Unweighted Total Weighted Total
HOUSING
People against development/nimbyism
Lack of suitable sites/finding suitable land
Planning constraints/rules
Lack of social housing/affordable housing
Housing (unspecific)
Freeing up green belt
Sustainable development
Demolition of old housing stock
Impact of superstores
NPPF
High house prices
Unrealistic government housing targets
OTHER/GENERAL

			AGE	_				PAF	RTY			COUNCIL TYPE						
Tatal	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	l ala	1 :1-	0	امما	Other	Uniten	0	Metro	1	District		
Total						Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	politan	London	District		
411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200		
411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%		
74 18%	7 34%	5 16%	16 21%	17 18%	28 15%	35 19%	16 12%	12 21%	1 24%	9 39%	-	9 10%	6 13%	4 7%	10 24%	44 23%		
19 5%	2 9%	1 5%	3 4%	6 6%	6 3%	12 6%	3 2%	3 6%	-	-	-	1 1%	* 1%	3 5%	2 5%	13 7%		
17 4%	2 11%	* 2%	2 3%	3 3%	9 5%	8 4%	1 1%	4 7%	1 24%	3 12%	-	3 3%	3 7%	-	1 3%	10 5%		
11 3%	-	2 7%	4 5%	1 1%	4 2%	6 3%	-	2 3%	-	4 17%	-	1 1%	4 9%	* 1%	2 5%	5 3%		
10 2%	-	-	2 3%	3 3%	5 3%	2 1%	4 3%	2 3%	-	1 6%	-	2 2%	-	-	1 2%	7 4%		
7 2%	-	1 3%	1 1%	2 2%	2 1%	2 1%	4 3%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	2 4%	2		
3 1%	1 5%	-	* 1%	1 1%	*	1 1%	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%		
3 1%	1 5%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	2 1%		
2 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2 1%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 6%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	2 1%		
2	1 4%	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1		
1 *	- /0	-	1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 /	*	-	-	1 1 1%	- * 1%	-	-	-	*	-	-	1 2%	-		
1 *	-	-	170 - -	-	- 1 1%	1 1%	170 - -	- -	-	-	-		- - -	- 1 2%	-	-		
270 66%	9 43%	16 48%	49 63%	73 74%	123 68%	114 61%	92 71%	42 73%	3 51%	14 60%	6 68%	67 71%	33 72%	34 65%	28	123 65%		





**Councillors Survey July 2012** 

	AGE								PAF	RTY		COUNCIL TYPE					
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Reduction in funding/financial constraints	104 25%	5 23%	3 9%	20 26%	31 32%	45 25%	29 15%	54 42%	13 23%	3 51%	3 12%	3 31%	33 35%	9 20%	13 25%	15 34%	38 20%
Investment in infrastructure/infrastructure issues	28 7%	1 6%	2 6%	5 7%	3 3%	16 9%	21 11%	-	7 12%	-	-	-	2 2%	5 10%	2 3%	1 3%	20 10%
Cuts to services	24 6%	1 4%	2 6%	7 8%	5 5%	10 6%	3 2%	14 10%	4 8%	-	1 6%	1 18%	7 8%	2 5%	5 10%	3 8%	7 3%
Depressed economy/economic situation	16 4%	-	2 6%	3 3%	3 3%	8 4%	8 4%	4 3%	5 8%	-	-	-	9 9%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	4 2%
Communicating with public/taking account of local opinion	14 3%	-	2 6%	3 4%	3 3%	5 3%	8 4%	5 4%	1 2%	-	- -	-	1 1%	2 5%	2 4%	1 2%	9 5%
Too much interference from central Government/too much central control	13 3%	-	1 3%	4 6%	3 3%	4 2%	4 2%	4 3%	3 5%	-	1 6%	-	2 2%	1 3%	* 1%	2 4%	8 4%
Matching commercial demands to need of community	11 3%	1 5%	1 3%	-	3 3%	6 3%	6 3%	2 2%	1 2%	-	1 6%	-	3 4%	1 2%	2 5%	-	4 2%
Growth in the retired population/providing services for older people	10 2%	-	-	2 3%	-	8 4%	10 5%	-	* 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	3 7%	3 6%	* 1%	4 2%
Schools/education	10 2%	-	1 3%	4 5%	3 3%	2 1%	4 2%	2 2%	3 4%	-	1 5%	-	5 6%	-	- -	2 5%	3
Employment opportunities/jobs	10 2%	-	-	1 1%	3 3%	6 3%	4 2%	6 4%	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	1 2%	6 3%
Localism/localism agenda	10 2%	-	* 2%	1 2%	2 2%	6 3%	4 2%	1 1%	4 8%	-	-	-	2 2%	1 2%	-	1 2%	6 3%
Private sector unwilling to invest/lack of private sector finance	9 2%	-	-	- -	3 3%	7 4%	2 1%	1 1%	3 5%	-	3 12%	-	2 2%	3 7%	2 3%	-	3 2%



Q1 In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges in meeting local development needs in your local area?

Base: All respondents

Unweighted Total Weighted Total
Opposition to change
Bureaucracy/red tape
Public inertia/apathy
Meeting public expectation
Protecting the environment
Welfare reform
Hospitals
Immigration
Business rates
Prioritising spending
Political agreement
Other

			AGE	_				PAF	RTY		COUNCIL TYPE							
Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District		
411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200		
411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%		
8 2%	1 5%	-	3 3%	1 1%	3 1%	3 2%	-	1 2%	-	3 13%	-	2 2%	1 3%	-	* 1%	5 3%		
6 2%	-	* 2%	1 1%	4 4%	1 1%	4 2%	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	* 1%	-	2 4%	1 2%	3 1%		
6 1%	-	* 2%	-	4 4%	2 1%	3 1%	-	2 3%	-	-	2 18%	-	-	1 2%	-	5 3%		
5 1%	-	-	* 1%	2 2%	3 2%	3 2%	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	4 2%		
4 1%	-	1 3%	* 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1	1 1%	2 3%	-	-	-	- -	2 4%	-	1 2%	3 2%		
3 1%	- -	1 3%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 2%			
2 1%	-	1 3%	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	- -	-	-	-	2 1%		
2	-	1 3%	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	- -	-	-	-	2 1%		
1 *	-	-	-	1 1%	*	1 1%	-	* 1%	-	-	-	- -	-	-	-	1 1%		
1 *	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	- -	1 2%	-	-			
*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	* 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*		
18 4%	1 6%	2 6%	1 2%	5 5%	9 5%	13 7%	4 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	2 2%	5 10%	1 2%	1 2%	10 5%		
66 16%	5 21%	10 32%	15 19%	7 7%	30 17%	29 16%	24 18%	6 11%	1 25%	3 12%	3 32%	19 20%	6 14%	13 26%	9 20%	20 11%		



Not Stated

Unweighted Total Weighted Total
HOUSING
People against development/nimbyism
Lack of suitable sites/finding suitable land
Planning constraints/rules
Lack of social housing/affordable housing
Housing (unspecific)
Freeing up green belt
Sustainable development
Demolition of old housing stock
Impact of superstores
NPPF
High house prices
Unrealistic government housing targets
OTHER/GENERAL

					RE	GION					GEN	IDER
Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
74 18%	6 15%	8 22%	8 16%	3 14%	6 12%	18 26%	6 14%	5 20%	9 23%	3 11%	51 16%	22 23%
19 5%	1 3%	1 4%	-	-	1 3%	7 10%	4 9%	1 4%	2 6%	-	11 4%	8 8%
17 4%	2 5%	3 7%	2 4%	1 4%	1 3%	3 4%	-	* 2%	1 3%	3 11%	12 4%	5 5%
11 3%	-	2 5%	2 4%	-	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	2 5%	3 11%	11 4%	-
10 2%	1 3%	1 4%	3 5%	-	1 2%	2 4%	* 1%	-	1 2%	-	4 1%	6 7%
7 2%	1 3%	1 4%	-	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	1 4%	1 2%	-	6 2%	1 1%
3 1%	* 1%	-	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	2 2%
3 1%	-		-	-	1 2%	2 3%		-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%
2 1%	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-		-	-	-	2 1%	-
2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 5%	-	-	2 1%	-
2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	2 1%	-
1 *	-	-	-	-	-	* 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	1 *	-
1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	1	-
270 66%	30 73%	21 58%	35 66%	19 77%	32 65%	40 58%	31 69%	14 55%	27 66%	20 79%	204 65%	66 68%



