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Executive Summary

Key findings – quantitative analysis

2280 responses were received to this consultation.

Respondents responded favourably to both propositions that Children’s Centres should meet the needs of a wider age range (Q1) and that they should focus on those that need them the most (Q2). Respondents were overall more supportive of the first, with 72.6% supporting or strongly supporting Q1 and 50.9% supporting or strongly supporting Q2.
75.1% of respondents think that having health services in the same place as Child and Family services is ‘very important’ or ‘good to have’, compared to 25.1% thinking it was ‘not important’ or unsure.

More respondents support (45.7%) than do not support (36.3%) our offer (Q4). However, 18% of respondents were unsure.

Overall, young parents are more supportive than the average respondent for all questions posed.

Parents whose children were all over 5 were more supportive of questions 1-4 than parents who had children under 5. For questions relating to specific districts, they were slightly less supportive in South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland. For the rest they were about as supportive.

Parents with children with disability or illness were generally as supportive of questions 1-4 as the average respondent. For questions relating to specific districts they were less supportive than the average respondent.

Key themes in comments – Children’s Centres meeting the needs of a wider age range:

1. There were comments which **supported** the idea of offering services to meet the needs of a wide range of children, feeling it would be beneficial to the family as a whole.
2. There were also comments which **did not support** this idea, with concerns about reduction in the current quality of the service and losing focus on providing early intervention for young children and families.
3. Respondents made comments related to the **resources required** to meet the needs of a wider age range of children.
4. Respondents suggested that **different skills** would be needed to support both younger and older children.
5. Respondents were **positive about the services** from children’s centres.
6. Respondents commented that they felt children’s centres should be a **universal service**.

Key themes in comments – Focus services on families that need them most

7. Respondents commented that children’s centres should be a **universal service**.
8. There were also respondents who felt they would not be categorised as being ‘in need’ but had **greatly appreciated the support** they had received whilst they had young children.
9. Respondents valued the **social contact and contribution to the local community** made by the children’s centres.
10. Respondents felt that all parents have needs, particularly in relation to **mental health** for new mothers.
11. Comments placed a high value on preventative early help. Some commented that parents with low need would not be supported and therefore their needs could become worse requiring more intensive services.

12. Respondents requested more information on the definition of need and commented that this definition is important to ensure the identification and assessment process is robust.

13. There were respondents who strongly supported the idea of focusing on those in need, feeling services are insufficiently targeting those with need at the moment.

14. There were respondents who felt there was not enough information provided to make the proposals clear.

15. Respondents commented that travel would be difficult with the longer distances involved and the difficulty of using public transport.

Key themes in comments – Importance of health services in the same place as Child and Family services.

16. Respondents commented that they would find it easier to access or approach health and children’s services if they were delivered in the same place.

17. Respondents felt that a familiar environment for both health and child and family services would be helpful, especially to those with special education needs.

18. There was also disagreement with the proposal, feeling it might be useful but not necessary.

19. There were respondents who expressed concerns about the mixed use of space for health and children’s services, commenting that it would be inappropriate in some cases. Respondents commented that they would prefer to go to their GP to discuss health problems, with some commenting that a ‘medical’ environment was not a relaxing space for play and social activities.

20. People felt that accessibility of services was more important than co-location.

21. People commented that this was already in place at their children’s centre, which they tended to regard positively.

Key themes in comments – Support for maintaining some existing Children’s Centres, delivering services in shared community spaces, outreach programmes and a greater online offer.

22. There were respondents who commented that they do not support the closure of any children’s centres.

23. People felt there was already a substantial amount of information available online. There were people who supported the development of the online offer if it improved what is already available and made it more comprehensive.

24. People felt that the online offer would not adequately replace face to face contact. They valued the support from the professionals and local community that their children’s centres gave them. There were concerns that not everyone has access to the internet.
25. People commented that they supported the shared use of spaces for delivering services, suggesting it can be a more effective use of resources and a way of maintaining services. Some people felt that shared spaces may not be appropriate and would need careful planning to ensure users were safe and comfortable.

26. People commented that face to face contact was very important to prevent isolation and resultant mental health issues.

27. There were concerns about travel requirements resulting in some people becoming isolated due to the difficulties involved with travel.

