like Suffolk has a lot to offer too - we just need the opportunity!

I feel SCC has always favoured rural areas over Ipswich, in terms of investment and resources and feel if given more control over the money Ipswich would lose out even more.

I guess in the long term the only difference it will make to me is that I will get even less and pay a lot more. It should be stopped now and at least save the cost of another worthless consultation

"I hate the idea of it.

More layers of government.

More snouts in the trough.

Apologies for the negativity but this is a totally bad idea as the idea of consulting local people is just box ticking and I've seen it all before. Thanks for the opportunity to comment "

I have lived in Ipswich for 18 years now, and would love to see more money spent locally, especially on renovating and reopening empty buildings - for example, the council offices near Bond St, the Railway Pub on Foxhall Road, Grimwades, Debenhams, and the Paul's Malt building on the Waterfront. I would also like to see money invested in helping the homeless, and providing opportunities and youth support for the young people.

I have lost faith in politicians. Unless it is a compassionate and caring council who actually care about people not profits I can't see this helping at all. Too open to bribery and corruption.

I have no doubt that Suffolk county council will ignore these surveys and carry on as they are!!!

I just hope the money spent will be used for projects which improve the look and practicality of the town, promote social cohesion, learning, respect for others, reduce congestion (there's a lot of reliance on the Orwell bridge currently for example) and makes us proud again of our county town. Much of the rest of Suffolk are a gem so it would be great to bring Ipswich back up to match it, especially now with added football interest in the premier league

"I know everyone in local gov works really hard so this isn't a personal comment but stop thinking about inward structure and start thinking about what would really make a difference to our amazing county as a whole - our roads and rails in and out are crumbling, flooded and

unreliable . As are our schools and hospitals. We are a rural county but have thriving tourism and local specialist employment. Stop the districts closing down our high streets and turning them into charity shops. Our employment needs are what?

Are there opportunities with Norfolk Cambs or Essex?

"

I live in Lowestoft - I would support a coastal authority that would be based on the East Coast (Greater Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth). I feel no affinity with Suffolk at all - SCC does not include or recognise Lowestoft's needs; I can't even get to Ipswich without taking out an overdraft for the train fare! Be serious about connecting the different parts of Suffolk - this deal should not go ahead given the current lack of cohesion in the county.

"I note the extra money is about 2%...unless I am very mistaken..and reducing by inflammation... A very small financial

incentive it seems to me."

I oppose the proposal.

I repeat yes devolve money & decision making to local authorities...not just County but no to putting power into fewer hands.

I request that the ' non Conservative ' members of SCC combine and reject this IDIOTIC suggestion .

I see devolution as a cynical attempt by central government to shift the blame for lack of funding onto a new authority. It won't make any difference to the amount of money available from central government, which is already lagging behind what is required

I see what is going on in London and it

I strongly disagree

I strongly object. It would be a disaster.

I strongly oppose the election of a Suffolk mayor

I suppose my main comment would be about visibility and raising awareness, or the lack of it, as I literally had no idea about this until I stumbled across it on the thread of a neighbourhood blog page. I am no community activist but I have lived in Suffolk on and off for the last 50 years. I have worked and raised my family here, so I am invested in many ways. I would therefore have expected this to be a much more visible and open discussion county wide. The fact that it has not been a big topic, is in itself rather worrying and makes me wonder why??

I think as long as these people can be held to account or forced to enact their pledges and not have to wait the full 4 years in some way it would be a good idea

"I think I have made my views clear. This process is a waste of time and money.

Suffolk does not need to devolve, FULL STOP"

I think I've made my objections clear in the previous answers.

I think it is a good idea, as long as we can trust the people who spend the money :)

I think it largely depends on the competence of the elected leader but an improvement hopefully from what we currently have.

I think it should be some clothes shops in Haverhill, normal Health center, more police and better road quality

I think it will be good to have local issues debated and decided closer to home.

I think it's a mistake and am completely against devolution

I think I've covered my concerns in the other comments. Party politics and obstreperous individual councillors need to be managed for this to work.

I think I've stated my objection

I think that presenting a deal in this way is tantamount to pointing a gun at the same time as holding out a large bribe. It is not really feasible for us to refuse one part while accepting the bulk of it.

I think the majority of Suffolk residents don't want devolution in any shape or form. But we all know our views will be largely ignored and it will go ahead anyway

I think this would be a total waste of time and money and do nothing for ordinary people no matter what these people say they would do - just look at other mayors, Police and Crime commissioners and all the other party failures to deliver

I think, and hope, that the deal would have a positive impact on Suffolk and that it should be accepted. Whilst I strongly support any devolution, I would prefer an East-Anglian wide devolution deal (similar to the North-East or Cambridgeshire & Peterborough) that would include Norfolk and Essex and allow a connected and coordinated approach on things like transport, tourism and adult skills. But I am very supportive of what has been offered so far!

I totally disagree with a devolution deal for Suffolk. Our current county council is failing the general population and is not fit for purpose.

I want to see more information on the potential "pitfalls" or cons of such a deal. Sure it sounds like money being given to Suffolk would be a good thing - but I doubt very much that this is without negative consequences, particularly with the money now being linked to inflation - Suffolk could be worse off in the medium/ long term!

I will not be very happy if it means our taxes go up to pay for all this change.

I work at the Council and I feel this is a negative thing and is being railroaded through rather than thought and consideration being given. Local people will only focus on local matters and will not understand the Leadership vote.

I work for SCC, and as both an employee and tax payer, I think there is far too much waste within SCC. There are far too many managers and not enough frontline staff. Money is wasted wholesale, like introducing systems that don't work properly, investigate who signed off Total Mobile! Too many little empires and not enough listening to frontline staff.

I would be interested to understand how much this has already costed, as a tax payer it continues to shock me how poorly my hard earned money is squandered especially in light of how I plan and spend the money I am left with after countless taxes.

I would be very concerned if this was to go ahead.

I would be extremely concerned that SCC could end up in desperate financial difficulties as some other devolved authorities eg Thurrock, Northampton, Birmingham.....

I would encourage to accept the deal, however the process would need transparency and a detailed roadmap and spend schedule, for at least next 5 years communicated to the stakeholders so that the value driven context is easily established. This will send the message that devolution empowers local authority who are fully aware and have planned to the future changes and transformation both social and economic.

I would like to see greater consultation process as part of implementation of the deal if it goes ahead. Perhaps panels of stakeholders to advise and influence on the detailed plans.

I would like to see less housing on greenfield sites, more sites for nature, safer rural roads with cycle lanes and better signage, traffic calming measures, appropriate speed limits and improved bus services

I would like to see this happen to enable communities to thrive instead of being ruled and dominated by boards and committees that don't live or know the areas they preside over

I would like to think that not all plans and monies get sunk into deprived areas. The success of the County lies far more broadly in areas that are successful and thriving currently. They should not suffer as they are key to Suffolk's future.

I would love to see Suffolk truly grasp the opportunities of active travel. This is an easy win win for local people, better quality of life and lower costs associated with transport. Please do more in this area. Thank you.

I would personally like to see specific additions in relation to public transport and SEN. As I mentioned previously Suffolk's track record in respects of SEN is "diabolical" and needs serious address. We as a county should take this opportunity to reverse this and become a leading example for the rest of the country.

I would rather see a change to unitary authorities, following the pattern of the existing district councils in Suffolk, and abolishing the county Council tier of governance

I would say devolution is nothing but a good thing. We would be foolish to refuse

I would suggest you pause and think about why the government want to offer this deal to Suffolk

.

I would resist this proposed deal if nothing else £480 M over 30 years is not at all sufficient

I'm not sure whether there should be a maximum total time period for serving otherwise we'll end up in the same position as we are with the PCC where things seem to be getting worse but he's still in position with poor turnouts

"I'd like to see simple and small things completed.

If you sort the potholes, I can guarantee tat most of the county would be on your side, or at least give you some credit.

Follow what the people want and need.

Imagine if we all just stopped paying our council tax, you'd literally be out of a job!

Make a difference please!!! "

If developers are allowed to continue to extract huge profits from building what is UNAFFORDABLE HOUSING no one gains except them. Social housing needs building immediately. Council owned and maintained otherwise renters are going to be priced out and homeless. There is not enough NHS Dr's nor dentists. Everyone has to drive miles or go without. Invest in our health and well being. We need a secure home and to be healthy to be productive.

"If I asked you personally if you wanted 480million pounds you would ask "what's the catch?"

You haven't made the case for change, just offered us a bribe to have an elected mayor like London - and look how that's turned out."

If it goes ahead it is crucial council listens to the residents of Suffolk

If it means we have Mayor like London and Manchester, Definitely a No from me !!!

If SCC did not waste so many resources in so many areas we would have far better services at no extra cost

If the deal goes ahead and results in an increase in resources I would hope that it would be possible to increase the allocation to public information services and , in particular libraries. The availability of a good library service was important for me during my education and helped me go on to higher education. I consider it a very bad thing that the Library Service has had to become a charity at a time when fluent reading has become more important than when I was young.

If the proposals for devolution go ahead the leader of the council should be elected under a Proportional Representation system. This position needs to be filled by someone who is collaborative, transparent and willing to work for the good of the electorate not their political party or it's aims.

if this went ahead you would see a large up move of people out of Suffolk and business on this matter as talking to some at the time of this they have said the Bid town and local area is lost in space and moving to Great Yarmouth with better connections and roads and shops

if we are impacted negatively by council decisions we would, firstly, object strongly and, secondly, we would move out of the county if our objections were not heeded.

If we are to continue with Parish Council's they need to have more influence on decisions affecting their village/community. At present the council pays lip service to the PC's views on planning applications, frequently deciding against their wishes.

If you don't get a positive deal now, why is that? Are your Officers who do your bidding passionate about "Our County"? Are your Officers ensuring All your Statutory Duties are met? Are they giving and using the most up to date data when creating your reports as I have known them to give elected members older data to drive a particular view point? I believe you could be doing more but you need to be seen using and getting the best from what you have, sitting at tables that matter, working together. It may be positive but depends on how you manage you.



If you listened and acted to local residents we might support you. But you never listen so we will never support you. You've destroyed a once thriving town while wasting millions of pounds in the process.

Im no expert on these matters, so not that i can think of

I'm not sure that funding allocation will be 'enough' for the period it is provided. Can see something similar to Birmingham happening in devolved areas

Important that councils at our level understand how the changes that the devolution deal specifically will bring impact on processes and communication channels between us and SCC, and that we are confident that we understand how to influence where required.