	REGION  East West East Vorth North South South and											GEN	NDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Reduction in funding/financial constraints	104 25%	10 24%	8 21%	10 18%	7 27%	9 18%	14 20%	10 21%	9 37%	15 37%	13 52%	75 24%	29 29%
Investment in infrastructure/infrastructure issues	28 7%	4 9%	2 5%	10 18%	-	1 2%	6 9%	2 5%	* 2%	1 2%	2 7%	20 6%	7 7%
Cuts to services	24 6%	1 3%	3 8%	2 3%	5 18%	5 9%	3 4%	* 1%	1 4%	3 8%	2 7%	18 6%	7 7%
Depressed economy/economic situation	16 4%	1 3%	1 4%	1 2%	1 4%	1 3%	* 1%	3 7%	1 4%	1 2%	4 17%	14 4%	2 2%
Communicating with public/taking account of local opinion	14 3%	1 3%	1 4%	1 2%	- -	4 9%	2 3%	2 5%	* 2%	1 2%	-	11 3%	3 3%
Too much interference from central Government/too much central control	13 3%	1 3%	-	- -	2 9%	3 6%	2 2%	3 6%	-	2 4%	-	10 3%	2 2%
Matching commercial demands to need of community	11 3%	2 6%	3 7%	-	1 4%	2 4%	2 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	9 3%	2 2%
Growth in the retired population/providing services for older people	10 2%	3 8%	1 4%	-	-	3 6%	1 1%	2 3%	-	-	-	10 3%	*
Schools/education	10 2%	-	-	1 2%	-	1 2%	2 3%	2 5%	-	2 5%	2 7%	5 2%	5 5 5%
Employment opportunities/jobs	10 2%	1 3%	1 4%	1 2%	2 9%	1 2%	1 1%	1 2%	-	1 2%	-	6 2%	4 4%
Localism/localism agenda	10 2%	3 7%	* 1%	* 1%	-	1 3%	1 2%	2 5%	-	1 2%	-	7 2%	2 2%
Private sector unwilling to invest/lack of private sector finance	9 2%	1 3%	1 4%	1 2%	1 4%	1 2%	-	1 2%	-	-	3 11%	8 2%	2 2%



Unweighted Total Weighted Total
Opposition to change
Bureaucracy/red tape
Public inertia/apathy
Meeting public expectation
Protecting the environment
Welfare reform
Hospitals
Immigration
Business rates
Prioritising spending
Political agreement
Other
Not Stated

					REG	SION					GEN	IDER
Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
8 2%	1 3%	* 1%	3 5%	-	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	* 1%		6 2%	2 2%
6 2%	* 1%	-	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	2 3%	1 4%	1 2%	-	6 2%	*
6 1%	-	-	5 9%	-	* 1%	* 1%	-	* 2%	-		4 1%	2 2%
5 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	1 2%	2 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	2 1%	3 3%
4 1%	1 3%	-	-	-	-	1 2%	* 1%	-	1 2%	-	3 1%	*
3 1%	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	-	3 1%	-
2 1%	-	1 4%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	1 1%
2	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	1	1 1%
1	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-		1	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-
*	-	-	-	-	-	* 1%	-	-	-		*	-
18 4%	1 3%	4 11%	4 7%	-	2 4%	4 6%	2 4%	* 2%	1 2%		15 5%	3 4%
66 16%	5 12%	7 18%	6 12%	3 13%	10 21%	10 14%	7 14%	6 23%	8 19%	5 21%	58 19%	8 8%



				AGE					PAF	RTY			COUNCIL TYPE					
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District	
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200	
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%	
Housing/new homes/social housing	23 6%	1 5%	1 4%	3 3%	7 7%	11 6%	9 5%	11 8%	3 5%	-	-	-	6 6%	2 3%	2 5%	3 6%	10 5%	
Investment/promoting investment	22 5%	1 5%	3 10%	5 6%	3 3%	10 5%	10 5%	7 5%	2 4%	-	-	3 31%	12 12%	1 2%	-	1 3%	9 5%	
Employment opportunities/creating jobs	20 5%	-	2 6%	3 4%	2 2%	12 7%	16 8%	1 1%	3 5%	-	-	-	3 3%	7 16%	2 3%	-	12 6%	
LEPs are effective/joint development/working together partnership is working	19 5%	- -	3 9%	1 2%	6 6%	9 5%	10 5%	5 4%	5 9%	-	-	-	6 7%	-	2 4%	* 1%	10 5%	
Apprenticeships/job training/work experience	17 4%	-	1 5%	1 1%	3 3%	12 7%	10 5%	5 4%	2 3%	-	-	-	1 1%	3 7%	5 9%	2 4%	8 4%	
Regeneration programmes	12 3%	-	-	3 4%	1 1%	8 5%	8 4%	1 1%	2 3%	1 27%	-	-	3 3%	1 3%	-	1 2%	7 4%	
Business experience/expertise	10 3%	3 13%	-	1 1%	1 1%	5 3%	8 4%	1 1%	-	-	1 6%	-	2 2%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	5 3%	
Planning consultation	10 2%	-	-	1 1%	4 4%	5 3%	2 1%	5 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	3 3%	* 1%	-	2 4%	5 3%	
Social services	4 1%	-	* 2%	1 2%	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	* 1%	1 3%	1 2%	1 2%	*	
New development	4 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	2 1%	3 2%	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	* 1%	-	-	4 2%	
Infrastructure	4 1%	- -	-	-	3 3%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	3 2%	
Schools/education	4 1%	-	2 5%	1 1%	-	1 1%	4 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 1%	
The retail offer	4 1%	-	1 3%	-	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	2 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 1%	



				AGE					PAR	TY	COUNCIL TYPE						
	Total 18-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+						Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
										•				46			
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%		52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Commercial viability	3 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-
Innovation	2 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	1 1%
Leisure	2 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%
Reduction in red tape/bureaucracy	2	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	2 1%
Industry	2	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	* 1%	-	-	-	* 1%	-	-	-	1 1%
Children's services	1	-	1 3%	-	-	*	1	-	* 1%	-	-	-	* 1%	-	-	1 2%	-
Sponsoring services	1	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Air ambulance	1	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Improved decision making	1	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Public transport	1	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
They don't/no benefit/will only benefit the companies	95 23%	5 22%	2 5%	15 20%	31 31%	43 24%	33 17%	38 29%	15 27%	-	8 36%	2 18%	23 24%	12 26%	12 23%	5 11%	49 26%
Other	7 2%	-	2 5%	1 2%	1 1%	3 2%	4 2%	1 1%	2 4%	-	-	-	2 2%	1 2%	* 1%	1 3%	2 1%
Not Stated	173 42%	13 60%	18 54%	42 54%	38 39%	62 34%	75 40%	56 43%	20 35%	4 73%	13 59%	4 50%	34 36%	15 34%	27 51%	27 62%	72 38%



						REG	SION					GEN	IDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Housing/new homes/social housing	23 6%	2 5%	-	2 3%	5 18%	2 5%	6 8%	4 8%	-	3 7%	-	18 6%	5 5%
Investment/promoting investment	22 5%	3 8%	1 4%	3 6%	1 4%	3 6%	5 7%	1 3%	-	1 3%	3 11%	17 6%	4 4%
Employment opportunities/creating jobs	20 5%	2 6%	1 4%	10 18%	-	1 3%	2 4%	2 5%	* 2%	-	-	14 5%	5 5%
LEPs are effective/joint development/working together/partnership is working	19 5%	2 4%	4 10%	2 3%	1 4%	2 5%	4 6%	4 10%	- -	* 1%	-	16 5%	3 3%
Apprenticeships/job training/work experience	17 4%	1 3%	3 7%	2 3%	2 9%	1 2%	6 9%	-	-	2 5%	-	12 4%	5 5%
Regeneration programmes	12 3%	* 1%	-	4 7%	-	2 5%	2 3%	2 5%	-	1 2%	-	8 3%	4 4%
Business experience/expertise	10 3%	1 3%	-	1 2%	-	4 8%	2 3%	-	-	2 4%	-	8 3%	2 2%
Planning consultation	10 2%	* 1%	3 8%	* 1%	2 9%	-	* 1%	2 3%	-	2 5%	-	7 2%	3 3%
Social services	4 1%	-	1 4%	-	-	* 1%	-	* 1%	1 4%	1 2%	-	3 1%	1 1%
New development	4 1%	-	-	* 1%	-	1 2%	1 1%	2 3%	-	-	-	3 1%	1 1%
Infrastructure	4 1%	-	1 4%	-	-	1 2%	1 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	4 1%	-
Schools/education	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 2%	-	2 4%	-	2 1%	2 2%
The retail offer	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	1 2%	-	1 2%	-	3 1%	*



						REC	GION					GEN	IDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Commercial viability	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 10%	3 1%	-
Innovation	2 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 1%
Leisure	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 5%	-	-	-	1 *	1 1%
Reduction in red tape/bureaucracy	2	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-
Industry	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	* 2%	-	-	1 *	*
Children's services	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	* 1%	-	1 2%	-	1 *	-
Sponsoring services	1 *	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Air ambulance	1	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		1 1%
Improved decision making	1	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-
Public transport	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
They don't/no benefit/will only benefit the companies	95 23%	15 38%	10 27%	11 21%	8 32%	10 21%	16 22%	8 18%	7 28%	5 12%	5 21%	72 23%	24 24%
Other	7 2%	-	1 4%	-	1 4%	-	1 2%	2 3%	1 4%	1 2%	-	5 2%	2 2%
Not Stated	173 42%	14 34%	14 38%	20 38%	7 28%	20 40%	27 39%	18 40%	15 62%	24 58%	14 58%	128 41%	45 46%



Unweighted Total Weighted Total
We'll be investing more as a result
No difference, we'll be investing the same as before
We will be investing less as a result
Don't know
Not Stated