28. People commented that it was important to have local wrap around child care.

29. People commented on particular locations where they wanted service to be maintained. These included Caldecote, Romsey Mill, Homerton, Histon, Gamlingay, Abbey ward in Cambridge, Murrow, Linton, Fawcett, Sutton, Somersham, Cherry Hinton, the southern part of Cambridge, Bottisham, Wisbech and Whittlesey. There were respondents who were concerned about the potential redesignation of services in South Cambridgeshire.

30. There were respondents who suggested they would be willing to make a larger contribution to services.

Key themes in comments across all district questions

31. There were respondents who questioned whether libraries are an appropriate space for children’s centres.

32. There were people who expressed concerns about the longer term risks for children of the proposal in terms of safeguarding, development and impact on other services.

33. There were people who commented that they wished to see more funding for Early Intervention services.

34. There were respondents who disagreed with the proposals redesignating centres or reducing funding. Respondents were concerned about maintaining the quality of service whilst reducing funding by £1 million.

35. People were concerned about the accessibility and suitability of venues, especially for people with limited mobility.

36. People were concerned whether future growth had been taken into account.

37. There were people who made reference to the increase in councillor allowances.

Key themes in comments – Further thoughts and comments

38. Across all questions people wanted to tell us that they value the current services from their Children’s Centre.

39. People voiced concern about budget reductions. There were people who said there should be no cuts in budget.

40. There were comments on a general disagreement with the proposals.

41. Across all questions, people asked for further information about the proposals.

42. Across all of the questions, people were concerned about the wording of the survey. There were also people questioning the consultation method.
43. There were people who voiced concern about closing centres. There were also people who did not want to see a reduction in services.

44. Respondents were concerned about transport to services going forward.

45. Respondents questioned whether the consultation would have an impact on proposals.

46. Comments supporting delivery in particular areas or centres, highlighted in the district questions.
Introduction

Background

Cambridgeshire’s first Children’s Centre opened in 2005 with the aim of helping families in more deprived areas to give their children the best start in life. There has been significant growth and change in the level of provision over the past 12 years.

At the present time there are 38 designated Children’s Centres across the County delivered by a combination of the County Council, schools and voluntary organisations. The contracts for externally delivered Children’s Centres conclude in April 2018 and the County Council is looking at how to ensure that the money spent has the greatest positive impact on young children’s development before re-tendering contracts.

The County Council published proposals (which are set out in outline below) and opened a public consultation, which ran from 17 July to 22 September 2017. This report sets out the results of the survey element of the consultation.

The proposals

The proposals are described in broad outline below. This description is taken from the front page of the survey on the County Council’s website. A full consultation document was also available.

We will offer services in the following 4 ways:

1. Child and Family Centres

We will create 10 Child and Family Centres at the heart of our communities, for families with children of all ages. These are proposed to be in our areas of highest need and population and designed to meet the following eight Family Friendly Criteria.

   1. Flexible access across the day week and year
   2. Activity Rooms
   3. Confidential Spaces
   4. Staffed reception
   5. Maximised Use
   6. Safe and Secure
   7. Accessible for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
   8. Work space for staff and partners

2. Child and Family Zones
We will continue to deliver a range of activities and interventions from other locations. We propose up to 12 Child and Family zones. These will be places where services will be delivered either from some of our existing centres or other suitable buildings such as community centres, libraries, health centres etc.

3. Outreach Programme

We know that in a county with a significant rural population it is essential that we have a flexible and responsive outreach service offer. These will include weekly sessions in community venues, a scheduled programme of courses including parenting programmes delivered across the district, and responsive support to meet local needs as they arise.

4. Online Offer

We know that lots of families want to be able to help themselves and simply need support in knowing what is available and where. We will develop a comprehensive online offer, providing information and advice that guides and supports families in accessing good quality help in and across their area.

We will look to change the use or re-designate some of the remaining children’s centre buildings, to provide additional early years provision.

Increases in free early education for vulnerable two, three and four year olds means that the Council needs to look at how to create more childcare place provision as part of its early years strategy. There is an opportunity to consider this alongside delivery of children’s services.

Some Children’s Centre services in your community may no longer be delivered from the same buildings that they currently are, especially if you live in less deprived areas. However you will have access to a range of Centres in other locations and other Government funded programmes such as free childcare, health services, and outreach services will be available to individual families in greatest need.