Important to involve younger sector eg 18-30 to a much greater level

Improved transport and education would improve job opportunities and wages, which could bring in more income to the region. That could also be spent on more housing, to help drive down house prices, which are currently unsustainably high due to second homes and holiday homes. Turn Suffolk into a place to live, rather than a place to holiday.

In general things should be done locally. Taxes should be raised locally and spent locally. But this is not that policy. I foresee huge cuts in services, huge rises in council tax, money squandered.

in suffolk no help to start new business

In the democratic society we live in I think councils should be run by the party in power for that area. Councils are notorious for wasting money, why not investigate this and try to work smart.

"In the grand scheme it's good more of our money that London takes compulsory from our pockets. will return to Suffolk.

Bad idea to have and elected leader. Another politician on mega money."

In theory a good idea, local governing, but how local is local, I still believe smaller more rural areas will be forgotten

In Transport need to take into account the demand for EV charging spaces. In my area (Hadleigh), several EV parking spaces have been installed in what were originally spaces for any vehicle and in all car parks with these there is seldom cars using these spaces. This in turn limits the number of available spaces for petrol and diesel cars, and EV vehicles who do not need to charge their cars so cannot use these spaces which results in more pollution in cars having to drive around for longer to find a space. Will also impact on local traders when people no longer visit due to unavailable parking. I am sure that other areas are affected to the same degree as Hadleigh. Again impact on our High streets and not all residents are able to walk due to distance or get public transport to these areas

Increased funding for young people in hard to reach communities in terms of transport to work, study etc. More PROPER affordable housing. Clear transparency on budget spend each year.

Inflation eroding the value of the £16M offer!

infrastructure is most important - schools - hospitals - libraries - all need help for the local residents

Ipswich has clearly been failed by Suffolk's local government structure for years. It is very easy to keep adding more power to the exactly the same old, same old people and broken system. More of the same is not a solution.

Ipswich particularly needs a focus and improvement, it used to be one of the richest towns in the UK - go forward a couple of hundred years and it's now on the list of least desirable - How has this happened and what needs to be done to improve it.

Ipswich use to be a vibrant town, unfortunately it has become a ghost town which nobody want's to visit or work in. Bury is just a few miles away and has managed to retain and grow it's local community to a high standard. Ipswich has become unsafe, dirty, and an empty town that nobody is visiting. Parking charges are unrealalistic and empty park and rides are not fit for purpose.

It appears that residents don't really get a say in any of this and that the whole process is predetermined, with it being voted upon by a small number of cabinet members from a ruling party elected in an unfair manner, that does not at all represent the local Electorate.

It has pluses and minuses, all conditional on electing the local leader, a govt bribe.

It is difficult to see how this will benefit residents of Suffolk in any meaningful way. All services are under resourced and badly managed already, as seen in the recent SEND report. We are not confident that this funding would be managed any better by Suffolk County Council.

It is heartening to see the council's ambitions for Suffolk and its openness in exploring this pioneering opportunity

"It is madness to me that it would take a referendum to revert our electoral system back to the status-quo - but a mere vote of councillors to inflict this deal upon residents. None of this was ever within the manifesto of the current administration, they have no mandate to push this through. I also cannot understand why the DEL of the council can't also be a councillor of a division - instead we are looking to force residents to vote again for a new candidate in their division, which makes no sense and just adds additional costs.

Suffolk County Council needs to make the case for unitary powers. It needs to advocate strongly at government for fair multi-year settlements for local authorities. It needs to galvanise the support of other councils to do this - not look at weakening it's own governance for a few crumbs and scraps of funding from a zombie government in freefall."

It is not needed. It will all change after the general election anyway.

It needs to be for the whole of Suffolk. You cannot get meals on wheels in Newmarket, why?

It really won't have any impact on me. I have little faith in local or general government. The competency of those running it or their ability to not line their own pockets.

It should help the smaller towns,not just the larger ones.

It should not happen , it would just give more power to corrupt useless self important politicians who don't give a fig about most of the people who don't live in a few select areas of rural Suffolk.

It will cost me as tax payer more money. What is to stop councillors awarding themselves enhanced salaries? I do not trust SCC with my money

It will cost more to hold elections with no benefit to the public. We already pay a hefty price for an elected police commissioner we don't want to shoulder the cost of a mayor

It will happen because it is in the interests of both central government to divest responsibility, and therefore accountability, to local government. And a number of individuals will do well out of the increased levels of bureaucracy, waste and corruption. The Suffolk resident and taxpayer won't, but that's of little concern to those making the decisions and who will reap the benefits. This consultation is merely to provide veneer of legitimacy to a preordained decision. I am convinced it is already a done deal, and Suffolk will be poorer because of it.

It will just cost us more for less. It always has and it always will.

It will not effect me directly as we have little to no meaningful joined up local bus services anyway as they assume all dwellers of the Rural communities have cars which are possibly part of the problem rather than the solution. A joined up big project such a tram or other similar service would be better to link all the rural communities to the main centres such as Bury, Ipswich etc. As a region we have the poorest community transport links in the country but ` I think this comes down to National approaches and county approaches, This is why we need to stick to a national approach as the funds from Government you are talking about would not even provide a tramline from Woodbridge to Ipswich. It needs massive spending such as has been granted to the NE, NW.and central parts of the country. Unfortunately the East if England has always been starved of cash for development, we haven't even got any motorway as such and ` I do not think that this strategy will improve the matter just desolve the amount of cash left to actually do something

It will not improve anything we been more money for public services to find this we have put taxes up

It will not work because the calibre of councillor is poor

It would be foolish not to take this by both hands, and I think people would be surprised that this is not how things work already.

it would be good to see local investment in climate change mitigations, rather than the usual licking this important can down the road

It would help to have a better understanding of how decision-making on the use of additional funds will genuinely involve local people. This is not clear from this consultation exercise.

It's a NO from me

It's a recipe for disaster. Who would trust anything the Tories do.

It's just another bribe.

It's the fact that the promised funds are fixed into the future. That's just not acceptable.

It's a bad idea and if it goes a head the average Suffolk resident will lose out.

It's a miserly deal.

It's a terrible idea, it will have to be undone by someone sensible in the future, and it seems just about enriching Mayor Hicks.

I've read the consultation document but I don't feel, as an ordinary citizen, I have enough information to make a judgement. I'm tempted to think this is a central government way of transferring responsibility to the regions so they can take the blame when things go wrong.

JDI

Jobs and Apprenticeships in Suffolk are somewhat poor, it would be important to myself that Suffolk attempts to increase the available Jobs and especially Apprenticeships offered in an attempt to economically grow Suffolk. Housing is also of great importance to me with the housing situation within the region making housing almost entirely unaffordable for first time buyers.

Judging by the state of the roads in Suffolk and the appalling underperformance in SEND the county council and councillors in particular should focus on fixing existing responsibilities rather than taking new ones on.

Just a bigger gravy train.

Just another way for SCC to waste public money with bad decisions made by the wrong people.

Just devolve yourself down the sewage laden waterways

just do it

Just stop picking on second home owners, drivers, holiday makers and landlords. Try and spend less with your existing revenue

Just take it for goodness sake

Keep it fair and the public needs to know all the decisions.

Let's put Suffolk on the map and go forward with positive changes

lets get the rents down, the cost of housing down, people arent having kids, we have been below replacement birth rates for decade +, like 20% of the population is on antidepressants, lets just work together to make life better for people

lift trade restrictions and fees on recycling centres this will reduce flytipping ect

Listen and act for local people

Listen to the people not them that do not use or live around the services

Loaded survey as usual

Lobby for even higher figures. Ensure that the new powers and responsibilities dont come with higher budgetary obligations than will covered by the monetary settlement.

Local government should be reorganised before any further devolution of powers from government is considered. The current 2 tiered system from 1974 needs overhauling first, it is not fit for purpose.

Look at area where this has already happened Scotland , a complete financial mess run by idiots

look at spending on local small bussiness for uniforms and look at ways of making systems paper less for those who can access the internet, look at policies to promote suffolk and it's communties to stay and work in suffolk, help the local high street stay relivant stop paying for the 1st hour of parking in local authority run carparks bring more people back to the high streets

Lower council tax. Shrink the council. Cut. Sack people.

Lowestoft is the second largest town in Suffolk and has high levels of deprivation and a lot of poor quality housing, particularly in the rental sector. The roads are in a shocking condition. The NHS is in a crisis, people are unable to see a GP, so underlying health conditions are not picked up. Social care is in crisis, there are a very high %age of older people living here who need support. the Conservative govt have wasted so much money and provided nothing for the residents of Suffolk.

Make it very clear to the public what the autonomy would look like exactly

Make sure the county is brought up to scratch. We need better transport infrastructure, a motorway is needed from Felixstowe

Make sure the money is directly used in the county and due diligence is used to make a real difference. It's vital people can see the benefit of the devolution.

"Make the county a great place to live in

"

Make this more common knowledge - report in local papers etc. give more residents of the county an opportunity to read and provide feedback as possible

making suffolk a better place to work and live .more police on the streets and better housing ,would be a start and easy travel around suffolk with free travel on trains and bus

More clarity on the four tiers of government, ie: national, county, district and parish. Who does what and why?

More layers of if staff to pay for

More local control is a,good thing. More emphasise on local facilities for older people.

More power for parish councils to affect the outcome of all issues that affect them in there areas as people that live and work in those areas and Who have a greater understanding of the true needs of each and every village/area on its own merits. Rather that the unknowing and uninformed parties making decisions that overall have no impact on there lives or areas of residents

Most people are still not well informed about this and there has been little effort to present the potential cons as well as the pros.

"My building mates will be very pleased if introduced.

Why not build better roads and wider for EV's if we can't get rid of them "

"my concern is for the so called consultation. like many such consultations it looks like it will miss the majority of the public, the publics views will be ignored but the consultation box will be ""ticked"".

A comprehensive postal survey that reaches all residents is required with a fully detailed explanation as to how the SCC see their priorities"

N/A

N/A

n/a

N/a

N/A

n/a

"NA

here's hoping if it goes through it is for the benefit of the right people at the right time-this includes people who actually work for a living-all too often it is the people on benefits that are awarded for sitting at home all day

The whole benefit structure is shot to bits-so much fraud it is untrue-I know as se it in my popstion of work"

Need's very careful thought and looking at how it's going in areas such as Manchester. Needs good leadership.