			AGE					PAR	TY				CC	UNCIL TY	PE	
Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
86 21%	4 20%	7 21%	14 18%	29 29%	32 18%	52 28%	22 17%	11 19%	-	1 6%	-	14 15%	5 11%	6 11%	12 27%	51 27%
104 25%	8 36%	7 20%	16 21%	19 19%	55 30%	54 29%	28 21%	12 21%	1 27%	7 31%	1 17%	22 23%	18 39%	17 33%	12 27%	42 22%
62 15%	1 4%	6 18%	15 19%	16 17%	24 13%	13 7%	36 28%	7 13%	-	3 12%	3 33%	16 17%	7 15%	9 18%	4 10%	27 14%
155 38%	8 39%	13 39%	32 41%	34 35%	69 38%	66 35%	44 34%	26 46%	4 73%	12 51%	4 50%	43 46%	16 35%	19 36%	16 37%	67 35%
4 1%	-	* 2%	1 1%	-	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	* 1%	-	-	-		-	1 2%	-	3 1%



Unweighted Total Weighted Total
We'll be investing more as a result
No difference, we'll be investing the same as before
We will be investing less as a result
Don't know
Not Stated

					REC	SION					GEN	DER
Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
411	41	37	53	25	49	70	45	25	41	25	313	98
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
86	14	8	16	3	5	20	6	3	11	-	65	21
21%	35%	20%	31%	13%	10%	29%	13%	12%	26%		21%	21%
104	14	8	8	6	7	21	14	8	11	8	85	19
25%	33%	23%	15%	23%	14%	30%	31%	31%	26%	31%	27%	19%
62	2	7	6	5	15	9	5	4	4	5	47	15
15%	4%	20%	12%	18%	31%	13%	11%	17%	9%	21%	15%	15%
155	12	14	21	11	21	19	20	10	16	12	114	42
38%	28%	37%	39%	46%	43%	27%	45%	40%	38%	48%	36%	42%
4 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	2	2 2%



				AGE					PAR	TY				CC	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
NEGATIVE	68 17%	2 9%	5 16%	20 26%	14 14%	27 15%	30 16%	22 17%	10 18%	-	6 28%	-	18 19%	11 24%	8 16%	5 10%	28 15%
It hasn't/none/no change	44 11%	1 5%	* 2%	10 12%	11 11%	22 12%	22 12%	11 9%	7 12%	-	5 22%	-	13 13%	9 21%	5 9%	2 4%	16 8%
Will have fewer resources	8 2%	1 4%	-	5 6%	1 1%	2 1%	3 2%	5 4%	1 2%	-	-	-	3 3%	-	3 6%	1 2%	2 1%
Will waste more money/run up more debt	5 1%	-	2 7%	2 3%	-	*	4 2%	-	* 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	4 2%
Too many restrictions/limits our opportunities	4 1%	-	1 3%	1 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	3 1%
Less social housing being built	2 1%	-	1 3%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 1%
Council nervous about investment/will hamper investment	1 *	- -	* 1%	* 1%	*	-	- -	- -	1 3%	-	-	-	*	-	* 1%	-	*
More dependent on government grants	1 *	-	-	1 2%	-	-	- -	-	-	-	1 6%		-	1 3%	-	-	1 1%
Implications not thought through	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 1%	- -	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
A backward step	1 *	-	-	1 1%	-	-	- -	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	
POSITIVE	59 14%	2 9%	4 13%	9 11%	20 20%	23 13%	32 17%	19 15%	8 14%	-	-	-	11 12%	7 15%	3 5%	8 18%	34 18%
Self financing will encourage more house building/ more funds availablefor investment in housing	17 4%	1 5%	2 6%	6 7%	5 5%	4 2%	9 5%	6 4%	3 5%	-	-	-	4 4%	-	* 1%	3 6%	10 5%
Can/will build more council houses	16 4%	-	1 4%	2 3%	5 5%	7 4%	9 5%	6 5%	* 1%	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	2 5%	11 6%



				AGE					PAR	RTY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Able to improve existing housing stock	13 3%	-	2 6%	4 6%	3 3%	3 2%	10 5%	2 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	4 8%	8 4%
More funding for social housing/affordable housing	11 3%	-	-	1 1%	4 4%	6 3%	8 4%	2 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	*	3 6%	1 2%	1 2%	8 4%
Can make longer term plans	8 2%	1 4%	1 3%	-	3 3%	3 2%	1 1%	6 4%	2 3%	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-	1 2%	3 2%
Neighbourhood consultations/more discussion with local people	3 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 1%	-	* 1%	-		-		2 4%	1 2%	-	-
The risk is spread	1 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-
Has sped up the house building process	1	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-
Has encouraged innovation	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-
Will encourage right to buy	1 *	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
More sustainable housing options	1 *	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Lack of red tape encourages investment	1 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 1%
Other	8 2%	-	-	* 1%	6 6%	1 1%	5 3%	1 1%	* 1%	1 24%	-	-		-	2 3%	-	6 3%
Don't know/unclear about it/not sure/too soon to say	70 17%	4 17%	2 5%	10 13%	15 15%	40 22%	31 16%	20 15%	8 13%	1 27%	8 34%	3 31%	21 22%	5 12%	8 16%	8 19%	29 16%
Not Stated	208 51%	14 65%	21 66%	38 49%	44 45%	91 50%	91 49%	68 53%	32 55%	3 49%	9 38%	6 69%	44 47%	23 50%	31 61%	23 53%	94 49%



						REC	SION					GEN	DER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
NEGATIVE	68 17%	6 14%	8 20%	7 12%	2 10%	9 19%	15 22%	6 13%	3 12%	5 11%	8 31%	56 18%	12 12%
It hasn't/none/no change	44 11%	4 11%	7 18%	4 7%	2 10%	4 8%	10 14%	5 11%	2 8%	2 5%	5 21%	41 13%	4 4%
Will have fewer resources	8 2%	-	-	* 1%	-	3 7%	-	1 2%	-	1 2%	3 10%	6 2%	2 2%
Will waste more money/run up more debt	5 1%	-	* 1%	1 2%	-	-	2 3%	-	-	1 2%	-	3 1%	1 2%
Too many restrictions/limits our opportunities	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 4%	-	1 4%	-	-	2 1%	2 2%
Less social housing being built	2 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	1	1 1%
Council nervous about investment/will hamper investment	1 *	-	* 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	*
More dependent on government grants	1 *	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Implications not thought through	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
A backward step	1 *	-	-		-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
POSITIVE	59 14%	6 14%	6 15%	13 24%	4 18%	3 7%	16 23%	2 5%	2 6%	7 17%	-	41 13%	17 18%
Self financing will encourage more house building/ more funds availablefor investment in housing	17 4%	-	* 1%	6 11%	-	* 1%	6 9%	1 2%	* 2%	3 7%	-	11 3%	6 7%
Can/will build more council houses	16 4%	2 5%	1 4%	7 12%	-	-	3 5%	1 2%	-	1 2%	-	9 3%	6 6%



						REC	SION					GEN	IDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Able to improve existing housing stock	13 3%	1 3%	1 4%	2 3%	-	-	5 7%	1 2%	-	2 6%	-	9 3%	4 4%
More funding for social housing/affordable housing	11 3%	2 6%	-	1 2%	-	-	5 7%	-	1 4%	1 2%	-	8 3%	2 2%
Can make longer term plans	8 2%	1 3%	-	2 3%	3 13%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	6 2%	2 2%
Neighbourhood consultations/more discussion with local people	3 1%	-	1 4%	-	-	1 2%	* 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-
The risk is spread	1 *	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Has sped up the house building process	1	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Has encouraged innovation	1	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Will encourage right to buy	1	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-
More sustainable housing options	1	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	1	-
Lack of red tape encourages investment	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Other	8 2%	-	* 1%	4 7%	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	1 5%	-	-	4 1%	4 4%
Don't know/unclear about it/not sure/too soon to say	70 17%	8 20%	7 18%	12 23%	7 27%	3 6%	7 10%	11 24%	3 14%	9 22%	3 11%	50 16%	20 21%
Not Stated	208 51%	22 52%	17 45%	19 36%	11 45%	32 66%	31 44%	26 58%	15 63%	20 49%	14 58%	163 52%	45 46%



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

#### LEPs will be more effective than the Regional Development Agency (RDAs) at attracting inward investment

					AGE	_				PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 5 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	40 10%	1 5%	4 13%	4 5%	8 8%	23 13%	35 19%	-	4 8%	-	-	-	7 8%	8 17%	3 6%	3 6%	22 5 12%
Agree	(1.0)	92 22%	5 23%	7 23%	11 14%	20 20%	50 27%	61 33%	9 7%	14 25%	-	7 29%	1 18%	13 14%	16 35%	10 19%	6 14%	51 5 27%
Disagree	(-1.0)	84 21%	2 10%	6 17%	18 24%	19 19%	40 22%	23 13%	38 29%	14 24%	1 27%	5 24%	3 32%	22 23%	8 17%	14 27%	10 22%	35 35 18%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	64 16%	5 25%	8 25%	12 16%	23 24%	15 8%	8 4%	47 36%	6 10%	1 24%	1 6%	-	15 16%	4 9%	15 29%	5 11%	26 5 14%
Don't know		98 24%	8 37%	7 23%	18 23%	24 24%	41 23%	47 25%	24 18%	16 29%	3 49%	7 30%	2 18%	16 17%	5 11%	9 17%	20 45%	52 5 27%
Not Stated		32 8%	-	-	15 19%	4 4%	13 7%	12 6%	12 10%	3 5%	-	3 12%	3 31%	21 22%	6 12%	1 3%	1 2%	4 2%
AGREE		132 32%	6 28%	11 35%	14 19%	28 28%	73 40%	97 52%	9 7%	19 33%	-	7 29%	1 18%	20 21%	23 51%	13 25%	9 20%	73 39%
DISAGREE		148 36%	8 36%	14 42%	31 40%	42 43%	54 30%	31 17%	85 65%	19 34%	3 51%	7 30%	3 32%	37 39%	12 26%	29 55%	15 33%	61 32%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		14 1.45 .086	46 1.55 .429	24 1.58 .299	55 1.35 .199	43 1.47 .178	.21 1.36 .121	.72 1.23 .113	-1.32 .89 .100	06 1.36 .157	-1.48 .62 .441	12 1.18 .393	29 1.10 .632	43 1.43 .189	.43 1.36 .227	65 1.39 .228	32 1.40 .264	.07 1.45 .122