A network of 10 Child and Family Centres will be created over 15 sites across the 5 districts of Cambridgeshire. These will cover the highest areas of need and population while also covering 8 criteria: be flexible across the day, week and year in order for services to operate in the evenings, weekends and summer holidays; contain activity rooms, with appropriate equipment for all ages and abilities; have confidential spaces, suitable for family or safeguarding meetings and health consultations; have a staffed reception; have maximised use; be safe and secure; be SEND accessible; and contain work space for Cambridgeshire County Council and partner organisations to make use of, with secure Wifi.

These Child and Family Centres will be supported by 12 Child and Family Zones. Although they will vary in scale that will meet the majority of the 8 criteria of the Child and Family Centres. These will be located in buildings with shared space, across the districts. In order to
ensure access for all families, particularly with consideration to those in rural locations there will also be an Outreach Programme. This will include weekly sessions in community venues, parenting programmes and responsive support to meet local needs that arise. Further to this an Online Offer will be developed, giving families the ability to help themselves should they choose by giving access to good quality help, information and advice.

Design and Delivery

The consultation questions that were put to the public were designed with input from the County Council’s Research Team (who support the whole organisation with consultation and survey work). The team provided quality assurance on the process and looked to ensure that the consultation complied with the agreed County Council Consultation Strategy. This included recognising key points within the organisation’s commitment to consult on important issues;

• Engaging people by giving them an opportunity to voice their opinions at a formative stage.

• Making sure that all consultation information includes a simple to understand summary and an explanation of any local implications. Giving people enough information to ensure that they can give an intelligent response.

• Providing adequate time for consideration and response; being clear as to the democratic process so that people are aware when key decisions will be taken

• The product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals. Normally this means a report on the findings of consultation needs to be considered by the recognised committee or project board.

Publicising the consultation and the proposed changes to Children’s Centres was led by the County Council’s Communication Team who managed the use of social media as well as traditional channels of communication such as newspapers and broadcast media. The Children’s Centre services themselves also played a significant role in ensuring that all stakeholders (people with an interest in the services) received the consultation material.

The consultation questions themselves were designed to be as neutral and clear to understand as possible, and were structured to enable people to comment on all the key areas of decision making. Helping people to understand and comment on both the County Council’s strategy and the local implications of this.

There was a focus on grid questions with the option for respondents to enter comments on the majority of questions. Questions 6 to 10 related to local (district level) implications so respondents had the option to skip over areas / places that weren’t relevant to them.
The main tool for gathering comments was an on-line survey although it was recognised that online engagement, whilst in theory available to all residents, could potentially exclude those without easy access to the internet. As a result, paper copies of the questions were also available at Children’s Centres and Libraries. Children’s Centre staff were available throughout the consultation to support families to understand and respond to the survey, and inputted the paper responses onto the online survey once they were submitted. Other forms of response e.g. detailed written submissions were also received and have been incorporated into the analysis of the feedback.
In total, 2,280 residents responded to the online consultation. The consultation was available to all residents of Cambridgeshire – a population of 652,110.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>% of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other definition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who have no children</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who have children</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who currently use a children’s centre</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who have disability or illness</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who are young parents\(^2\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who have children aged(^3):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with disability or illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of children under 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Source: Cambridgeshire Research Group 2016 population estimates

\(^2\) In this report young parents have at least one child and are under 25 years old

\(^3\) These categories are not mutually exclusive. Respondents can be counted more than once if they have more than one child or fit into multiple categories.

Parents with no children under 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents by ethnicity group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (all categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (all categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (all categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller/Gypsy/Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following map breaks down the rate of response by district and ward:
87% of respondents indicated they had children, and 73% of respondents currently use Children’s Centres. The following chart breaks down the age ranges of these children. Please note that these are not exclusive categories, one respondent can have multiple children across several age ranges.
Of the respondents who indicated they had children, 23% had no children under the age of 5. 6% of those with children are considered young parents for the purposes of this report. Young parents are those who are aged under 25 years old.

7% of respondents in this consultation had children with disability or illness, and 6% had disability or illness themselves. The proportion of children with disability or illness is slightly higher in the respondent profile than in the population.