Negative, a waste of money get the current elected members to do the job within the current framework.

Negotiate the fund to increase in value if inflation went up.

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

no

No

No

No

No

No

NO

no

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

"No 15 min cities

No levelling up

More transparency

More proper surveys (without weighted answers)

This survey should of been available online!"

No but make sure you listen to local people to get it firth for the county

No comment.

No devolution

No further comments

No just baffled you would even consider taking on more responsibility when clearly cannot cope with services you currently are responsible for.

"No just go for it!

Our own decisions, priorities and how to spent the money more efficiently "

"No more housing

Putting nature at the forefront

Better public services

More funding for the current services we have (GP's, Dentists, Schools etc) "

No more inefficient local councillors

No no no no no - this is another way of extracting more money from tax payers to set up another layer of bureaucracy. Look at London, Manchester etc.

No one should have to struggle to survive in this day and age, regardless of social status or wealth they are all our people and as such deserve compassion and the help we can offer.

No other comment

No point because you don't [REDACTED] listen.

No such thing as a Democracy in any type of so called Government

No thank you.

No thanks.

No to 15 minute zones, no to cameras, 20mph speed limits,

NO to devolution

NO to giving SCC more funds to waste and less control for the people of Suffolk. WHEN WILL MR. HICKS LISTEN TO THE POEPL OF SUFFOLK.

No.

No.

No.

No.

No.

no. all points made under each section

None

none

None

None

none

none

none

None

None of it directly affects me. It's the next generation I worry about after 14 years of Tory rule

None of these things raised would positively effect me, all stupid proposals on stupid services.

"None of this will actually affect me.



I am against unnecessary levels of administration and against elected governments either national or local trying to hive off their responsibilities."

None.

Nope

Northern bypass of Ipswich

Not at this stage, no.

Not at this time.

Not aware of any adverse impacts.

not really

Not really have made my position clear

Not really.

Nothing further

Nothing further to add

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the Council are capable of managing this money properly. It would be disastrous if they were given even more money to mispend.

Nothing to add

Nothing to add

Obviously an important matter which requires very careful consideration before any changes are made.

Oh do something about awful SEND inspection we had

On paper this sounds like a good deal that would mean important decisions about services in Suffolk would be made by those who are "on the ground" rather than those who might never have even visited Suffolk!

On reflection I think adult education is one of the most important aspects out of everything mentioned.

On ya bike

Once this deal is sorted out a bigger push for more local devolution from central government is essential.

One area that will be a challenge is using the funds appropriately across the region and not neglecting areas. Having representation from all areas of Suffolk would allow for fair decisions to be made

One thing that has been continually re-emphasised over the last 20+ years is that politicians, of both national and local level, are a huge negative. The only positive outcome is anything that reduces both their number and their power. If we have to have them, then the less of them the better.

"Only is this a decision made by the council itself?"

Will all us residents get a say?"

Only those who live in Suffolk really understand its needs and way of life and how to invest in these. Central Government is too remote.

Open and transparent sharing of information particularly on strategy so that every Suffolk resident can be part of the County's future development.

Our conservative councillor in Ipswich is telling us all it is rubbish so if she says that it must be good!

Our current Council is poorly run, fails in its written commitments and ignores every question asked of them. That is a personal experience. We need something better, not something worse

Our local MP is ineffectual and has been in that position too long. We need other representation

Overall this should be good for Suffolk. It will need careful planning and management so that the majority of the extra money is used as intended and not swallowed up in additional overheads.

Overall, while there may be challenges and considerations to navigate, the proposed deal presents an exciting opportunity for positive change and progress in Suffolk. By embracing innovation, collaboration, and community engagement, we can unlock the full potential of this deal to create a brighter future for all.

People electing the leader I agree with. Negative. The cost to the people

People with political and business knowledge should be listened to carefully, particularly in case there are hidden snags to the plan.

Please can the council prioritise education and healthcare. I am in debt due to having to use a private dental practice (never been in debt before) and I cannot believe we have a fantastic university in Suffolk that people don't know exists. By providing local people with higher education, we will raise aspirations and grow the economy.

Please commit to citizens assemblies to improve your decision making on this topic and the new powers you will gain. Then I will support.

Please consider making Ipswich a Unitary Authority.

Please do not give incompetent people more power and money! Employ some people who come from the grass roots to make decisions, do not rely on people that do not have a clue or hear what people want and need!

Please do not support this deal. It will undermine any attempt to align health and social care with housing and leisure/ arts funding. It does not provide for a much needed democratic accountability through an elected Mayor nor address the needs of the Suffolk people to have more say in the locality provision of services where they really matter. It will be another layer of bureaucracy when what is needed is de-layering to get efficiency and accountability gains.

Please do not vote this forward.

Please don't be fooled by the clever rhetoric - the evidence for devolution working along a model like this is very ambiguous. Devolved areas should not get preferential funding bids (as outlined earlier in the argument proposed) and giving the area a fixed 'deal' over a period of time, is the same sort of poor financial planning that lands so many borrowers and savers in difficulties when interest rates and inflation change. What doesn't work well for individuals will not work for a region. No fixed deals agreed at the start will end up with the devolved area actually being better off; if it was, it would be undemocratic anyway, as some other area would be short changed!

Please don't do it.

Please don't do this. Such a waste of public resources.

Please don't attempt to take more control when you can't even control the minimum of your statutory duties as it is.

Please get your house in order and don't try and take on more

Please if this deal goes ahead try to fix the roads please they are a disgrace

Please let Newmarket leave Suffolk. We deserve better, and the council evidently doesn't care. This abusive relationship needs to end.

Please make this happen.

"Please publicise this by sending questionnaires to all households I'm the county.

Also, as a further thought, there's no mention of working with other councils, which is important eg in infrastructure across county lines. Currently you cannot even liaise on the same standard or colour of refuse bins, nor on recycling.

seem to remember that you (or was it Norfolk CC,) rejected a proposal to work together in the past.

"

Please reject this plan. Suffolk has enough difficulty in making decisions - introducing another complication into the equation is a recipe for disaster.

Please see my previous comments, this has been awful.

Please see previous comments boxes. Suffolk is a backward thinking, unwelcoming place. Change that first. Then worry about how to spend any money. For God's sake don't give them more power. They can't rightly use that which they have.

Please stop cutting staff. I know of very valuable and knowledgeable staff who have lost their jobs. They are loyal to Suffolk County Council. Get the devolution deal and put more loyalty into your staff. Use the money wisely rather than just focusing on SEND. Communities deserve more.

Please, please, please don't be tempted to go down this route

Politicians of every party will need to work together on this. It is no good if each party undermines the positives that they can all bring to the table. The people of Suffolk MUST come first, not political agendas.

"Positive = more direct accountable control

Negatives= no trust from suffolk tax payers you would not create more commities and we would gain nothing"

Present an actual plan on how this money would be spent, how the council is going to be held accountable for wrong decisions and how the public is going to be consulted on decisions as to how the money is going to be spent

Principally I feel more cost locally to residents through tax while central government is reducing national taxation.

Proposal just tinkering with a broken system. Local Government needs to be reformed ~ too many levels with fragmented responsibilities. Creating an elected leader just reinforces those divisions. We don't need, Town Councils, District Councils, County Council , Cabinets and directly elected Mayors

Prove you can spend OUR money in an effective and efficient manner by addressing the things people care about education roads etc

Put it to the electorate in a local referendum.

really don't like the idea of one single point of failure!

"Red tape and what is the point when what is desparately needed the Ipswich northern bypass is sidelined by just ONE mp ignoring what the people need

"

Reduce number of second home owners forcing locals out of affordable housing market

Reduce the amount of exterior private company involvement

Regenerate old areas of terraced housing

Regional development to re-balance the geographical disparities in prosperity, of GDP per head, is vital. this can easily be carried out by central government in a country as small as the UK. Target the investment to regional development corporations, as we did in the 1970s in Telford and Milton Keynes, is the method I would prefer.

"Regional devolution is a sop to the globalists in power in government, ie not just the elected Red Labour or Blue Labour politicians in our undemocratic British Parliament, but also to those in the real government - the civil service and local authorities! This kind of plan takes an uncanny resemblance to the EU's plan to divide the UK into 11 administrative zones with, surprise surprise, Scotland and Wales remaining intact, N Ireland being reabsorbed into Ireland (clearly a good thing) but England being split into 8 regions many of which would have administrative centres in Continental Europe. That has always been their plan, and it remains so under the forthcoming Labour government here in the UK.

It would be better for us all if England had its own Parliament through which it could run its own affairs without provincial contamination. Keep the British Parliament in a federal sense by all means, but give England the same powers and controls that the provinces enjoy."

Road conditions and digital care is terrible jnder sccc

"Sack Ipswich Central and do something urgently to sort out our county town.

Review what our strategic plans are say and do something to improve education attainment in the county.

Invest in public transport for rural towns"

SCC are looking to cut over £60m from their budget and put council tax up - wont this money just offset this?

SCC cannot be solely responsible for the money and its expenditure. They have shown that as an organisation they are governed badly, with the current deficit. They work in silo and are Ipswich centric. Suffolk is a large and diverse county, this should be reflected in any expenditure proposal.

SCC demonstrably can't manage to fill potholes I wouldn't trust them to manage £480 million. Also I don't think it is nearly enough money.

SCC has always favoured rural areas over the county town. Thus would allow them to continue to overlook Ipswich on a much greater scale.

SCC have failed for years, and now more than ever, in fulfilling many of the basic responsibilities and functions it is responsible for. Health, mental health, roads, education, local services, children's services. The list is endless. I do not trust SCC with this level of power and responsibility.

SCC have performed badly, wasting money and not providing a good service.

SCC have turned Lowestoft into a tip. The roads are disintegrating and tears of poor road design have throttled the town. I couldn't possibly agree to giving a bunch of Tory idiots even more money to waste mirroring the disaster of the last 14 years of right wing anti public service central government. NO!

SCC must not under any circumstances be given more power and even more funding to waste .

SCC needs to start doing it's job properly under the current system. This is just a way to disguise it's failings and have residents forget what a mess things are currently in. For the record I have no political affiliation - all politician's are equally appalling

Scrap first past the post elections and change system to reflect overall % of electorate voting for an individual/party

Scrap it and go and do the jobs you're paid for. Open up your council finances to independent audit. Investigate the bank accounts of all councillors.