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

#### LEPs will be more effective than the Regional Development Agency (RDAs) at attracting inward investment

							REC	SION					GEN	DER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	40 10%	4 9%	6 17%	6 12%	-	4 9%	7 10%	7 16%	3 12%	1 3%	-	31 10%	9 9%
Agree	(1.0)	92 22%	17 41%	7 18%	12 23%	6 23%	11 22%	24 34%	6 14%	4 16%	6 14%	-	75 24%	17 18%
Disagree	(-1.0)	84 21%	9 21%	12 32%	6 11%	9 36%	11 23%	9 13%	13 29%	6 25%	10 24%	-	63 20%	22 22%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	64 16%	4 11%	5 14%	7 13%	10 41%	13 27%	7 10%	7 15%	7 28%	4 9%	-	45 14%	19 19%
Don't know		98 24%	6 15%	7 19%	19 35%	-	10 20%	22 32%	12 27%	3 13%	20 48%	-	68 22%	30 31%
Not Stated		32 8%	1 3%	-	3 6%	-	-	1 1%	-	1 6%	1 2%	25 100%	31 10%	1 2%
AGREE		132 32%	21 51%	13 35%	19 35%	6 23%	15 31%	31 44%	13 30%	7 28%	7 17%	-	106 34%	26 26%
DISAGREE		148 36%	13 32%	17 46%	13 24%	19 77%	24 49%	16 23%	20 43%	13 53%	14 33%	-	108 34%	40 41%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		14 1.45 .086	.21 1.32 .230	- 10 1.48 .303	.17 1.52 .278	95 1.18 .327	45 1.48 .225	.33 1.35 .180	17 1.52 .246	48 1.54 .321	44 1.28 .260	- - -	07 1.44 .097	37 1.46 .180



#### Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

## **LEPs will drive job creation in my local area** Base: All respondents

114						
					AGE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	27 7%	1 5%	4 11%	3 4%	5 5%
Agree	(1.0)	106 26%	2 11%	7 23%	16 21%	21 22%
Disagree	(-1.0)	97 24%	6 29%	5 17%	15 19%	30 31%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	34 8%	4 21%	6 19%	5 6%	10 10%
Don't know		113 27%	7 35%	9 27%	23 30%	27 28%
Not Stated		34 8%	-	1 3%	16 20%	5 5%
AGREE		133 32%	3 16%	11 34%	19 25%	26 26%
DISAGREE		131 32%	11 49%	12 36%	20 25%	40 40%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		02 1.30 .080	76 1.31 .349	14 1.55 .309	06 1.28 .202	29 1.26 .156

[				AGE					PAF	TY				CC	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
2.0)	27 7%	1 5%	4 11%	3 4%	5 5%	15 8%	24 13%	-	2 4%	-	-	-	3 3%	5 11%	3 5%	2 5%	15 8%
1.0)	106 26%	2 11%	7 23%	16 21%	21 22%	59 32%	66 35%	19 14%	13 23%	-	8 35%	-	20 22%	17 38%	13 25%	5 12%	56 30%
1.0)	97 24%	6 29%	5 17%	15 19%	30 31%	41 22%	35 19%	38 29%	15 27%	3 51%	1 6%	4 50%	22 23%	10 23%	16 30%	8 18%	44 23%
2.0)	34 8%	4 21%	6 19%	5 6%	10 10%	9 5%	8 4%	21 16%	3 6%	-	1 6%	-	11 12%	* 1%	4 8%	3 6%	16 8%
	113 27%	7 35%	9 27%	23 30%	27 28%	46 26%	42 22%	38 29%	20 35%	3 49%	9 41%	2 18%	17 18%	7 15%	14 27%	24 54%	55 29%
	34 8%	-	1 3%	16 20%	5 5%	12 7%	12 6%	14 11%	3 5%	-	3 12%	3 31%	21 22%	6 12%	3 5%	2 4%	4 2%
	133 32%	3 16%	11 34%	19 25%	26 26%	73 40%	91 48%	19 14%	15 27%	-	8 35%	-	23 24%	22 49%	16 30%	8 17%	71 38%
	131 32%	11 49%	12 36%	20 25%	40 40%	49 27%	43 23%	59 46%	19 33%	3 51%	3 12%	4 50%	33 35%	11 24%	20 39%	11 25%	60 31%
	02 1.30 .080	76 1.31 .349	- 14 1.55 .309	06 1.28 .202	29 1.26 .156	.24 1.24 .111	.48 1.23 .112	79 1.10 .135	13 1.24 .151	-1.00 - -	.36 1.17 .442	-1.00 - -	32 1.29 .174	.49 1.14 .190	17 1.27 .222	20 1.38 .287	.09 1.31 .113



#### Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

## **LEPs will drive job creation in my local area** Base: All respondents

							REC	SION					GEN	DER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	27 7%	* 1%	4 12%	7 13%	-	4 8%	4 6%	3 7%	3 10%	1 3%	-	23 7%	4 4%
Agree	(1.0)	106 26%	21 51%	11 30%	12 22%	8 32%	12 25%	21 30%	10 22%	6 23%	5 13%	-	85 27%	22 22%
Disagree	(-1.0)	97 24%	4 9%	10 26%	14 26%	8 32%	19 39%	17 24%	14 32%	5 19%	7 17%	-	76 24%	21 22%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	34 8%	4 11%	3 8%	6 12%	3 13%	5 9%	4 6%	4 8%	2 10%	2 4%	-	27 8%	7 8%
Don't know		113 27%	10 24%	9 24%	13 24%	6 23%	8 17%	22 32%	14 30%	8 33%	24 57%	-	71 23%	42 43%
Not Stated		34 8%	1 3%	-	2 3%	-	1 2%	2 3%	-	1 6%	2 4%	25 100%	32 10%	2 3%
AGREE		133 32%	22 53%	16 42%	19 35%	8 32%	16 33%	25 35%	13 30%	8 33%	7 16%	-	108 34%	25 26%
DISAGREE		131 32%	8 20%	13 34%	20 37%	11 45%	24 48%	21 30%	18 40%	7 28%	9 22%	-	102 33%	29 29%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		02 1.30 .080	.31 1.20 .228	.15 1.36 .283	01 1.44 .240	34 1.22 .385	20 1.28 .193	.07 1.25 .172	17 1.30 .214	.08 1.45 .352	18 1.29 .297	- - -	.01 1.31 .089	14 1.27 .178



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

#### LEPs provide the local vision, knowledge and strategic leadership needed to drive sustainable private sector growth in my area

					AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	21 5%	1 5%	3 10%	3 4%	4 4%	10 5%	20 10%	-	1 3%	-	-	-	3 3%	4 8%	1 3%	2 4%	12 6%
Agree	(1.0)	114 28%	2 11%	8 25%	14 18%	27 28%	62 34%	73 39%	16 13%	15 26%	1 25%	8 35%	-	22 24%	18 40%	12 22%	6 14%	57 30%
Disagree	(-1.0)	112 27%	7 34%	7 23%	26 34%	25 25%	46 25%	44 23%	40 31%	18 31%	1 27%	4 18%	4 50%	17 18%	11 24%	19 37%	12 27%	57 30%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	40 10%	2 11%	5 16%	6 8%	15 15%	11 6%	8 4%	26 20%	5 9%	-	1 6%		19 21%	2 4%	5 10%	1 2%	13 7%
Don't know		88 21%	9 40%	9 26%	13 16%	21 21%	37 21%	29 16%	32 25%	15 27%	3 49%	7 29%	2 18%	11 12%	4 9%	11 22%	22 49%	44 23%
Not Stated		37 9%	-	-	15 19%	7 7%	15 8%	13 7%	16 12%	3 5%	-	3 12%	3 31%	21 22%	7 15%	3 5%	2 4%	6 3%
AGREE		135 33%	3 15%	11 35%	17 22%	31 32%	72 40%	93 49%	16 13%	16 29%	1 25%	8 35%	-	26 27%	22 48%	13 25%	8 18%	70 37%
DISAGREE		152 37%	10 45%	13 39%	33 42%	40 41%	57 32%	52 28%	66 51%	23 40%	1 27%	5 24%	4 50%	37 39%	13 28%	25 48%	13 29%	70 37%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		13 1.28 .075	60 1.24 .344	- 13 1.46 .291	36 1.21 .168	28 1.32 .156	.10 1.22 .107	.36 1.21 .105	91 1.05 .127	25 1.21 .137	04 1.25 .881	.09 1.18 .393	-1.00 - -	43 1.39 .178	.32 1.19 .193	41 1.19 .198	18 1.20 .240	01 1.24 .103