- Only around 2% of children in the population under the age of 5 have Early Support involvement
- According to the 2017 School Census (which only relates to children aged over 5) only 3.1% of children have a Statement of Special Educational Need or an Education, Health and Care Plan
- According to 2011 Census data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) the percentage of people with long-term health problems in Cambridgeshire is 3.5% for those aged 0-15 years old

According to the 2011 Census, Cambridgeshire's ethnicity profile consists of 84% White British, 8% White Other, 4% Asian, 2% Mixed, 1% Black, less than 1% Traveller/Gypsy/Roma and 1% any other. In this consultation the majority of respondents were White British, 80%, followed by White (other), 10%. 3% of respondents were Asian, 2% mixed, 1% ‘any other’, with Black and Traveller/Gypsy/Roma making up less than 1% of respondents. 4% preferred not to say.
Figure 3: Percentage of Respondents by Ethnicity
Question 1 asked respondents whether they supported the Children’s Centres meeting the needs of a wider age range, from expectant parents to young adults. 2265 respondents answered this question. 72.6% of respondents supported this statement while 16.9% did not. The remaining 10.4% were unsure.

**Figure 4: Percentage of Respondents Support For Question 1**

A majority of people supported the statement across all district areas. The following chart breaks down the responses by area:

**Figure 5: Percentage of Respondent Support for Question 1 by Area**
74.3% of respondents with children under 5 were supportive of this statement, with respondents with all children over 5 similarly supportive at 74.5%. Respondents with children with disability or illness with slightly more supportive at 76.5%. The following chart breaks down these responses:

**Figure 6: Percentage of Support for Question 1 From Respondents With Children**

Young parents were slightly more supportive of this statement, at 75.3%. They were also slightly less unsupportive, at 15.7%, and unsure at 9%. Those with disability or illness themselves were slightly less supportive, with 68.8% supporting this statement and 19.1% not supporting it. They were also slightly more unsure at 12.1%. Those with no children were the least supportive, with 60.9% supporting the statement and 26.4% not supporting it. They were also the most unsure at 12.7%.

**Comment analysis**

In total 625 comments were received in relation to this question.

- Respondents supported the idea of offering services to meet the needs of a wide age range of children, young people and expectant parents. A few responses described how their local centre already does this. People felt that extending the age range would be beneficial to the family as a whole, that parents may need support whatever age a child is, and it would be helpful for parents with an older and a younger child if both children could visit the same centre.

- There were respondents who also did not support the idea of extending the age range. Many people making this comment felt that children’s centres should stay as they are, and be focused on the needs of young children. People were concerned that to expand the age range would mean the focus on providing early intervention for young children and families would be lost, and reduce the quality of the existing
service. Some people felt that the needs of teenagers and young children were so different that it would not be appropriate to mix them.

- Comments discussed the resources required to extend the age range. People were strongly supportive of the idea of extending the age range in principle, but concerned that doing so would mean that resources for younger children would reduce and this would reduce the services available. There were people who felt that in the context of the reduction in budget, it would be impossible to meet the needs of a wider age range.

- Responses suggested staff would need different skills to support older and younger children, and that the buildings and spaces which children and young people from different age ranges would need to be designed carefully in order to be appropriate for both groups. Others suggested that schools or youth camps might do a better job of supporting young people of school-age.

- Responses asked for more information about the proposals, commenting that understanding the detail about the services that would be offered for older children is important in terms of deciding whether they support it or not.

- Comments referred to Children’s Centres or services in specific locations, including Romsey Mill, Homerton and Fawcett in Cambridge, Caldecote, Linton, St Ives, St Neots and Ely. Some of these centres were described as already running services for a wide age range.

- People responded with positive comments about services, describing their experiences using children’s centres as ‘a lifeline’, saying it ‘really helped’ them and they find them ‘invaluable’. There were also respondents who felt that the question was unfair.

- There were respondents who commented that they felt children’s centres should be a universal service.

**Question 2: To what degree do you support the proposal to focus services on those families that need them most?**

Question 2 asked respondents how supportive they were of the proposal to focus services on those families that would need them the most. 2256 respondents answered this question. 50.9% of respondents supported this statement while 29.9% did not. The remaining 19.1% were unsure.