Scrap SCC divide county into three because they have failed in mental health. Schools .Roads and Ipswich has gained to the detriment of east and west being ignored

See above

See precious.

See previous comments

Services and roads etc. have got considerably worse over the last 20/30 years. Suffolk looks shabby now, litter, overgrowth on rusty road signs, little maintenance. Hopefully this could help improve our beautiful county.

Should consider unitary government for Suffolk rather than the multi-tiered system we have.

Should SCC be minded to accept the devolution deal it MUST be planned out from the long term and separated from short term populist agendas. Services and infrastructure in Suffolk need to be improved to be brought up to a decent standard, not left to stagnate further because of ill judged "investment" into headline items. IF this does go ahead, IMPROVE the existing do not INCREASE the number of areas requiring funding.

Should think about how this deal would work, if have right people to carry this out & also are the elected members able to deliver these new opportunities, there seems to be no show of the money government would give or Suffolk normally gets in these areas so I'm sceptical if it's really benefit finically & I believe the lack of full information easily accessible on this will make people unusre

Since the offer of the deal its monetary value has reduced. If only it could be indexed link or at least some recognition of the need to consider inflation, be included in the deal. Its trail blazing so well done on that - we need some brilliant brains to come forward to represent Suffolk, something else you cant control. But we should give it all a try and help the idea evolve.

"Social care provision to enable older people to stay in their homes if they are unable to drive.

Provision of new medical centres as the existing are now oversubscribed ( staffed by nurses as opposed to GPs if necessary )"

Some people in Ipswich are trying to undermine it by spreading mistruths. don't listen to them!

Sort out distgusting grass areas not being mowed regularly weeds every where. youths behavior in streets estates parks.more police presence quicker police responses more available doctor local family's to get social housing above people from other nations

Start listening to the people of Suffolk instead of these personal agendas that we do not want!!

stop being the lackeys of agribusiness and nuclear

Stop building houses on green fields, support local farmers. No farms no food. Utilise drown fields for housing and commercial projects

Stop this waste of time and money and concentrate on real priorities, such as properly fixing the roads, funding schools and social care.

"Stop wasting money trying to create yet more layers of management.

Fix the potholes"

Stop wasting money, get the roads resurfaced and hold utilities accountable, make developed develop within time frames and to build the local infrastructure as part of the planning application.

"Stop wasting public money on projects that never see the light of day.

Cut back on Middle Management who are highly paid for duplicating work across the Social Care and Children's Services. Make your Departments more accountable for wasting money."

Strongly oppose devolved management of funds and protocols. Leads to cronyism and internecine party politics.

Suffolk 'leaders' have ruin the lives of thousands with their poor and inadequate leadership, that's a fact. It would have disastrous consequences and be incredibly irresponsible if this plan goes ahead

Suffolk are a law to themselves. They are making a mess of Haverhill and surrounding areas. Council tax constantly going up 3 council we pay in our tax. It's time to take conservative control away.

Suffolk c.c appears to have let Suffolk down in all areas

Suffolk County Council has to be one of the worst in the country, just look at the complete lack of infrastructure projects, we have no motorways, desperately need an Ipswich northern bypass and the A12 and A140 to be duelled. The last major road building was the Orwell Bridge 40 years ago! Where's the levelling up of East Anglia? Our transport infrastructure is stuck in the dark ages compared to the rest of the country.

Suffolk County Council needs to listen to the local Suffolk people and carry out the needs of the of local people. Suffolk County Council does not.

Suffolk County Council seems to have failed in all areas especially Ipswich.

Suffolk county council would be even more of a disaster than it is now. Don't do it

Suffolk has always been an underfunded part of the country. Anything that increases our voice is a good thing when campaigning for rural equality with the urban funding which has far outstripped rural funding for decades.

Suffolk has for along time been the forgotten county with no city no unitary councils ,though this is often down to certain leaders

Suffolk is expanding with housing and hopefully, infrastructure. It is progress, positive or negative. Suffolk also needs an airport to reduce pressure of travelling to Stanstead, Heathrow and Gatwick. This may also encourage overseas investment in the county

Suffolk is my home county, I love it to pieces but its proximity to London and arguably even Essex causes a lot of issues especially for our coastal towns, whilst this is not true for everything I feel that Norfolk is a good example of how things should be - Suffolk and Norfolk have a long connected history.

Suffolk is too small for this plan

Suffolk needs some love - It's extremely underfunded in comparison to our county neighbours. Ipswich needs a unitary council and widening of its historical borders to allow itself to determine its own destiny and fulfil its potential as a city and be a place Suffolk can be proud of. Suffolk has enormous potential but needs joined up thinking and people who actually care about Suffolk and not their own pockets.

"Suffolk needs to also request the funding that was originally provided by the European Union. This should be used to improve Suffolk rather than finding its way into Ministers' pockets.

"

Suffolk needs to move forward, if we stay still we're going backwards, that's why this deal needs to go through

Suffolk remains a great county and I'm happy here and want it to succeed. I can see the sense of local decision making for effective planning. I just can't see that the sums of money listed are in any way sufficient.

Suffolk's current leaders need to understand that they will do better in the long run by getting an equal tranche of the central government pie as one of the counties, not by trying to compete with the city majors who obviously have greater needs and more compelling arguments for funds.

Talk to the farmers.

Tell the voters the truth just for once.

Thanks for chance to comment!

That Suffolk is opened up and goes beyond Ipswich and the affluent coastal towns and villages and funding is directed at the areas - rural and urban - that are socially and economically isolated.

The additional fund might be good to facilitate projects that promote ecology and help reduce carbon emissions. The county really needs to reduce its reliance on cars and improve its public transport instead.

The additional money offered is not sufficient - it is a short term gain which is not enough for long term sustainability. The concept works for a metropolitan area but not a large rural county. The economies of scale are too difficult to achieve for a large area made up primarily of small towns and villages

"The appalling state of Sen, transport and infrastructure, planning and much more is already attributed to you and you have proved time and time again that you are incompetent. You don't have the trust of Suffolk residents with what you currently have and NO ONE, not one person commenting on your ads (paid for with our money) wants devolution which will give you more power and opportunity to waste more of our money.

You will do it anyway because it will line your pockets and that is your motivation, and every four years you can wash your hands of the mess you make knowing that you have gained personally at the expense of Suffolk residents

"

The central government powers are devolved to local leaders, those elected represent need to make sure that they know exactly what the local people want in the areas of which money has



been allocated to be spent. If tax payers can see the money is being spent wisely then it can be an incredibly successful, but if it remains the same as it is now but just under a different kind of system, essentially money wasting with extra steps, then you might as well not bother.

"The closure of the Bury St Edmunds Record Office in Raingate Street in Bury St Edmunds is a shocking loss to Suffolk's history and heritage. The decision to close this should be reversed, and Bury St Edmunds should keep its Record and Archive Centre. This is already being scaled down and made less accessible to the public. It should be fully re-opened. All the libraries in the county are now fully open, the Record Office in Bury St Edmunds should be fully open for all those interested in Suffolk's wonderful local history. The same considerations apply to the branch Record Office and Archive Centre in the Central Library in Lowestoft, which is a vital amenity and asset for the people of the Lowestoft area. Moving all the archives to Ipswich is a bad idea, especially considering how difficult it is to get from Lowestoft to Ipswich by public transport. (Plus the cost of travelling to Ipswich to use the archive office even if you have a car.)

The Museum Of East Anglian Life in Stowmarket (now called the Food Museum) should receive funding.

Library services should be maintained and developed."

The consultation does not explore alternative options such as level 1 or level 2 options, very limiting and not necessarily showing the additional costs and expenditure

The cost of this consultation / application process esp if it does not go ahead

"The costing and if it means setting up a different structure that means considerable amount of the money will be for setting up offices , paying the leader like the Police Commissioner that costs us all 250 pounds on everyone's rates . I hope this factor has been costed into the actual benefits.

I would like to see a business plan for the proposed first 5 years of the scheme . "

The council is a money pit. There should be much LESS money in their hands not more.

The council needs to show that it can run the services it already controls in an efficient manner before it is entrusted with wider powers- I do not believe the current council is competent to do this

The county is nice but the wages are low and the standard of education in the populace is low. There is also a very big class divide which needs to be dealt with if everyone is to be happy.

"The County is too big and there are differences between east and west, split the county in to two unitary authorities and abolish the district

Councils"

The danger will be that the rich areas of Suffolk would promote their interests instead of the poorer areas. Every effort must be made to ensure SCC is actually representative of the council.

The date for closure of this survey needs to be extended and not limited to sites like Next Door which excludes the majority of Suffolk residents. Most Suffolk people will never have heard of county devolution when the survey closes.

The deal doesn't seem to be linked to any real specific positive proposals, no evaluation of whether the funding talked about would make a significant difference. How a new elected leader would work etc. I feel that to give meaningful feedback needs a lot more information. Also lastly with the disintegration and lack of credibility of the current govt it feels very hard to trust any negotiation with them, especially in the light of an imminent general election.

The deal is poor. It is morsels and a photo opportunity when it should be an opportunity to influence public services. This deal provides little influence on the join up and responsiveness of local public services.

The deal should go much further with direct devolution of power and budgets across a range of different services without most expenditure being already earmarked by central government. The county also needs tax raising and investment powers.

The elected leader should be actively encouraged to appoint the best candidates for the various roles and not be tempted to follow any party lines. These appointments should somehow be independently scrutinised as to their suitability.

The elected leader will personally want to set up a team of advisors - will this lead to another layer or group of paid staff e.g. the policy unit in 10 Downing street? I don't know how these systems work in other L.A.s with devolved powers, but obviously a system that works harmoniously and positively is important. Spending more money to put new systems in place would not be good.

The extra money is a drop in the ocean and not worth the risk of local politicians going power crazy.

The GDP of Suffolk is about £27bn. Gov. accounts for about £12bn of that. Devolution would mean a significant part if that is spent by Local gov. This is just showboating.

The impacts on young people, mental health and physical health should be considered as these are areas which are currently under funded and need improving.

The inability of organisations locally NHS, Social Care - Ipswich Borough - Police to work well together is clear. They are all in their silos - do not share information resources - culture and this leads to duplication/conflict/negativity/watching their backs/and lack of drive to improve lives of community. Consider experience of other local mayors etc - political wrangling - a lack of commitment leading with racism

"the increased centralisation will lead to further remoteness for many in the county. The Archives looted from Lowestoft and removed to Ipswich (depriving the local population of a connection to their past) is an example of this.