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

#### LEPs provide the local vision, knowledge and strategic leadership needed to drive sustainable private sector growth in my area

							REC	SION					GEN	DER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	21 5%	* 1%	3 8%	5 10%	-	4 8%	5 7%	-	3 10%	1 2%	-	16 5%	5 5%
Agree	(1.0)	114 28%	18 45%	12 34%	14 26%	8 32%	16 32%	18 26%	17 37%	5 21%	6 14%	-	97 31%	16 17%
Disagree	(-1.0)	112 27%	6 14%	14 37%	13 24%	3 13%	17 35%	26 37%	18 39%	5 21%	10 25%	-	84 27%	28 28%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	40 10%	4 11%	1 4%	6 12%	10 41%	6 12%	4 5%	4 10%	3 11%	1 2%	-	28 9%	12 12%
Don't know		88 21%	8 20%	7 18%	12 23%	3 13%	5 11%	16 23%	7 15%	8 30%	21 52%	-	56 18%	31 32%
Not Stated		37 9%	3 8%	-	3 6%	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	1 6%	2 5%	25 100%	32 10%	5 5%
AGREE		135 33%	19 46%	16 42%	19 35%	8 32%	20 40%	23 33%	17 37%	8 31%	7 16%	-	113 36%	22 22%
DISAGREE		152 37%	10 25%	15 40%	19 36%	13 54%	23 47%	30 42%	22 49%	8 32%	11 27%	-	112 36%	40 41%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		13 1.28 .075	.15 1.24 .239	.08 1.22 .238	03 1.40 .233	73 1.41 .424	13 1.31 .189	10 1.23 .156	26 1.14 .173	04 1.47 .347	27 1.14 .250	- - -	05 1.26 .083	41 1.30 .164



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

LEPs are a good idea in theory by will struggle in reality to provide the same level of regional economic development that Regional Development Agency (RDAs) provided

					AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	62 15%	2 10%	5 15%	11 14%	22 23%	22 12%	18 9%	33 25%	10 18%	-	1 6%	-	18 19%	6 14%	9 17%	2 6%	29 15%
Agree	(1.0)	169 41%	5 24%	9 29%	33 43%	37 38%	84 46%	70 37%	52 40%	25 43%	4 76%	15 65%	3 35%	31 33%	22 48%	25 49%	16 36%	80 42%
Disagree	(-1.0)	68 17%	6 28%	5 15%	7 10%	11 12%	38 21%	43 23%	10 8%	12 21%	-	1 6%	1 15%	10 10%	5 11%	9 17%	6 13%	40 21%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	23 6%	1 5%	5 15%	5 7%	6 6%	7 4%	16 9%	7 5%	* 1%	-	-	-	7 7%	5 11%	2 4%	3 6%	9 5%
Don't know		56 14%	6 28%	9 27%	6 8%	16 17%	18 10%	29 16%	14 11%	7 12%	1 24%	3 11%	2 18%	8 9%	2 4%	5 10%	14 32%	29 15%
Not Stated		33 8%	1 4%	-	15 19%	5 5%	12 7%	11 6%	14 11%	3 5%	-	3 12%	3 31%	21 22%	6 12%	2 4%	3 6%	3 1%
AGREE		230 56%	7 34%	14 43%	44 57%	59 61%	106 58%	87 47%	85 65%	35 61%	4 76%	16 71%	3 35%	49 52%	28 62%	34 66%	19 42%	109 57%
DISAGREE		92 22%	7 33%	10 30%	13 17%	17 17%	45 25%	59 32%	17 13%	12 22%	-	1 6%	1 15%	16 17%	10 22%	11 21%	9 19%	49 26%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		.55 1.22 .067	.11 1.33 .356	.18 1.51 .297	.65 1.21 .158	.77 1.23 .139	.50 1.15 .093	.20 1.29 .111	.92 1.15 .125	.68 1.11 .115	1.00	.91 .65 .188	.40 1.05 .606	.66 1.30 .163	.52 1.28 .200	.67 1.14 .178	.36 1.22 .213	.51 1.21 .094



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

LEPs are a good idea in theory by will struggle in reality to provide the same level of regional economic development that Regional Development Agency (RDAs) provided

						REC	GION					GEN	DER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly (2	62 15%	8 19%	3 7%	5 10%	10 41%	12 25%	11 16%	7 16%	4 14%	1 2%	-	40 13%	22 22%
Agree (1	169 41%	21 51%	20 55%	24 44%	11 46%	19 38%	24 35%	22 48%	12 50%	15 37%	-	132 42%	37 38%
Disagree (-1	68 17%	4 9%	10 27%	14 26%	1 4%	8 16%	15 21%	8 18%	3 10%	5 13%	-	51 16%	17 17%
Disagree strongly (-2	23 6%	4 9%	3 7%	-	2 9%	5 10%	4 6%	2 5%	1 4%	3 7%	-	21 7%	2 2%
Don't know	56 14%	4 9%	1 4%	9 16%	-	4 9%	14 20%	6 13%	4 15%	14 34%		37 12%	18 19%
Not Stated	33 8%	1 3%	-	2 3%	-	* 1%	1 1%	-	1 6%	3 7%	25 100%	32 10%	1 2%
AGREE	230 56%	29 70%	23 62%	29 55%	21 87%	31 64%	36 51%	29 64%	16 65%	16 39%		171 55%	59 60%
DISAGREE	92 22%	8 18%	13 34%	14 26%	3 13%	13 26%	19 27%	10 23%	4 14%	8 20%		72 23%	19 20%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error	.55 1.22 .067	.69 1.24 .209	.29 1.18 .216	.48 1.08 .169	1.05 1.21 .335	.58 1.37 .196	.44 1.30 .160	.61 1.18 .174	.76 1.08 .231	.26 1.20 .223	- - -	.48 1.24 .078	.76 1.17 .130



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

#### LEPs will only succeed if private sector partners can be engaged more meaningfully in economic development by local government

					AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	80 19%	5 25%	7 22%	13 17%	23 23%	32 17%	42 22%	20 15%	16 28%	-	2 11%	-	21 22%	8 18%	9 18%	4 10%	35 19%
Agree	(1.0)	213 52%	10 45%	13 41%	35 45%	47 48%	108 59%	99 53%	66 50%	28 50%	4 75%	13 56%	3 35%	38 40%	25 54%	31 60%	21 48%	106 56%
Disagree	(-1.0)	27 6%	1 5%	4 11%	6 8%	6 6%	11 6%	13 7%	10 8%	3 5%	-		1 15%	6 6%	2 5%	4 7%		16 9%
Disagree strongly	(-2.0)	8 2%	-	1 3%	2 3%	3 3%	1 1%	2 1%	4 3%	-	-	1 6%	-	2 2%	-	2 4%	1 2%	2 1%
Don't know		50 12%	5 24%	7 23%	6 8%	15 15%	16 9%	19 10%	17 13%	7 12%	1 25%	4 16%	2 18%	7 7%	3 7%	4 8%	17 38%	23 12%
Not Stated		35 8%	-	-	16 20%	5 5%	14 8%	13 7%	14 10%	3 5%	-	3 12%	3 31%	21 22%	7 16%	1 3%	1 2%	6 3%
AGREE		292 71%	15 71%	20 63%	48 62%	70 71%	139 77%	141 75%	85 65%	44 78%	4 75%	15 67%	3 35%	59 62%	33 72%	40 78%	26 58%	142 75%
DISAGREE		34 8%	1 5%	5 14%	8 10%	9 9%	12 7%	15 8%	14 11%	3 5%	-	1 6%	1 15%	8 8%	2 5%	6 11%	1 2%	19 10%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		1.01 .88 .048	1.20 .78 .195	.88 1.12 .212	.90 1.01 .134	1.03 .97 .109	1.04 .75 .060	1.07 .84 .071	.87 .99 .109	1.22 .74 .076	1.00 - -	.90 .96 .289	.40 1.05 .606	1.05 .98 .121	1.10 .72 .116	.90 .97 .146	1.06 .68 .121	.97 .88 .068



Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

## LEPs will only succeed if private sector partners can be engaged more meaningfully in economic development by local government Base: All respondents

							REG	SION					GEN	DER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Agree strongly	(2.0)	80 19%	3 8%	8 22%	11 20%	8 32%	13 27%	14 20%	13 30%	6 24%	3 7%		57 18%	23 23%
Agree	(1.0)	213 52%	25 61%	25 68%	26 48%	11 45%	24 49%	41 59%	29 64%	11 43%	20 50%		168 54%	45 46%
Disagree	-1.0)	27 6%	2 4%	3 7%	6 11%	2 9%	6 13%	5 7%	2 5%	1 4%	-	-	17 5%	9 10%
Disagree strongly	-2.0)	8 2%	1 3%	-	-	2 9%	1 2%	-	-	2 10%	1 2%	-	5 2%	2 2%
Don't know		50 12%	7 16%	1 4%	10 18%	1 4%	4 9%	7 10%	* 1%	3 13%	16 39%	-	36 11%	14 14%
Not Stated		35 8%	3 8%	-	2 3%	-	-	2 4%	-	1 6%	1 2%	25 100%	30 10%	5 5%
AGREE		292 71%	28 69%	33 89%	36 68%	19 77%	38 76%	56 79%	43 94%	17 67%	23 56%		225 72%	68 69%
DISAGREE		34 8%	3 7%	3 7%	6 11%	5 18%	7 15%	5 7%	2 5%	3 14%	1 2%		23 7%	12 12%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		1.01 .88 .048	.90 .81 .148	1.08 .73 .132	.98 .90 .144	.86 1.28 .368	.95 1.04 .145	1.07 .75 .089	1.21 .68 .094	.83 1.28 .268	1.01 .68 .126	- - -	1.02 .84 .053	.97 1.01 .111



#### Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

## Summary table of mean scores Base: All respondents

				AGE	_				PAR	TY				СО	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
LEPs will be more effective than the Regional Development Agency (RDAs) at attracting inward investment	14	46	24	55	43	.21	.72	-1.32	06	-1.48	12	29	43	.43	65	32	.07
LEPs will drive job creation in my local area	02	76	14	06	29	.24	.48	79	13	-1.00	.36	-1.00	32	.49	17	20	.09
LEPs provide the local vision, knowledge and strategic leadership needed to drive sustainable private sector growth in my area	13	60	13	36	28	.10	.36	91	25	04	.09	-1.00	43	.32	41	18	01
LEPs are a good idea in theory by will struggle in reality to provide the same level of regional economic development that Regional Development Agency (RDAs) provided	.55	.11	.18	.65	.77	.50	.20	.92	.68	1.00	.91	.40	.66	.52	.67	.36	.51
LEPs will only succeed if private sector partners can be engaged more meaningfully in economic development by local government	1.01	1.20	.88	.90	1.03	1.04	1.07	.87	1.22	1.00	.90	.40	1.05	1.10	.90	1.06	.97



#### Q5 Thinking about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

## Summary table of mean scores Base: All respondents

						REG	ION					GEN	IDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
LEPs will be more effective than the Regional Development Agency (RDAs) at attracting inward investment	14	.21	10	.17	95	45	.33	17	48	44	-	07	37
LEPs will drive job creation in my local area	02	.31	.15	01	34	20	.07	17	.08	18	-	.01	14
LEPs provide the local vision, knowledge and strategic leadership needed to drive sustainable private sector growth in my area	13	.15	.08	03	73	13	10	26	04	27	-	05	41
LEPs are a good idea in theory by will struggle in reality to provide the same level of regional economic development that Regional Development Agency (RDAs) provided	.55	.69	.29	.48	1.05	.58	.44	.61	.76	.26	_	.48	.76
LEPs will only succeed if private sector partners can be engaged more meaningfully in economic development by local government	1.01	.90	1.08	.98	.86	.95	1.07	1.21	.83	1.01	-	1.02	.97



Q6 Still thinking about LEPs, which of the following, if any, are barriers to investment that need to be addressed in your local area?

Base: All respondents

				AGE					PAR	RTY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Low level of skills in the local workforce	189 46%	8 37%	15 47%	28 36%	54 55%	84 46%	83 44%	72 55%	22 38%	1 24%	7 30%	4 54%	38 40%	16 36%	34 66%	16 36%	89 47%
Lack of suitable property options	121 30%	5 22%	13 40%	22 29%	36 36%	45 25%	51 27%	40 31%	21 37%	1 25%	5 23%	3 33%	24 25%	10 21%	12 23%	15 33%	61 32%
Poor transport links	168 41%	6 27%	12 36%	29 38%	43 44%	78 43%	87 47%	37 28%	28 49%	3 51%	11 46%	3 36%	32 34%	22 49%	14 27%	8 19%	97 51%
High levels of crime	19 5%	-	1 3%	3 4%	7 8%	8 5%	9 5%	10 8%	* 1%	-	-	-	6 6%	-	2 4%	8 17%	3 1%
Low levels of education	128 31%	5 24%	9 28%	21 27%	28 29%	65 36%	63 34%	39 30%	16 28%	-	7 30%	3 36%	26 27%	13 29%	21 42%	9 19%	64 34%
Limited potential for further growth	76 19%	5 25%	2 6%	9 12%	19 20%	41 22%	25 14%	38 29%	6 11%	1 27%	4 17%	1 17%	14 15%	4 8%	14 28%	10 22%	34 18%
The presence of other similar businesses nearby	29 7%	-	1 4%	5 6%	4 4%	19 10%	15 8%	7 5%	3 6%	-	1 6%	1 18%	3 4%	7 15%	2 4%	2 4%	13 7%
The lack of other similar businesses nearby	41 10%	1 5%	1 3%	7 9%	13 13%	19 10%	13 7%	18 14%	6 11%	1 27%	-	1 18%	9 9%	3 8%	9 18%	4 9%	14 8%
Other	49 12%	6 30%	5 15%	10 12%	15 16%	13 7%	21 11%	14 11%	8 14%	-	5 24%	-	13 13%	3 6%	5 11%	5 12%	25 13%
ANY	316 77%	18 83%	27 84%	56 72%	80 81%	135 75%	143 76%	105 81%	45 79%	4 76%	13 59%	6 69%	64 68%	33 72%	42 82%	36 80%	150 79%
There are no barriers to investment in my local area	30 7%	1 4%	-	1 1%	7 7%	21 12%	16 9%	4 3%	5 9%	-	4 18%	-	4 5%	4 8%	6 11%	1 3%	16 9%
Don't know	18 4%	3 13%	4 13%	1 2%	3 3%	7 4%	10 5%	3 2%	4 7%	-	1 5%	-	4 4%	1 2%	-	6 13%	9 5%
Not Stated	47 12%	-	1 3%	19 25%	8 8%	19 10%	18 10%	18 14%	3 5%	1 24%	4 18%	3 31%	22 23%	8 18%	4 7%	2 4%	14 7%



Councillors Survey July 2012

Q6 Still thinking about LEPs, which of the following, if any, are barriers to investment that need to be addressed in your local area?

Base: All respondents

						REC	SION					GEN	IDER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total	411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Low level of skills in the local workforce	189 46%	17 42%	26 71%	26 49%	17 68%	25 51%	28 40%	21 47%	13 53%	15 35%	-	140 45%	49 50%
Lack of suitable property options	121 30%	10 25%	12 31%	18 33%	11 46%	17 34%	25 35%	13 28%	2 10%	14 35%	-	95 30%	27 27%
Poor transport links	168 41%	16 38%	19 52%	31 58%	10 41%	20 41%	33 48%	23 51%	8 33%	7 18%	-	129 41%	40 40%
High levels of crime	19 5%	2 5%	3 8%	1 2%	-	3 6%	-	2 5%	1 4%	7 16%	-	14 5%	5 5%
Low levels of education	128 31%	13 33%	16 43%	24 45%	11 46%	17 34%	19 27%	14 31%	7 26%	7 18%	-	104 33%	24 25%
Limited potential for further growth	76 19%	7 18%	5 13%	6 12%	14 55%	14 27%	6 9%	12 26%	4 17%	9 21%	-	59 19%	17 18%
The presence of other similar businesses nearby	29 7%	7 18%	3 8%	4 7%	-	7 14%	3 5%	1 2%	1 6%	2 5%	-	25 8%	3 3%
The lack of other similar businesses nearby	41 10%	2 5%	3 9%	3 6%	7 27%	7 13%	5 7%	10 22%	1 4%	3 7%	-	32 10%	8 8%
Other	49 12%	6 15%	6 15%	8 15%	2 9%	3 6%	9 13%	9 20%	1 4%	5 12%	-	37 12%	12 13%
ANY	316 77%	31 76%	33 89%	45 85%	22 91%	42 84%	54 77%	39 87%	18 72%	31 76%	-	240 77%	76 77%
There are no barriers to investment in my local area	30 7%	7 17%	1 4%	2 3%	2 9%	4 9%	5 8%	2 4%	4 18%	1 3%	-	22 7%	8 8%
Don't know	18 4%	* 1%	-	3 6%	-	1 3%	5 7%	2 3%	-	7 16%	-	9 3%	9 9%
Not Stated	47 12%	2 6%	3 7%	3 6%	-	2 4%	6 8%	2 5%	3 10%	2 4%	25 100%	42 13%	5 6%



Q6 Still thinking about LEPs, which of the following, if any, are barriers to investment that need to be addressed in your local area?