**Figure 7: Percentage of Respondents Support For Question 2**
There was a majority supporting this statement in Fenland, Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire. The following chart breaks down the responses by area:

**Figure 8: Percentage of Respondent Support for Question 2 by Area**
Respondents with children under 5 were 49.1% supportive of this statement, while 30.4% did not. Respondents with all children over 5 were more supportive at 56.7%, with 26.7% answering as not supportive. Respondents with children with disability or illness were 49.7% supportive, with slightly more being unsupportive at 33.3%. The following chart breaks down these responses:

**Figure 9: Percentage of Support for Question 2 From Respondents With Children**

Young parents were more supportive of this statement, at 57.4%, and only 22.4% responding as unsupportive. They were slightly more unsure at 20.1%. Those with disability or illness themselves were the least supportive, with 44.7% supporting this statement and 32.6% not supporting it. They were also slightly more unsure at 22.7%. Those with no children were 51.5% supportive, with 32.6% not supporting it. They were less unsure, at 16%.
Comment analysis

937 people left additional comments after completing question 2.

• People commented that Children’s Centres should help all families and be a universal service. There were people who felt that they would not be categorised as being ‘in need’, due to their income and the fact they are not involved with social care, family work or SEND services, but nevertheless had greatly appreciated the support they had received from children’s centres whilst they had young children themselves. People also particularly valued the social contact and contribution to the local community made by Children’s Centre activities and services. There were people who said they would be happy to pay a small amount to continue to attend activities.

• People felt that all parents have needs, particularly around the mental health of new mothers, and preventing them becoming isolated and lonely.

• People leaving comments on this theme also put a high value on preventative early help, suggesting that people’s needs change over time and it is difficult to accurately identify need because people might not say anything. People commented that not all needs will be obvious, or people may not be willing to discuss them, such as domestic violence; others commented that everyone experience challenges as a new parent. A universal service would allow them to be identified and supported because they were in contact with a wider community.

• People commented that under the proposals, some parents with relatively low needs would not be supported, and therefore their needs would become worse and require more intensive services.

• Respondents also commented that the definition of ‘need’ is important, and the identification and assessment process needs to be robust. People asked how ‘need’ is to be defined and how we would know whether someone was in need.

• People discussed the idea of targeting vulnerable families. There were also people who strongly supported this idea, and commented that they think the services are insufficiently targeted on people with low incomes or with other needs at the moment. There were people who commented that targeting vulnerable families was likely to be the best use of resources in terms of impact. Other people described some difficulties they saw in targeting services – particularly around how families with disadvantaged backgrounds can be engaged by services.

• People commented that maintaining a universal service would be the best way to target vulnerable families, because they would be less likely to attend activities known to be for poorer or more vulnerable families, as a result of social stigma; and because vulnerable families might not know about how to access support or have the confidence to do so.

• There were people who felt that the question was unfair or not enough information was provided to make the proposals clear.

• People commented that the proposals would mean they would have to travel longer distances and that was difficult on public transport.
There were people who described particular areas in their comments, including Brampton, Fawcett and Fenland.

**Question 3: How important is it to have health services in the same place as your Child and Family services?**

Question 3 asked respondents how important having access to health services in the same place as Child and Family services. 2260 respondents answered this question. 36.9% of respondents thought this was very important, 38.2% felt this was good to have and 14.8% thought it was not important. The remaining 10.3% were unsure.

**Figure 10: Percentage of Respondent Support For Question 3**

There was a majority across all areas of support for this question. The following chart breaks down the responses by area:

**Figure 11: Percentage of Respondent Support for Question 3 by Area**
37% of respondents with children under 5 thought this was very important, 37.7% felt this was good to have and 15.9% did not think it was important. Respondents with all children over 5 were slightly more supportive, 38.1% feeling it was very important, 39.4% responding that it was good to have and 14.1% answering as not important. A higher percentage of respondents with children with disability or illness felt it was important, at 40.5%, or not important at 18.3%. The following chart breaks down these responses:

Figure 12: Percentage of Support for Question 3 From Respondents With Children

More young parents felt this was very important, at 47.8%. Slightly less felt it was good to have, at 32.1% while less felt it was not important at 9%. Those with disability or illness themselves were slightly less supportive, with 33.3% feeling it was very important and 36.2% feeling it was good to have, while 20.6% felt it was not important. 9.9% were unsure.
Those with no children were more unsure, at 16.7%. 34% felt it was very important, 39% that it was good to have and 10.3% that it was not important.

Comment analysis

533 people left a comment on this question.