This plan means less localism not more."

The level of interest and understanding of politics and systems and structures in Suffolk is very low. Plus most people will never see this survey - especially those who are digitally excluded. A strategy to increase public understanding is desperately needed.

"The money is an incentive but do not ruin Suffolk with thousands of new homes let keep our farming to grow what the country needs !

"

The money is probably not nearly enough anyway

The money would be welcome but I fear it may be wasted.

The more layers of government there are, the more money is wasted. Money should be spent of fixing roads, schools and hospitals, not on more administrators, managers, and politicians.

"The most important aspect of this deal is that it is the start of a process and will lead to more. We will never start with everything we want but this is a promising toe in the door.

"

The one thing that REALLY bothers me is that the amount is not index linked. That's the only thing that could count against this deal, and in 20-30 years time councillors, and us, may live to regret the devaluation of the amount.

The only devolution which the whole of England needs, is a devolved parliament for the whole of England. Splitting us up into weak county structures, is extremely divisive, and is something that the country really doesn't need right now.

The people need to have a voice and the voice needs to be listened to. This needs to be before and not after projects are decided.

The proofs always in the pudding, so if accepted one would hope best outcomes from other devolved areas would be fully explored and utilised. No need to reinvent the wheel, shared best practice for best outcomes has to be the way forward

The proposed deal is very weak. The directly elected leader idea is not a good idea. We have seen a similar set up where there are elected mayors in other areas, much of the energy of the organisation is spent in political infighting

The proposed deal should be cancelled. Suffolk County Council have been rated inadequate for provision of SEND. I'd prefer they'd focus on provision of good children's services.

The proposition has much to recommend it

The proposed sums are too little to achieve successful outcomes and Suffolk doesn't have the equivalent of Andy Burnham with the passion and vision to achieve change, at least not that I've seen in living in the county for forty years or perhaps they've been carefully hiding their light under a bushel all that time ready to surprise us. The County Council hasn't got the funding now to carry out its statutory duties so how will devolution change that given the farcical amount offered. All devolution will do is let the government off the hook and for services to further decline

The publicity of the Devolution deal has been atrocious - almost as if you want to keep it under wraps. Even the District Council don't seem to know much about it.

The question of a directly elected leader is quite a separate matter.

The question is, do you think fixed deals are sustainable. Ultimately this deal will be worth a lot less in future and make these deliverables impossible. Ultimately as a member of the public we do not know the answer to this!

The SCC are evidently wishing to accept this paltry bribe to eventually get rid of the expense of local democracy, District and Borough Councils but to build up their importance and powers, of course their and their Officers Salaries, Allowances and Benefits. Evidently having as little integrity and probity as their masters in Whitehall.

The voters need to believe in and trust politicians and councillors. Leaders should set an example of decent behaviour and be honest about what they can and can't achieve. Local government projects need much better project management.

The way in which this process is being carried out is fundamentally undemocratic. The economic impact of the proposals would be minimal, and insufficient to even begin to mend the chronic underfunding of local government in our County. The proposed distribution of powers as between the Leader and other elected representatives is fundamentally undemocratic. The probable outcome of elections under the proposed system in 2025 is utterly undemocratic, and has the potential to bring the whole concept of local democracy into disrepute. It is not too late to stop this process, and we believe it should be stopped now.

The way the (Tory) county council always does what it can to do (non-Tory) Ipswich down means this plan will have absolutely no benefits to the town, but will just further empower the county to further damage Ipswich.

The way this is presented is not arbitrary. Clearly SCC has already decided it wants this. The nature of the presentation and the questions offers no balance. Any responses are likely to be presented in a positive manner. The whole process should have been managed independently which would have ensured the result was a true reflection.

The whole description of this proposed devolution seems to have been written by people with Rose tainted spectacles. Several obvious concerns have not been given the airing such a proposal deserves.

The whole idea should be put in the bin

The wider issues around the deal have not been covered along with details of a full cost benefit analysis.

There is a large element of "suck it and see" about the proposals. So much depends on the calibre of candidates

There is always a danger that budgets will be eaten up by consultations and surveys so steps must be taken to guard against this happening. Make the money work for the people of Suffolk.

There MUST be close engagement and working with Districts and Boroughs on any proposals that fall out of the County deal.

There must be some negative points, ie. Budget management & financial control, what happens if you overspend and will the new post create more admin jobs

There needs to be a very clear benefit to the Suffolk community.

There needs to be an increased level of scrutiny and promises by local councillors not to play ping-pong with proposed changes just to further their own/party ambitions. The people of Suffolk need integrity, common sense and evidence-based decision-making.

There should be a push for more transport services as a result of this deal, including bus franchising.

This appears to be a very low level of devolution. A better approach might be to look at the introduction of unitary authorities ( perhaps a division of County into East and West Suffolk).

This appears to provide Suffolk with a chance to have extra funding which can be used to improve services in certain areas; areas where improvement is needed

This can only improve services for local people.

"This concept is delusional. The people that public service attracts simply aren't up to the job and this will waste money.

Better to have PR and then for the elected members to choose their leader."

"This consultation has not been advertised widely and I believe is being actively hidden.

I suspect the decision to accept the deal has already been agreed behind closed doors.

The deal should be put to the public and not left to the council."

This council already doesn't know how to spend money for the good of suffolk.

This County is a shambles. The major of Ipswich opening a Muslim prayer session in the park. I have friends born in Ipswich who will no longer go into Ipswich alone ( not suggested these two events are linked). No ho areas in our major city??? Women scared to walk our streets in daylight????

This deal can only have a positive impact on Suffolk and it is key that those in charge are directly elected and accountable to the residents of Suffolk

"This form of governance of a locality is long overdue.

"

This has absolutely nothing whatsoever do to with me personally. It has far more to do with the desire of the current county councillors to have more money in a pot which they can then spend opaquely, as they currently do with the income received from our council tax. I dislike the way the deal is being sold as a force for good with an "elected leader". The fact that the proposal has reached the stage it has without any previous consultation is itself undemocratic. The consultation document produced is selling the deal in a most disingenuous way. I am absolutely against it.

This idea is very depressing and I sincerely hop that it will not be proceeded with.

This idea should not proceed.

This is a bad idea, SCC do not need any more power , as they are already useless in many ways

This is a biased questionnaire with no explanation of the alternative to accepting the proposal.

This is a waste of money and time it is a grandiose scheme that is not needed

This is another layer of local government that is not needed and will not improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the local service SCC is suppose to provide, the Council needs to focus on making improvement in the local services they are currently providing and not being distracted by this political folly

This is not devolution

This is one of the worst political ideas I've ever heard. It's a complete waste of time and resources, and this survey itself and its analysis are wastes of time.

This is one of those should I jump or not? Suffolk is in effect being bribed to take the devolution route which I hope it will resist.

This money will simply create more bureaucracy.

This plan will add to the burden on the local taxpayers and not add to their lives.

This proposal is a side-show to what is really needed: a major reform of local government responsibilities and financing so councils are solely responsible for raising the finance to pay for their activities. Only then will we have proper accountability rather than the buck-passing the current system makes inevitable

This proposal should be thrown out

This survey is a farce.

This survey is a tick box exercise. Should have been a referendum with forms sent out with the local election papers. The way this publicized in limited to those people on social media which is not democratic.

This survey is a waste of time, electors don't care- how many have answered ths survey?

This survey is biased

This survey is biased towards this agreement taking place, completely unsuitable for purpose

"This survey is so bias.

I strongly disagree with this."

"This survey is so biased as it doesn't indicate where the money is coming from and if its additional or just the same as we get now.

"

this will be a waste of money, save the money, oh and get rid of Police and Crime Commissioners whilst you are at it!

Time to get rid of County Councils and empower smaller authorities.

To for it!

To note £480m over 30 years is only £16m per year

"Tories must go!

Tories are all self-interest corrupt politicians.

They must spend time to reorganise themselves.

The deal will a corrupt one like most of the projects implemented in the last 10years.

Stop wasting any more time and call a general election. "

Transparency is needed in all areas of negotiating brownfield sites, where the devolution funding is coming from & the effect on other services. All councils are still cutting back on spending so I see no real term increase in funds.

Transport East hasn't been mentioned here. Even with devolved powers, I'd hope the sub national body could still be developed with Norfolk and Cambs.

transport which helps people get to work is a key factor in improving employment in rural areas

Turn the deal down, and insist on a sovereign parliament for England, as an equal member of the United Kingdom.

"Unwanted

Unnecessary

Distraction

Just not in anyone's interest apart from those in local government who think they might profit from devolution "

Use this as an opportunity to listen - increase green initiatives, combat rural isolation and develop brown field sites whilst preserving the countryside

Very difficult for you to consult in a meaningful way as not enough info on current practice to compare with this proposal and make any kind of objective judgement. The average resident does not understand how local govt funding works at present.

Very interested to hear more. I am not negative, but think the detail to date is too 'top level'

Wait until after the general election, go back to the drawing board and present us with a proper devolution proposal that makes sense. Not this half-baked, pointless proposal.

Waste of energy. Focus on making what you have work and hold decision makers to full account. When you prove you can then people might be more supportive of this

"We also need more accessible care homes and respite facilities for adults who are unable to self-fund.

Whilst there are many positives to Devolution, I do have concerns regarding the long term impact of Inflation and residents having less of a voice regarding decisions if there is someone in charge who may not be acting in the County's best interest. What happens then? "

We are blessed in Suffolk but that shouldn't mean we stay still moving forward and therefore going through changes will feel uncomfortable for a while but but will keep us feeling blessed.

"We do not need devolution. Suffolk County Council needs to improve the quality of roads and the communication of road closures (especially for businesses). Business support generally is very poor in the county.

Finally, this form is not accessible or user-friendly for those with neurodiverse needs. "

We don;t want this

We have no Pavements, No surface water drains, no street lighting, we pay for our own road repairs, we have no viable bus service, yet we pay the same Council tax as areas that have all these facilities. I cannot support this deal as I see no advantage to us.

We have recently experience a major decision being made by representatives of SCC that affects our town based on a twisted and false narrative with cherry-picked data, and ultimately a purely politically motivated decision. Devolution would be the WORST idea for Suffolk residents given the conduct of those already in the County Council.

We have seen devolution in other areas of the country and sadly powers and money haven't come to fruition. Yes it would give people of Suffolk a voice but seems to me another layer of bureaucracy and red tape. Look at the PCC office. Turnouts low, and a PCC whose primary focus is on rural crime as opposed to the significant issues and crime facing less affluent areas and urbanised areas

We must become a low tax, small government nation.