Base: Excluding "there are no barriers"

	AGE								PAF	RTY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	379		35			158	153	104	101			5	77	, ,	44	50	183
Unweighted Total		20		72 	94					4	12			43			
Weighted Total	381 100%	21 100%	32 100%	77 100%	91 100%	160 100%	171 100%	126 100%	52 100%	5 100%	19 100%	8 100%	90 100%	42 100%	46 100%	43 100%	173 100%
Low level of skills in the local workforce	189 50%	8 39%	15 47%	28 36%	54 59%	84 53%	83 48%	72 57%	22 42%	1 24%	7 37%	4 54%	38 42%	16 39%	34 74%	16 37%	89 51%
Lack of suitable property options	121 32%	5 23%	13 40%	22 29%	36 39%	45 28%	51 30%	40 32%	21 41%	1 25%	5 28%	3 33%	24 26%	10 23%	12 26%	15 34%	61 35%
Poor transport links	168 44%	6 29%	12 36%	29 38%	43 47%	78 49%	87 51%	37 29%	28 53%	3 51%	11 56%	3 36%	32 35%	22 54%	14 30%	8 19%	97 56%
High levels of crime	19 5%	-	1 3%	3 4%	7 8%	8 5%	9 5%	10 8%	* 1%	-	-	-	6 6%	-	2 5%	8 18%	3 1%
Low levels of education	128 34%	5 25%	9 28%	21 27%	28 31%	65 40%	63 37%	39 31%	16 31%	-	7 37%	3 36%	26 29%	13 32%	21 47%	9 20%	64 37%
Limited potential for further growth	76 20%	5 26%	2 6%	9 12%	19 21%	41 25%	25 15%	38 30%	6 12%	1 27%	4 21%	1 17%	14 15%	4 9%	14 31%	10 23%	34 20%
The presence of other similar businesses nearby	29 8%	-	1 4%	5 6%	4 4%	19 12%	15 9%	7 6%	3 7%	-	1 7%	1 18%	3 4%	7 16%	2 4%	2 4%	13 8%
The lack of other similar businesses nearby	41 11%	1 5%	1 3%	7 9%	13 14%	19 12%	13 8%	18 14%	6 12%	1 27%	-	1 18%	9 10%	3 8%	9 20%	4 9%	14 8%
Other	49 13%	6 31%	5 15%	10 13%	15 17%	13 8%	21 12%	14 11%	8 16%	-	5 29%	-	13 14%	3 7%	5 12%	5 12%	25 14%
ANY	316 83%	18 86%	27 84%	56 73%	80 87%	135 84%	143 83%	105 83%	45 87%	4 76%	13 71%	6 69%	64 71%	33 78%	42 92%	36 82%	150 87%
Don't know	18 5%	3 14%	4 13%	1 2%	3 4%	7 4%	10 6%	3 2%	4 7%	-	1 6%	-	4 4%	1 2%	-	6 13%	9 5%
Not Stated	47 12%	-	1 3%	19 25%	8 9%	19 12%	18 11%	18 14%	3 6%	1 24%	4 22%	3 31%	22 24%	8 19%	4 8%	2 4%	14 8%



Q6 Still thinking about LEPs, which of the following, if any, are barriers to investment that need to be addressed in your local area?

Base: Excluding "there are no barriers"

						REC	GION					GEN	DER
	Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total	379	33	30	48	12	50	76	51	23	46	10	285	94
Weighted Total	381 100%	34 100%	36 100%	52 100%	22 100%	45 100%	64 100%	43 100%	20 100%	40 100%	25 100%	291 100%	90 100%
Low level of skills in the local workforce	189 50%	17 51%	26 74%	26 51%	17 75%	25 56%	28 44%	21 49%	13 64%	15 37%	-	140 48%	49 54%
Lack of suitable property options	121 32%	10 30%	12 33%	18 34%	11 50%	17 37%	25 38%	13 30%	2 12%	14 36%	-	95 32%	27 30%
Poor transport links	168 44%	16 46%	19 54%	31 60%	10 45%	20 45%	33 52%	23 54%	8 40%	7 18%	-	129 44%	40 44%
High levels of crime	19 5%	2 7%	3 9%	1 3%	-	3 7%	-	2 5%	1 5%	7 16%	-	14 5%	5 6%
Low levels of education	128 34%	13 39%	16 45%	24 46%	11 50%	17 38%	19 29%	14 32%	7 32%	7 19%	-	104 36%	24 27%
Limited potential for further growth	76 20%	7 21%	5 14%	6 12%	14 61%	14 30%	6 10%	12 27%	4 21%	9 22%	-	59 20%	17 19%
The presence of other similar businesses nearby	29 8%	7 22%	3 8%	4 7%	-	7 16%	3 5%	1 2%	1 7%	2 5%	-	25 9%	3 4%
The lack of other similar businesses nearby	41 11%	2 7%	3 9%	3 6%	7 30%	7 15%	5 8%	10 23%	1 5%	3 7%	-	32 11%	8 9%
Other	49 13%	6 19%	6 16%	8 15%	2 10%	3 7%	9 14%	9 20%	1 5%	5 12%	-	37 13%	12 14%
ANY	316 83%	31 92%	33 93%	45 88%	22 100%	42 92%	54 83%	39 91%	18 87%	31 79%	-	240 82%	76 84%
Don't know	18 5%	* 1%	-	3 6%	-	1 3%	5 8%	2 4%	-	7 17%	-	9 3%	9 10%
Not Stated	47 12%	2 7%	3 7%	3 6%	-	2 5%	6 9%	2 5%	3 13%	2 5%	25 100%	42 14%	5 6%



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

## The way your local authority works Base: All respondents

·											_						
				AGE					PAR	TY				CO	DUNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Very positive (2.0)	30 7%	2 11%	4 11%	6 8%	7 7%	12 6%	24 13%	1 1%	3 6%	-	1 6%	-	2 2%	4 10%	3 7%	4 8%	15 8%
Fairly positive (1.0)	182 44%	8 35%	16 49%	33 42%	38 39%	88 49%	107 57%	32 25%	28 49%	1 25%	12 53%	1 17%	40 43%	19 43%	19 36%	19 43%	92 49%
Fairly negative (-1.0)	109 26%	6 26%	6 19%	16 21%	29 30%	52 28%	29 15%	60 46%	14 25%	1 27%	4 17%	-	27 29%	15 33%	17 33%	11 25%	43 22%
Very negative (-2.0)	27 7%	2 9%	1 3%	13 16%	5 5%	7 4%	4 2%	15 12%	1 2%	-	4 18%	3 33%	9 10%	2 5%	2 4%	3 6%	12 6%
Don't know	61 15%	4 19%	6 18%	11 14%	18 18%	23 13%	23 12%	21 16%	9 16%	3 49%	1 6%	4 50%	14 15%	4 9%	10 20%	8 18%	27 14%
Not Stated	2 1%	-	-	-	2 2%	*	-	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	* 1%	* 1%	-	*
POSITIVE	212 52%	10 46%	19 60%	38 49%	44 45%	100 55%	131 70%	33 25%	31 55%	1 25%	13 59%	1 17%	42 45%	24 52%	22 43%	23 51%	108 57%
NEGATIVE	136 33%	8 35%	7 22%	29 37%	34 35%	58 32%	33 17%	75 58%	15 27%	1 27%	8 36%	3 33%	37 39%	17 38%	19 37%	14 31%	54 29%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error	.23 1.20 .064	.15 1.35 .328	.56 1.11 .206	.04 1.36 .170	.16 1.19 .133	.29 1.13 .089	.72 1.00 .082	52 1.09 .116	.39 1.07 .111	04 1.25 .881	.11 1.36 .363	95 1.64 .946	02 1.20 .141	.21 1.22 .193	.10 1.20 .190	.26 1.22 .187	.35 1.18 .090
'																	



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

## The way your local authority works Base: All respondents

							REC	SION					GEN	DER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Very positive	(2.0)	30 7%	4 9%	6 16%	5 9%	-	5 10%	4 6%	2 3%	3 10%	3 6%	-	24 8%	6 6%
Fairly positive	(1.0)	182 44%	18 43%	13 35%	30 57%	7 27%	21 43%	35 50%	24 52%	12 48%	18 43%	5 21%	145 46%	37 38%
Fairly negative	(-1.0)	109 26%	14 34%	8 23%	8 15%	10 41%	14 28%	15 21%	15 32%	5 19%	10 24%	10 41%	82 26%	27 27%
Very negative	(-2.0)	27 7%	2 6%	4 12%	* 1%	5 18%	4 9%	3 4%	3 7%	2 10%	3 7%	-	17 6%	10 10%
Don't know		61 15%	3 8%	6 15%	8 15%	3 13%	5 11%	13 19%	2 5%	3 11%	8 19%	9 38%	43 14%	18 19%
Not Stated		2 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	* 2%	-	-	2 1%	*
POSITIVE		212 52%	21 52%	19 50%	35 66%	7 27%	26 53%	39 56%	25 56%	14 58%	20 50%	5 21%	169 54%	43 44%
NEGATIVE		136 33%	16 40%	13 34%	9 16%	15 59%	18 36%	18 25%	18 40%	7 29%	13 31%	10 41%	99 32%	36 37%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		.23 1.20 .064	.16 1.22 .207	.24 1.40 .275	.71 .94 .147	58 1.17 .352	.20 1.27 .182	.40 1.10 .134	.13 1.16 .162	.34 1.29 .262	.22 1.22 .195	34 .97 .398	.29 1.18 .072	.03 1.26 .138



