

Response ID ANON-Y33W-B698-Y

Submitted to Consultation on Proposals for Local Government Reorganisation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Submitted on 2026-03-26 17:07:39

Tell us about yourself

1. What is your name?

Name:

2. Are you responding as an individual or providing an official response on behalf of an organisation?

Official response on behalf of an organisation

3. Are you providing the official response from a named consultee?

Yes

4. In which council area is your address? (if you are responding as an individual this is your home address. If you are responding as an organisation this is your organisation address)

Cambridgeshire County Council

5. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know the organisation's name:

Organisation:

South Cambridgeshire District Council

6. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please let us know your position within the organisation:

Position in organisation::

7. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the type of organisation from the options below:

Local government - principal council within the invitation area

8. What is your email address?

Email address::

Personal Data

1. Please read and tick the box before proceeding with the consultation

The sections for each proposal in this consultation include free text boxes where you can explain your answers. Please tick this box to confirm that you will not include information which may identify an individual in these boxes

Consultation on the Proposal from Cambridge City Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly agree

8. If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on the proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

The plans set out within this proposal would result in two Councils - North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and Greater Cambridge - that are the right size to thrive but local enough to care.

In particular, Greater Cambridge reflects clear functional geographies, linking the area where the majority of people live, work, study and access services (Q1). The business case demonstrates that these proposed councils align with existing economic footprints, transport patterns and housing markets, which supports strategic planning and service delivery across each area (Q1, Q4)

The two Councils would also have similar sized economies, each with distinct strengths that are nationally important (Q2). As a larger Council, North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would have the scale needed to fund high levels of statutory service

demand – evidenced within the proposal through higher levels of deprivation, lower life expectancy, and existing pressures on children’s and adults’services. At the same time, Greater Cambridge would be well positioned to manage fast growth, infrastructure pressures and the need for sustainable, long-term planning (Q3, Q4). This balance of economic capacity across the two councils is of paramount importance, as it provides a more stable and equitable foundation than alternatives that would create structurally imbalanced unitaries.

The evidence within the proposal demonstrates that both councils would have the capacity and resilience to operate efficiently, improve professional capability and withstand financial shocks (Q3). Bringing district and county functions together within each area would simplify governance, reduce duplication and enable more preventative, place-based approaches. This is particularly important for delivering high-quality, sustainable services that are joined up around residents’needs (Q4).

The proposal reflects public feedback gathered throughout 2024 and 2025 (Q5). During September and October 2025, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council ran a joint survey asking whether respondents support a new unitary council for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The survey received 889 responses, with 69% supporting a unitary council based on the current boundaries. This followed an earlier joint survey by the seven Cambridgeshire councils during summer 2025, which although not about specific reorganisation options, indicated support for change if it results in better services. These findings demonstrate that the proposal is aligned with local views and local priorities, and that it builds on the feedback gathered to date (Q5).

The proposal also clearly sets out how establishing these councils would strengthen devolution arrangements, making it easier for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver on strategic priorities (Q6). A two unitary model creates a stronger platform for a long-term, place-based devolution deal, giving the region a more coherent voice in negotiations and enabling clearer accountability.

An important additional strength of Option B is the alignment it creates with the geography proposed for the Greater Cambridge Development Corporation. A Greater Cambridge unitary covering Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire would match the Development Corporation’s intended footprint, enabling clearer governance, better integrated spatial and economic planning, and more streamlined partnership arrangements.

This proposal identifies opportunities for stronger community engagement and improved neighbourhood empowerment (Q7) through a pro-active locality working model. Unitary structures would simplify the relationship between communities and their council, making it clearer who is responsible for what, and enabling more

meaningful dialogue with residents and parish councils. The focus on locality working across both new councils is particularly positive, ensuring that decision-making can be closer to communities while benefiting from the efficiency and coherence of a single organisation.

9. I confirm that I have not provided any information that identifies an individual in the free text box.

Yes

Consultation on the Proposal from Cambridgeshire County Council

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat agree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

8. If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on the proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

This proposal aims to create two councils of a similar geographic and demographic scale.

However, by doing so this option brings together areas with very different economic profiles and levels of service demand. This creates two new unitaries with a greater degree of imbalance between their respective economies and needs, and would make it harder to ensure long-term financial resilience (Q3) and consistent service standards (Q4).

The economic divergence in this option risks embedding inequality between the two councils, which could have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of services (Q4), financial resilience (Q3), long-term investment, and the attractiveness of the area for inward investment (Q2).

Given the Government's consultation on a Greater Cambridge Development Corporation, a future local authority would ideally mirror the same spatial footprint, to support coherent strategic planning and partnership working (Q1, Q4). This option does not reflect that geography and would therefore create a less intuitive and potentially more fragmented governance landscape (Q6).