We must not accept this proposal . NO to a directly elected leader !!! .

WE NEED LEADERSHIP TO ENSURE LION LINK GOES OFFSHORE.

We need SCC to spend money on the things that is mentioned above. All basic public services needs improving significantly and under the Tories, nothing is changing and this new political setup won't change anything either - they will still keep all this money for themselves and not spend it.

"We need to look at:

Agriculture

Tourism

Housing

Employment

Infrastructure - transport/provision of bus services

Foreplanning - education"

We said NO to an elected regional Mayor - this is a back door attempt to impose one. The offer is not enough.

We should be bold and ambitious.

We should reject it and fund the current administration correctly

We would need to know a lot more about the background of candidates. I am concerned that people may not want to take on the responsibility.



Well planned and excellently managed devolution would certainly get my vote - but do we have sufficient of the right people for the job?

West Suffolk is poorly serviced in many ways. Very difficult to get SCC cabinet councillors over from Ipswich. Residents and support for Haverhill very under served.

What are the main reasons for making this change??? How will it actually benefit us long term??

What is the vision with 'additional' powers, this needs explaining more. Benefits outlined so far are unclear and have ambiguity about them.

What we need is a strong central govt not a series of devolved ones. Unfortunately we don't have it and it looks unlikely in the future

Whatever happens I am sure that Councillors will keep on the gravy train.

Whatever is decided it could have a negative impact on me as I live near a Brownfield site earmarked on the Local Plan which hasn't got suitable road infrastructure. Surrounding area will be negatively impacted upon if proper investment and research is made on our road and waterways infrastructure before development. And due consideration for an appropriate business and design which is in keeping with the rural location.

Whoever designed this questionnaire needs to get a professional to give feedback on it... It's not a questionnaire or consultation, it's a series of promotional statements to try and ensure devolution. Pathetic

Why has there been so little publicity regarding this? It seems to be very much a "need to know" operation. I became aware it only seeing a Facebook item while looking elsewhere. A poor show.

Why has this public consultation come so late in the process? We should have been consulted at the outset, when you could have offered us several different options. So why have you chosen to offer us just this deal or no deal?

Why have I been targeted for this consultation?

Why not have a referendum to find what the people in the county think 😞

Why would you turn this down?

Why, given the massive cuts SCC has faced under this Government would I think they are going to do anything which will help the people of Suffolk

Will be important to have proposals that command support from all parties at national level

"Will bring more public sector jobs to Suffolk, presumably

Hope money is spent wisely , not given to greedy contractors without penalty. Look at how long A14 and A12 works are taking and the financial toll on our county due to delays. Get inspiration from efficient nations like Germany and Japan, break away from recycling the money through wealthy political donors "

Will our children get a better deal in their education, both mainstream and SEND?

Will this mean increases in council tax I wonder!

Will you take the slightest notice while there is still a Tory majority on the Council?

With any large organisation bureaucracy is the enemy, make sure the money goes into service delivery and not into consultants or managers pockets. Skills need strengthening

With the right people it can work

Work with each area in Suffolk to work together and affect the growth of the town

Would it prevent cooperation on some services with adjacent counties?

"Would you invest in services in the west of the county? You know beyond BSE?

Here in Newmarket, no recycling centre, awful roads, [REDACTED] schools, poor facilities all around really.

"

Wrong time, wrong political party introducing it ( how many voters have been removed from the roll, how many rights have we as citizens lost? ) just another attempt to slim the state and control the electorate.

Yeah, why bother? How much has all of this 'consultation ' cost us? The lies, cheating, dishonesty and downright uselessness of those in charge at SCC needs addressing before the creation of this cushy little number for one of their friends.

Yes but wasting my time as it will happen, don't see anything to change current highways current thinking.

Yes don't do it you are unable to run efficiently as you are. The last thing we need is you being given more money and more power

Yes hold all public representatives to account including their families. Next look into all planning that has passed and changed, charge developers personally for failed infrastructure and changed plans that were about profit not community. We have this offered because you know only less than a 1/3 of voters understand what your doing, this allows the immoral and illegal activities to have a sham of a legal smoke screen.

yes just dont do it, it has disaster written all over it

Yes, listen to the will of the people WE DONT WANT IT!

"Yes. Please answer. And I would Love a personal contact with a SENIOR SCC Councillor . But I know this will not happen

I do watch the POffice Scandal every day.

All this will be just pushed to the side.

I advise. It will not be by myself

."

"Yes. An open and honest platform is necessary for the people of Suffolk to be consulted (not that we ARE?!) on this Deal.

A public-facing consultation platform of FAQs and QPNAs should have been made available for the members of public living in Suffolk. The consultation ( if it was supposed to have been filtered down through Parish Councils) has been utterly inadequate. "

Yes-I object, having given a very clear answer to the survey, trying to push me into a direction I have no wish to go in. -and which the survey seems to be trying to influence the direction I go in.

You are a public company, you should stay one.

you are not proposing to use this funding to support the most vulnerable, and I suspect it will merely provide the already wealthy with more money

You can say what you want to west Suffolk but they make the rules up as they go along but don't tell anybody!!!!

You could save money by having the directly elected leader being the police commissioner

You don't have time to read any other comments I may have on politics on any level

"You have power to sort stuff now but political correctness gets in the way

This more will not make any difference except cost us more money

? Are services better now or 20 years ago??"

You lot are so stupid you probably won't do it but go on, prove me wrong.

You need to rebuild public trust before even considering to attempt something like this.

"You should consider contacting all of your residents and holding (and informing residents) open meetings for discussion.

I'm appalled to have found this so late and on YouTube 🙄🙄 "

You should strongly consider what I've said in my other comments. If you care for your freedoms, your life and your loved ones, I strongly urge you reading this to do everything in your power to stop devolution immediately.

you think you are getting more money one more power instead you are giving both away - CCAs are designed to be run as mayoral - with control or police, court, local and county councils - for th benefit of the big Freeport main business

"Your consultation document is biased towards the decision you want.

Tell the government to fund us properly without strings and bribes "

#### **Q15. How did you hear about this consultation?**

**(other)**

Advert phone

Advertised through my employer

Already knew about it through consultation

An advert that came up whilst using my phone.

at work, I work for SCC

BBC app

BBC local

BBC local news on line

BBC national news app.

BBC news

BBC news

BBC news

BBC news app

BBC news item

BBC News online, on 22nd May 2024.

BBC news website

BBC news website

BBC news website

BBC News Website

BBC website

Bbc website

BBC website

BBC website

Briefed by current leader at PC meeting

Briefings

By accident from a friend. Not seen it published

by accidental net surfing

Came across leaflet by chance in library when preparin for an event there.

Cannot remember, but picked up the hard copy in the library

chair of churchgate area association in Bury St Edmunds

Consultation meeting

council briefing

council newsletter

council website

Council website.

County and District Councillors; communications to parish council.

County Councillor

Document at local library

E Mail

e Mail

email

Email

email

Email

email

email

email

email

Email

email

email

Email

email

email

E-mail

email

Email

Email from Bramford parish council

Email from Chambers

Email from Suffolk Chamber of Commerce

Email through work place

Email via Chamber of Commerce

Email, Council website

Employer

Employer

employer promotion

Family

FINDING THIS FORM IN LOCAL LIBRARY IS THE FIRST I'VE HEARD ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION.

forwarded to me by council

Found it by chance whilst www surfing

Friend

From county councillor

From the Leader of the Council

Generally aware!

I saw a flyer in a community centre

I was directly emailed

I was phoned by IPSOS

I work for SCC

I work for SCC

I work for SCC

I work for SCC and it has been on social media

In a public library

In my local library

Internal email, I work for SCC.

Internal SCC

Internet

intranet at work

Just read about it it in a leaflet in the local library

knew it would happen last year

Laptop

leaflet from local library.

leaflet in library

Leaflet in local library

leaflet in the library

letter page in the daily times

Library

Library

Library

LIBRARY

library

library

library

LIBRARY

Library

LIBRARY

Library

LIBRARY

Library

LIBRARY

Library

Library display Wickham Market

Library.

Linked in

Linked in

LinkedIn

LinkedIn

LinkedIn

Linkedin

LinkedIn

linkedin

LinkedIn

LinkedIn

LinkedIn

LinkedIn

Local councillor

local email group

local haverhill library

Local library

LOCAL LIBRARY

LOCAL LIBRARY

Local library

Local library

Local library

LOCAL LIBRARY

LOCAL LIBRARY

local library

Local library

Local library

Local library

Local library

Local library

local library

Local library

Local Library

Local parish council

LOCAL public LIBRARY

Local Residents' Association

Long Melford Library

Manager

My Manager at SCC

National online News BBC

National press - online

Ne notice

One of your libraries

Online

Online

Online BBC local news pages.

only heard week ending 19/5



Opera

Other

Pamphlet in library

parish

Parish Council

Parish Council

Parish Council

Parish Council email

Parish council meeting

Parish Council meeting

Parish council news

PC website.

play 123 game site

Received an email

Relative

research for work

Saw the form about this in Bury St Edmunds Library. If I had not seen a printed form EMPOWERING SUFFOLK'S FUTURE in the library in Bury St Edmunds I would have been wholly unaware of this consultation.

SCC

SCC

SCC

SCC Bulletin

SCC communication e-mail

SCC Sharepoint

SCC website

SCC website

Searching for something else on Suffolk County Council website and happened upon this survey. Suggests that this is not as widely advertised as it should be.

should have been through the post really !

Skills Team Meeting

'Smart Survey' just popped up on my mobile phone.

Southwold library

Suffolk Association of Local Councils

Suffolk Chamber of Commerce

Suffolk Chamber of Commerce

Suffolk Chamber of Commerce

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk library

Through Suffolk Coast DMO

Through work (SCC)

Thurston Library

University newsletter

University of Suffolk staff intranet

Very local association

Via many of the committees I sit on as an anchor institution in Suffolk

Via our Suffolk County Councillor at a Parish Council meeting

Via SCC

Via work

Via work

Village website

word of mouth, from a MP and also a town hall worker

Work

work

work

work

work

work

Work

Work

Work email

Work email  
work email  
Work for SCC  
Work Hub  
Work intranet  
work news bulliten  
work newsletter  
Work newsletter  
Work online hub  
Work place  
Work, at SCC  
Workplace  
Young Person's Networkwsletter of County Council

**Q17. To which of these groups do you consider you belong? (other)**

Another load of nonsense  
Australian  
Born in England all you need to know.  
British born  
European  
European  
European  
European  
European  
European!  
Half Greek cypriot  
I identify as a toaster  
Italian  
Last attempt to introduce sailed past me.  
Latinamerican  
Lithuanian

Not relevant

Pink English

Polish



**Q18. Are you: (prefer to self describe)**

A human being

Abused taxpayer

Does it matter

Half deer half otter

I'll be watching from henceforth.