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

#### Your local authority's ability to attract investment for development and job creation

				AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
Very positive (2.0)	31 8%	3 13%	5 15%	4 5%	9 9%	11 6%	26 14%	2 2%	3 5%	-	-	-	3 3%	5 12%	3 6%	3 7%	17 9%
Fairly positive (1.0)	140 34%	6 28%	11 33%	25 33%	23 24%	75 41%	89 48%	19 14%	18 31%	1 25%	13 58%	-	24 25%	21 47%	16 31%	12 27%	72 38%
Fairly negative (-1.0)	109 27%	6 30%	5 16%	17 22%	35 35%	46 25%	25 13%	64 49%	15 27%	-	-	4 54%	34 36%	9 19%	11 22%	13 29%	45 24%
Very negative (-2.0)	21 5%	-	-	9 11%	6 6%	6 3%	5 3%	13 10%	* 1%	-	1 6%	1 15%	9 10%	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	7 4%
Don't know	107 26%	6 29%	12 36%	22 28%	24 24%	43 24%	42 22%	31 24%	20 34%	4 75%	8 36%	3 31%	23 24%	8 17%	19 36%	16 35%	47 25%
Not Stated	2 1%	-	-	-	2 2%	*	-	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	* 1%	* 1%	-	*
POSITIVE	171 42%	9 41%	16 48%	29 38%	32 32%	85 47%	115 62%	21 16%	20 36%	1 25%	13 58%	-	27 28%	27 59%	19 37%	15 34%	89 47%
NEGATIVE	130 32%	6 30%	5 16%	26 34%	41 42%	52 29%	30 16%	77 59%	16 28%	-	1 6%	6 69%	43 46%	11 23%	13 26%	14 31%	52 27%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error	.17 1.22 .071	.33 1.24 .319	.75 1.10 .234	02 1.31 .180	09 1.27 .151	.28 1.14 .097	.73 1.05 .092	68 1.00 .113	.19 1.13 .131	1.00	.70 .94 .312	-1.22 .46 .228	32 1.20 .153	.53 1.16 .191	.19 1.22 .212	.13 1.21 .207	.34 1.19 .098



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

#### Your local authority's ability to attract investment for development and job creation

							REC	SION					GEN	IDER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Very positive	(2.0)	31 8%	6 14%	7 19%	4 8%	-	3 7%	4 6%	1 2%	3 12%	2 5%	-	25 8%	6 6%
Fairly positive	(1.0)	140 34%	18 43%	9 24%	22 41%	2 10%	18 36%	31 44%	16 34%	9 35%	9 21%	8 31%	113 36%	28 28%
Fairly negative	(-1.0)	109 27%	12 29%	10 26%	10 19%	11 45%	13 26%	14 20%	15 33%	4 17%	13 31%	8 31%	83 26%	26 27%
Very negative	(-2.0)	21 5%	-	3 8%	* 1%	5 18%	7 15%	2 3%	2 5%	1 4%	1 2%	-	15 5%	6 6%
Don't know		107 26%	6 14%	9 23%	15 27%	7 27%	8 16%	19 27%	12 26%	7 29%	16 40%	9 38%	76 24%	31 32%
Not Stated		2 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	* 2%	-	-	2 1%	*
POSITIVE		171 42%	23 57%	16 43%	26 49%	2 10%	21 43%	35 50%	17 37%	12 47%	11 27%	8 31%	137 44%	34 35%
NEGATIVE		130 32%	12 29%	13 34%	11 20%	16 63%	20 41%	16 23%	17 37%	5 21%	14 33%	8 31%	98 31%	32 33%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		.17 1.22 .071	.50 1.13 .197	.27 1.43 .291	.53 1.07 .186	98 .91 .303	07 1.35 .197	.41 1.10 .143	04 1.15 .187	.49 1.26 .281	05 1.19 .222	.01 1.03 .422	.21 1.21 .080	.03 1.26 .152



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

#### The amount of bureaucracy your local authority has to deal with

					AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
		Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
Unweighted Total		411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
Weighted Total		411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 5 100%
Very positive	(2.0)	22 5%	2 8%	6 18%	2 3%	7 7%	6 3%	19 10%	1 1%	2 4%	-	-	-	1 2%	2 5%	2 5%	3 6%	13 5 7%
Fairly positive	(1.0)	90 22%	6 29%	11 34%	20 25%	11 11%	43 23%	58 31%	10 8%	16 29%	1 25%	3 12%	1 18%	19 20%	14 30%	13 25%	9 20%	41 22%
Fairly negative	(-1.0)	147 36%	5 25%	7 21%	22 28%	45 46%	68 37%	52 28%	65 50%	18 32%	1 27%	9 40%	1 17%	30 32%	8 18%	18 35%	19 43%	73 39%
Very negative	(-2.0)	65 16%	5 25%	2 7%	16 21%	16 16%	25 14%	18 10%	35 27%	6 10%	-	4 17%	3 33%	20 21%	12 27%	7 13%	7 15%	23 5 12%
Don't know		80 20%	3 13%	6 20%	17 22%	17 17%	37 21%	39 21%	16 13%	13 22%	3 49%	7 31%	3 31%	23 24%	8 17%	11 22%	7 16%	36 5 19%
Not Stated		6 1%	-	-	1 1%	2 2%	3 2%	1 1%	4 3%	1 3%	-	-	-	1 1%	2 3%	* 1%	-	3 2%
POSITIVE		112 27%	8 38%	17 52%	22 28%	18 18%	48 27%	77 41%	11 8%	19 33%	1 25%	3 12%	1 18%	20 22%	16 35%	15 30%	12 26%	54 5 29%
NEGATIVE		212 52%	11 49%	9 29%	38 49%	61 63%	93 51%	70 37%	99 76%	24 42%	1 27%	13 58%	4 51%	50 53%	21 45%	25 48%	26 58%	96 51%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		44 1.27 .070	32 1.46 .345	.42 1.36 .257	52 1.30 .170	66 1.21 .136	45 1.21 .101	.06 1.33 .114	-1.11 .87 .092	21 1.25 .134	04 1.25 .881	91 .99 .314	97 1.36 .678	68 1.21 .153	40 1.45 .242	34 1.26 .205	49 1.24 .187	34 1.27 .101



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

#### The amount of bureaucracy your local authority has to deal with

							REC	SION					GEN	IDER
		Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
Unweighted Total		411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
Weighted Total		411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
Very positive	(2.0)	22 5%	2 6%	3 8%	6 11%	-	2 5%	3 4%	3 7%	-	3 6%	-	20 6%	2 2%
Fairly positive	(1.0)	90 22%	10 23%	7 20%	16 30%	1 4%	13 26%	17 25%	8 18%	8 33%	7 18%	3 10%	74 24%	16 16%
Fairly negative	(-1.0)	147 36%	20 48%	16 42%	13 25%	12 51%	15 30%	23 33%	21 46%	6 23%	17 40%	5 21%	108 34%	39 40%
Very negative	(-2.0)	65 16%	5 11%	7 19%	7 13%	7 27%	11 23%	6 9%	5 12%	5 20%	7 16%	5 21%	48 15%	17 18%
Don't know		80 20%	5 13%	4 11%	10 18%	4 18%	7 14%	19 28%	6 12%	5 22%	8 19%	12 48%	57 18%	23 23%
Not Stated		6 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	1 2%	* 1%	2 5%	* 2%	-	-	6 2%	*
POSITIVE		112 27%	12 29%	10 28%	22 41%	1 4%	15 31%	20 29%	11 25%	8 33%	10 25%	3 10%	94 30%	18 19%
NEGATIVE		212 52%	24 59%	23 61%	20 38%	19 78%	26 53%	30 43%	26 58%	11 44%	23 56%	10 41%	156 50%	56 57%
Mean Score Std Deviation Std Error		44 1.27 .070	40 1.20 .203	49 1.32 .249	.01 1.40 .227	-1.23 .72 .227	48 1.35 .198	26 1.24 .159	45 1.23 .186	41 1.31 .286	51 1.27 .204	-1.01 1.14 .510	36 1.30 .082	72 1.13 .129



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

## Summary table of mean scores Base: All respondents

	Total	18-34	35-44	
Unweighted Total	411	21	35	
Weighted Total	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	
The way your local authority works	.23	.15	.56	
Your local authority's ability to attract investment for development and job creation	.17	.33	.75	
The amount of bureaucracy your local authority has to deal with	44	32	.42	

				AGE					PAR	TY				CO	UNCIL TY	PE	
	Total	18-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Con	Lab	Lib	Green	Ind	Other	Unitary	County	Metro politan	London	District
	411	21	35	73	100	182	168	107	112	4	15	5	82	47	50	52	200
	411 100%	21 100%	32 100%	78 100%	98 100%	181 100%	187 100%	130 100%	57 100%	5 100%	23 100%	8 100%	94 100%	46 100%	52 100%	44 100%	189 100%
	.23	.15	.56	.04	.16	.29	.72	52	.39	04	.11	95	02	.21	.10	.26	.35
	.17	.33	.75	02	09	.28	.73	68	.19	1.00	.70	-1.22	32	.53	.19	.13	.34
to	44	32	.42	52	66	45	.06	-1.11	21	04	91	97	68	40	34	49	34



Q7 Generally, do you think that the Localism Act is going to have a positive or negative influence on your local authority regarding each of the following:

## Summary table of mean scores Base: All respondents

Unweighted Total	
Weighted Total	
The way your local authority works	
Your local authority's ability to attract investment for development and job creation	
The amount of bureaucracy your local authority has to deal with	

	REGION										GENDER	
Total	East Mid lands	West Mid lands	East Eng land	North East	North West	South East	South West	Yorks and Humb	London	Wales	Male	Female
411	39	31	50	13	56	83	53	28	48	10	308	103
411 100%	41 100%	37 100%	53 100%	25 100%	49 100%	70 100%	45 100%	25 100%	41 100%	25 100%	313 100%	98 100%
.23	.16	.24	.71	58	.20	.40	.13	.34	.22	34	.29	.03
.17	.50	.27	.53	98	07	.41	04	.49	05	.01	.21	.03
44	40	49	.01	-1.23	48	26	45	41	51	-1.01	36	72