In relation to Q7 we believe that provision for community engagement and neighbourhood empowerment is limited by the focus on geography rather than local community identity and resident engagement.

Recent local engagement has also shown strong public support for a Greater Cambridge unitary, which is not reflected in this option (Q5) and does not align with the

functional geography and patterns of service use across the Greater Cambridge area (Q1).

When assessed against the criteria in Questions 1–7, our view is therefore that the Greater Cambridge / North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough proposal remains the option that most clearly meets local needs, aligns with coherent economic and functional geographies, and best reflects the ways in which residents use public services.

9. I confirm that I have not provided any information that identifies an individual in the free text box.

Yes

Consultation on the Proposal from Huntingdonshire District Council

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Neither agree nor disagree

8. If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on the proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

We welcome the inclusion of a Greater Cambridge unitary council as part of this proposal, made up of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. This reflects a well-established functional geography (Q1) and supports coherent service planning in the south of the county (Q4). It also aligns with strong local support already evidenced for a Greater Cambridge unitary (Q5).

However, when assessed against the criteria in Questions 1–7, our view is that the overall three-council structure introduces additional cost and avoidable risk and uncertainty (Q3, Q4). In particular, separating Huntingdonshire from the wider northern area creates potential imbalances (Q1) and reduces the scale, resilience and financial viability of the proposed North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough unitary (Q3).

Concentrating high-need areas into a smaller unitary, with a reduced Council Tax base, increases pressure on services and reduces the region's overall resilience and options for innovation (Q4), particularly where need is highest. This creates significant implications for the long-term sustainability and viability of key services (Q3, Q4) in both a Huntingdonshire and a North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area.

Three unitaries also lengthen and complicate transition (Q3), increasing overheads and uncertainty for residents and staff, as well as making future devolution arrangements more complex by increasing the number of strategic interfaces (Q6).

Our overall assessment is that the Greater Cambridge / North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough model remains better aligned with coherent economic geographies (Q1), long-term service sustainability (Q4) and residents' patterns of service use (Q1, Q4).

9. I confirm that I have not provided any information that identifies an individual in the free text box.

Yes

Consultation on the proposal from Peterborough City Council and Fenland District Council

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal suggests councils that are based on sensible geographies and economic areas?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will be able to deliver the outcomes they describe in the proposal?

dropdwon answers:

Somewhat disagree

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils are the right size to be efficient, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks?

dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed councils will deliver high quality, sustainable public services?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal has been informed by local views and will meet local needs?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that establishing the councils in this proposal will support devolution arrangements?

Dropdown answers:

Somewhat disagree

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal enables stronger community engagement and gives the opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

8. If you would like to, please use the free text box to explain the answers you have provided to questions 1-7 referring to the question numbers as part of your answer. You may also use the box to provide any other comments you have on the proposal.

Text box to add further comments:

We welcome the inclusion of a Greater Cambridge unitary council as part of this proposal, made up of Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. This reflects a well-established functional geography (Q1) and supports coherent service planning in the south of the county (Q4). It also aligns with strong local support already evidenced for a Greater Cambridge unitary (Q5).

However, the proposal creates three unitaries (Q3) and splits Huntingdonshire between two of them (Q1), which introduces avoidable complexity. In our view, dividing a single district in this instance reduces geographical coherence (Q1), complicates service planning and commissioning (Q4), and would threaten the viability and resilience of the northern councils (Q3), particularly where needs are highest. Concentrating high-need areas into a smaller unitary increases pressure on services (Q4) and reduces the region's overall financial resilience (Q3). Three unitaries also lengthen and complicate transition (Q3), increasing overheads and uncertainty for residents and staff.

Effective devolution benefits from fewer, more coherent footprints. Moving to three unitaries and splitting Huntingdonshire adds additional interfaces for regional partners and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (Q6), making strategic agreements more complex. Smaller organisations may be advantageous in some

aspects of community engagement (Q7); however, having three councils would increase cross-border complexities for many (Q1). The division of Huntingdonshire may also risk generating negative feelings towards the LGR process and new unitaries (Q7).

Our overall assessment is that the Greater Cambridge / North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough configuration provides a more balanced (Q2/Q3), sustainable (Q4) and strategically coherent (Q1, Q6) model for the region.

9. This is a proposal that is accompanied by a request that the Secretary of State considers boundary change or that affects wider public services. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposal sets out a strong public services and financial sustainability justification for boundary change?

Dropdown answers:

Strongly disagree

10. If you would like to, please use this free text box to explain your answer to question 9.

Text box to add further comments:

As detailed within the answer to question 8.

11. I confirm that I have not provided any information that identifies an individual in the free text boxes.

Yes