Male. There are only 2 sexes. Stop pandering to idiocy.

Male. You cannot "self describe" something which is factual. If you do, it's called lying.

No sense

Normal

Not relevant to this survey.

Only 2 genders ... stop this nonsense

Question has no relevance to outcome

responding for myself (female) and my partner (male)

Responsible adult

There's only two genders.....

What would you like me to be?

**Q19. In your view, does the proposed deal have the potential to be beneficial or detrimental to you?**

... but believe that innovation necessary to ensure resilience in increasingly uncertain times and this may help facilitate this

absolutely awful- we are too small a country to have such chaos caused by deregulated zones- I have read and followed the select committees of the levelling up bill- believe me, its designed to destabilise and protect business at expense of people and communities - they get their hands on councils and build what the want where they want- removing whoever they want- no tax- no NI-

soon there will be no deregulated money, you will have to generate it from council taxes, and services will be the discretion of the big business - the poor will be left to rot on the curbs. Devolution will lead to chaos - as the levelling up bill allows for the slow erosion of county councils in favour of mayors - who can have sole responsibilities - this bill has been put in place by libertarians who want charter cities so they can not tell them how to live, where you pay the corporation not the government to live someone and for services - what in the mind of these people, who have drawn up deregulation - makes you think your friend and family will thrive in a structure they have devised ?

Again this question is badly set out. As I am against the deal on all counts I cannot answer the question in the way it is worded. In addition I would not have marked the unsure box but found that the mark cannot be removed once it has been accidentally entered. I am not unsure, I am quite sure that I do not think this deal should be taken up.

All elected representatives should declare any and all interests they may have in any developments, particularly with respect to housing development and other financial investments.

All I can see is local council continuing to waste money on their own pet projects

Already answered in previous questions.

Already expressed concern about accepting a deal from the government which covers an extensive amount of time yet is fixed and not geared to inflation. Very risky.

Any impact would depend on decisions made by the devolved authority

Anything that adds costs to local services has proven to be a poor use of public money. I don't want another layer of government making their own rules as it will impact the services I need.

As a rare member of tax paying humanity, such crazy profligacy is going to ensure I and others of my ilk pick up the cost of it all.

As a white middle aged male the moneys will not benefit me since special interest groups will most likely gobble it up

As it will only reinforce the current flawed 2 tier local government system.

as noted earlier, local politics does not currently seem to take the views of the local electorate into account! will this change?

As part of a demographic there is facing lack of joined up services between health and social care locally already. I cannot see that this proposal is predicated on improving lives of families and individuals. Extra money given to the same set of organisations is not going to make them do things better. We need cultural change based on shared values and drive to make life better for Suffolk residents/businesses etc. This will get mixed in political infighting.

"As previously stated, in theory it sounds good. I just don't see things being any different.

"

At this time I am unsure as nothing seems to directly impact myself at this time. And if the proposed changes take effect then it will be a case of "wait and see".

Because Equality Impact consultations and Equality Impact Statements are no longer given the sincere they require as they are no longer monitored/ enforced by the Equality Commission.

Because I pay my way, don't live on benefits have worked all my life to get what I have and don't need some bunch of know-nothing leeches living off my taxes

Because not much changes in rural countryside. We look after ourselves at community level.

Because of age

Because of my age

Because you cannot be trusted

Can't trust conservatives alone in a room with a marshmallow on a table for 30 seconds.

Change never does

Come on? We have had 14 years of a conservative Govt and how many years of a conservative led county council and you expect it to benefit the majority? Open your eyes, smell the coffee for goodness sake!

Deal is positive as it increases local say and relevance of decisions. Not sure what my "protected characteristics" are though.

Depends who we elect , reform uk might stand - brilliant outcome

Detrimental as we need less governnance, not more and less fat cat councillors.

Detrimental to all residents of Suffolk.

Devolution divides, it does not add to this country. Look at Scottish devolution!

Do not devolve

Do not support this idea and feel the country should have a vote before going ahead with this proposeal

Do your best but bring in people not in it for the ride

Every change costs us more

Everything gets centralised and taken to Ipswich. I cannot see any funding as a priority to living standards on Coastal or rural areas.

fives residents of suffolk opportunity to influence governance

Fix the Corruption first

Garbage discrimination stuff. There should be no 'protected' characteristics. Everyone should be equal.

Given I do not fall, as far as I believe, within any of the protected characteristics within the Equality Act, it's unlikely any final deal, will be detrimental.

Giving more power locally is the answer

Giving normal folk back their power in making choices that effect so many.

Happy to speak further if you want to speak further on my comments

How can it benefit anybody if the unfit Suffolk County Council is in control of it?

How you currently manage SEND education (delay/refuse/provide minimal) and Lack of rural Bus services already have detrimental and disproportionate effects on Disabled people across Suffolk. You know this but don't care, so stop trying to tick boxes and just act in a no discriminatory manner

I am a pensioner, should I be influencing a future I probably won't have

I am a taxpayer, an increasing rare characteristic within the population at large, though fair game for rapacious Councils and Governments. Stop burdening me further with your ill considered schemes.

I am not interested in how it will affect me personally. I am trying to look at the wider picture

I am retired on a fixed income. Proposed changes do not seem to affect me from the perspective of age, sex, or disability.

I am unsure as at my age as the changes made will take time to settle in but I do hope in time they will benefit Suffolk and future generations.

I believe that it has the potential to be both which is why the publisher should choose who makes the decision of where funding goes.

I can see, depending on who is in council, that there could be both benefits and detriments. However, it depends on who is in council and making the decisions, to what extent it will be more detrimental or beneficial.

I consider a deal for the benefit if the overall community not just a selfish attitude of what's in it for me .

I do not favour devolution. Elected government to make country wide joined up decisions. Joke of a LONDON mayor as an example...

I don't have any protected characteristics but I consider the proposed devolution looks to be too good to be true. Usually such optimistic proposals result in disappointment at best.

I don't think there will be a direct impact on my characteristics but I think the measures will eventually benefit not only me but everyone in the county

I don't want council to have any more power

I don't live in rural Suffolk , so will not see any benefits of this harebrained , power grabbing deal .

I don't think a Conservative controlled county council would use this money wisely.

I don't understand the question?

i fear that this investment monies from Whitehall will end up being spent on more and more staff for the council. Who will see money is spent wisely?

I feel there is a need for change and we need to grasp the nettle and give it a go

I have Adhd. I have not been diagnosed as no one will listen. Im 63 now but having a diagnosis wd be helpful to explain my behaviour to people. My daughter is waitin assessment. I dont think any decisions would impact on our condition

I have made my views clear

I have no idea

I have none.

I have seen it already with a recent decision from SCC. It would get worse if SCC had no accountability to government.

I have selected unsure because the system has potential to be beneficial to everyone providing the money spent responsibly. I personally have very little faith in government and local authorities spending priorities, maybe this system could be the positive change we all need regardless of political persuasion.

I hope

I may not have protected characteristics but I do hope anything that benefits me would also benefit everyone.

I stay adamant in the belief that the increased devolution of finances will be detrimental to Suffolk, however, I concur that the multi year financing system for transport investment and the leader election may be beneficial for Suffolk.

I sure hope so. I would love to See Suffolk change for the better. Open air swimming pools and man made sandy beach is needed.

"I think it will benefit Suffolk residents as a whole.

I don't think it will make any difference to me, personally. "

"I think this a really problematic question because as someone with multiple protected characteristics there is not enough information on how the money will be spent and therefore how could anyone comment whether it will impact them positively or negatively.

Additionally, in this survey you have not captured the full list of protected characteristics e.g sexuality, gender identity. "

I will not personally gain anything financially, or anyone in my family either, from anything that I have stated here previously in this survey!!!!!!!!!!!!

I would be concerned that it might lead to less accountability for decision making to support all members of the community if all cabinet picked by the one elected lesder

I would like to think that it will be a positive change but this will definitely depend on how creative and forward thinking the people are that will be making the final decisions.



I'd like to think that with more power my local government will make sensible decisions that will be beneficial to me and my demographic... however, history tells me that sometimes they get things severely wrong.

I'd like to think the deal would give a greater flexibility in and around support for local people, would bring a greater level of business innovation and incentivisation to local businesses enabling home-grown talent to flourish thus enabling local business and community to harmonise better. I think the deal is an opportunity to heal rifts and patch needs.

If positive improvements are made as a result of this my mental health may well improve as currently it's depressing walking around seeing so many opportunities to clean up and take pride in the County rather than just see more and more new houses being built and having more congestion on the roads

If public transport is improved that could be very helpful, if adult social services had more capacity that could also be helpful.

if the local people can do a good job of allocating the money then great but there is bad reputation about council people taking money for themselves, greed etc

If you're not moving forward, you're going backwards.

It will have short time in which to benefit or not to these changes which will obviously take time to be fully implemented.

It will struggle with accessibility and more public transport could help me

I'll get screwed either way... But I'd rather use be protected by the state not the county. If we could write our own county laws then I'd start listening.

"Illogical question

If this q is aimed at disabled then it needs to say so.

But I'm assuming it's for everyone. The proposed deal should be beneficial to everyone, but if I tick no impact ( as I'm not disabled) it implies the deal will make no difference to me, whereas hopefully it will.

Otherwise this deal is just beneficial for disabled people! "

Impossible to tell from your very poorly constructed questionnaire.

Improve public transport

improved bus service no buses sunday or bank holidays at present so stuck at home like a lot of non drivers

Improvements to public transport are generally beneficial to older people, especially once we are no longer able to drive

In the right hands, this deal has the potential to be great for Suffolk

Insufficient statistics provided to make an informed decision.

Investment in public transport will benefit me in the longer term when I have to give up driving. As a keen cyclist I want to see more investment in infrastructure to make cycling for all safer.

It all depends on the other points made

It could lead to more sensationalist politics which has been detrimental to LGBTQIA+ people. There would be potential for fringe parties with policies hostile to queer people getting into the cabinet without a mandate.

It depends on how the councillors choose to use the money. My interests have been outlined in previous boxes.

It depends on how well it is managed and who is elected.

It has the potential to be either beneficial or detrimental. It all depends on how it's implemented and the number of people with protected characteristics that are actively engaged in to process.

It is an unknown until it happens.

it is likely the impacts will be felt beyond my lifetime

It is reliant on enough young people having the education to give them the confidence to vote otherwise we could be underrepresented in political decision making, causing money to be invested in unsustainable ways for the future.

It is such a small amount of money to have any significant impact as to do more of the same is not the solution it needs a complete re think

It should be good for all of Suffolk but if it is spent in the same cavalier way that SCC does at the moment we will be lucky to see any improvements

It sounds like a lot of money but can it help with the problems we face: increasing congestion from the rise in population; not enough local services to cope with this increase; the huge burden of social care.

It will cost me more and deliver less

It will lead to less funding over time

It will only benefit a small proportion of Suffolk, mainly those in the east of the county around Ipswich.

"It will serve those in the east of the county.

Those of us in the west will remain forgotten. "

It won't be worth diddly squat in a few years time once inflation has eroded it.

It won't improve thongs and will put up council tax which will level me with less money to live on

"It would be for 'the good of the cause'.

It should be beneficial directly or indirectly to all of Suffolk's residents."

"It's an idea that was previously rejected when it was floated as a consideration for an East Anglian Mayor. This is an attempt at 'divide and conquer' by looking at it on a county by county basis. This is what those bureaucrats do when they are determined to push through their agenda. They frame their idea differently. The EU used this approach all the time. If they didn't get what they wanted they buried the idea within a new charter and then forced a vote on an all

or nothing basis so it crept through surreptitiously. That's how governments have conned us for years. This is yet another ruse to get more control over people and give them little in return.

"

It's a terrible deal but I don't have protected characteristics.

It's all too 'Airy-Fairy'

It's just a NO full stop. I do not think Suffolk should be used as a test case for devolution. Not a good idea at all.

It's not going to empower local people in any way. We currently have NO meaningful representation in the British Parliament because our local MPs always toe the party line and forget about their constituents for 5 years. Moreover, we have no meaningful way of making them consider majority opinion in their constituencies. This new 'deal' will make no difference to that at all.

its quite something that a white male is considered as having no protected characteristics

I've ticked the for answer but i feel not just me would benefit from this proposal. My family, friends and other local residence

Just an ordinary person - nothing special - nothing out of the ordinary - just not really taken into account - it's decisions about others that disregard our needs and views - nothing changes

Just gives more scope for money to be wasted.

Just stop this proposal in its tracks and get on with providing the services you are obliged to provide

Just that it would be good for the town and its inhabitants

Load of rubbish

Local government is run on political party system

Mainly anything that improves the transport infrastructure where I live especially a Northern Bypass.

More housing may prosper more job opportunities as businesses may be drawn here. But this needs to be part of the plan and not to just chuck houses up for the people who never intend to work.

More inflated wages for certain SCC personnel / gold plated pensions and more funds for SCC to waste .

More public money will be wasted and corrupt practices will increase.

More Tory nonsense

My answer is irrelevant as this is not a democratic consultation sent to every household therefore any changes should not be taking place. So many people are not online for all sorts of reasons and also unable to get out much. But they are the ones who will be affected by this the most. If this is not being done in a fair and legal way giving every person a right to respond the results are not valid.

No impact that I can foresee

No matter what the latest brilliant idea, for my town of Haverhill NOTHING ever gets any better. I worked in local government 50 years ago when Ted Heath's wonderful ideas were introduced and they were a disaster. This won't be any different.

No protected characteristics (read: not politically relevant, not legally protected in any way, open to every accusation there is and presumed guilty).

No such thing as protected characteristics... unless you're a snowflake .. this is the most stupidest woke [REDACTED] ever... bring back freedom of speech and stop all this [REDACTED]...

Not an essential question in my view.

Not enough information

Not enough information as to how this would affect local councils.

Not expecting it to benefit me directly but I hope it benefits disadvantaged people in Suffolk such as hard up young families

Not much point in supporting this if there is no benefit - for me public spending should be as close as possible to the end user

Not part of or self described as any group with regard to sexual orientation, ethnicity or any other label

Not sure yet, just is £16m enough to do all subjects talked about in Suffolk for a whole year?

Nothing that has been done previously makes me confident that the Council are capable of managing this money properly

Only just heard about it, did the survey to learn a bit more, need to find out more. Very concerned its all about getting a bit of money fast that will disappear very quickly and leave us in actually a weaker position long term.

Over 60 's

Parliament for the whole of England, not this stupid further decision. I don't think that county councils, or cities with mayors etc, have a great history of of sensible budget management.

Probably no impact on me, but important for future of Suffolk and its residents, particularly those of working age.

Protected characteristics should make no difference - the new deal is either of benefit to the local individual or not.

Provisions to increase infrastructure and transport would be especially helpful

Same old same old, Government shedding responsibility so we can waste it and then the blame transfers to us!

SCC are not keen on disabled people, removing blue badge spaces, not telling companies like tesla to put in disabled charging points etc.

Scc is not able to manage current issues, I have no faith they would be able to with devolution in place. I do not agree or support devolution in suffolk.

Scrap Suffolk County Council

See above

should be good for the improvements mentioned especially transport and local business support

So far nothing I've read here will impact me. It will impact the next generation. I include 40 and 50 year old in this

"Some groups are ignored or forgotten, especially when rights of way are being planned or improved. Equestrians - horse riders and carriage drivers - are 80% female and include many older/disabled people and families. Horse activities are very important in keeping people, especially women and families, engaged in frequent regular physical exercise. A well-linked network of safe off-road row for all, including disabled people, is essential for locals and also for encouraging tourism. (BHS, ICD-UK stats).

Thank you."

Sounds like another Government daft scheme.

Stop playing identity politics oppression olympics woke garbage.

Stupid question. It will be the decisions the council makes with the powers and money it will get that will have an impact.

Suffolk county councils actions have always been wilfully and deliberately detrimental to the people of Ipswich and its infrastructure. Giving you even more money would only exacerbate the problem. I hold you in complete contempt and only take a tiny amount of solace from the fact that Ipswich residents are finally waking up to your incompetence and sabotage

That doesn't alter my view that this is Gerrymandering

The county council are not up to their existing responsibilities never mind new ones. Matthew Hicks in particular is a complete liability.

the deal could be beneficial to me, but is not linked to my protected characteristics

The deal doesn't have any impact until you spend the money, spend it wisely and not all at once

The deal will have no positive impact

"The only thing that will be impacted is the tax payer.

Forever out of pocket!

Make the difference! "

The political situation at present, is in an absolute mess, so how can anyone be sure of anything in the future?

The proposal will be detrimental to me in regards to all of us as it will increase the Democratic deficit

The proposed "deal" will primarily benefit SCC as administrators. Whatever they did in dishing out money to cronies would be of more benefit to the recipients than to residents of Suffolk or to visitors to the county.

The proposed deal is not open, honest and transparent in terms of the pros and cons. The information provided is completely biased.

The proposed deal would be detrimental to everyone in the county - except for the person directly elected to be leader of the council who would have a nice salary from the job!

The west of Suffolk gets neglected over Ipswich. Sad, but true. This would only get worse if the system was changed

The whole idea is ridiculous

There is no clarity about the impacts for disabled people in the proposals. The proposals do not seem to be based on any population needs analysis rather on what central government is prepared to give in terms of small pots of funding for small scale initiatives. Proposals do not increase democratic participation or accountability.

There is no devolution being proposed.

Think what?

This deal makes no attempt to address any of the impacts on minority groups in Suffolk, because that will fall upon the manifestos of those standing as Directly Elected Leader.

This has the potential to be detrimental to ALL of the residents of Suffolk.

This is a "Box ticking" exercise. The only respondents to this electronic extravaganza will be those with an axe to grind, those with unrealistic expectations of national and local government, grumpy old men like me, and other strange folks! Why don't you look at polling results and work out how many voters showed any interest in the last elections!

This is just another fad and unlikely to have any benefit. More likely to have a negative impact.

This is still discrimination! Look up meritocracy

This survey only highlighted the pros of devolution. There must be cons otherwise every county would already have done it.

to many homes into the area and still no upgraded a12 to Ipswich or dual carriage way , and people in power will get a very large pay rise and will be biased towards a place not true to its meanings in the area

To me personally I do not know, but I think to Suffolk as a community it will be beneficial

Too much power given to people without correct knowledge understanding and intelligence to spend and perform these duties ...

Too much is unproven and some areas of change will in my opinion have a negative impact; New Anglia LEP was an effective organisation

Too old!

Totally unnecessary exercise, tick the box and do as you want. This is not democratic.

Unfortunately I feel I as a lifetime in work including being self employed I have struggled financially and would have been much better off playing the system and watching day time TV

Unlikely to be using the new services (eg adult education). If a few potholes were fixed and more disabled parking spaces introduced it might help me

Unsure, but may improve access to shops with suitable resting areas & increased public transport. Possibility of accessing education...never too old

Until implemented it is impossible to say.

Until this comes into effect, I am unsure what the impact will be on me. Prices may go up like council tax, etc., which would be detrimental.

Very strange way of expressing it

We don't trust your decisions regarding suffolk. Never have never will.

We have seen a deterioration in the services provided by Suffolk County Council. Adult and Social Care is not fit for purpose nor is Highways. Neither of these major issues will be addressed under devolution. These are the things that matter to people as is providing homes of the right type and price for residents particularly in areas where house prices are high.

We need proper funding from national govnt / amounts discussed in devolution deal are very small / poor idea to have an elected leader - better working needed between districts council and Mp

What sort of question is that?

When and where will there be safe spaces for women - I want to go to a ladies toilet without a 6'bearded man telling me he has the right to be there because he's a woman

Who came up with this question?

Who knows?

Who knows? This doesn't provide enough information. How will the leader be elected? How do we know the options for investment? How is the figure calculated? What financial checks and balances are there? It's like asking me to comment on the surface of the moon: I've never been there and you haven't given me enough info to respond clearly.

will this part be scrutinized by the councillor with portfolio for diversity or one of the 30 other members of their dept employed to ensure Suffolk goes woke and broke?

You've put n/a-no protected characteristics as an answer however every person has a protected characteristic such as AGE and SEX.