- People commented that they would find it easier to access or approach both health and children’s services if they were delivered in the same place. People felt it would save multiple appointments, travel, and would make sense in terms of a one stop shop for support. People also commented that it would be helpful to have a familiar environment for both health and child and family services, especially for children with special educational needs. People also commented that it would be easier for the professionals to communicate with one another if they were located in the same building, which could improve services.

- There were people who disagreed with the proposal. They felt that this might be useful but not essential; and that whilst it was more convenient it wasn’t necessary. People said they prefer to go to their GP if they had a health problem they wanted to discuss. Other people disagreed more strongly, sometimes because they felt that a ‘medical’ environment was not one that was relaxing and a space for play and social activities. Others felt that the spaces required for each activity were not compatible – for example, some said they were concerned about catching infections, and others felt that the ‘children’ space could be noisy and be inappropriate for mixing with people waiting for health services.

- There were people who felt that accessibility of services was more important than co-location. People supported the idea in principle but commented that it was dependent on what was in practice available – it was more important that a service was available locally without having to travel far, and that it was open at the right times. People said it was difficult to travel without a car with small children.

- People commented that this was already in place at their local Children’s Centre, which they tended to regard positively.

- People mentioned specific local places in their comments. The use of Brookfields in Cambridge was discussed, with some people expressing concerns about mixed use of a space for health and children’s services being inappropriate in the case of some services (drug rehabilitation services were particularly highlighted). Some people highlighted that health services are already offered in some specific children’s centres (Romsey Mill, Cherry Hinton, Waterbeach were all mentioned).

- There were people who felt the question was unfairly worded.
Question 4: Our offer will include the following: maintaining some of our existing Children’s Centres, delivering services in shared community spaces, providing outreach programmes at a local level, a greater online offer. To what degree do you support this?

Question 4 asked respondents whether they supported the offer of maintaining some of the existing Children’s Centres, delivering services in shared community spaces, providing outreach programs at a local level and a greater online offer. 2260 respondents answered this question. 45.7% of respondents supported this statement while 36.3% did not. The remaining 18% were unsure.

Figure 12: Percentage of Respondents Support For Question 4

There was a majority of support for this proposal in Fenland, Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire. The following chart breaks down the responses by area:

Figure 13: Percentage of Respondent Support for Question 4 by Area
Respondents with children under 5 were slightly more supportive of this statement at 49.1%, while 34.9% did not. Respondents with all children over 5 were also slightly more supportive at 48.3%, while also being slightly higher responding as not supportive, at 36.4%. Respondents with children with disability or illness were less supportive, with 41.5% supporting this statement and 41.4% being unsupportive. The following chart breaks down these responses:

**Figure 14: Percentage of Support for Question 4 From Respondents With Children**

More young parents supported this statement, at 53.8%, while 27.6% did not. A similar percentage were unsure, at 18.7%. Those with disability or illness themselves were less supportive, with 39.4% supporting while 37.4% were not supportive. More respondents in this category were unsure, at 23.2%. Those with no children were also more unsure, at 20.5%. They were also the least supportive, with 35% supporting and 44.5% not supporting.

**Comments analysis**
People commented that they do not support the closure of any Children’s Centres. A common comment was that Children’s Centres are a valuable part of the local community, or people described positive experiences they had when using Children’s Centres. Some people supported the principles set out in the question, but did not want this to be taken as support for closing Children’s Centre buildings; a few felt the service should be expanded in the way described in the question. A few people felt that the proposed offer would negatively impact on early intervention for families.

People discussed the online offer in their comments. People felt that there was already a substantial amount of information available online, although some people supported the development of the online offer, especially if it was improved compared to what is offered now and comprehensive. People felt that an online offer would not adequately replace a face to face discussion with professionals or support workers. People valued the relationships and sense of community they found in physically going to centres, in terms of the support from professionals, the involvement of their children in activities and support from other people in the community. People were concerned that not everyone has access to the internet, or the confidence or literacy levels to access online services. There were also people who commented that face to face services would be more appropriate and useful if someone was feeling overwhelmed or in crisis.

People discussed the use of spaces or buildings in their comments. There were comments focused on whether shared spaces would be appropriate, and that this would need to be carefully thought through. For example, midwifery services might need a personal room, and not all community venues may be suitable safe spaces for children to play. There were commenters who supported the shared use of spaces as a way of delivering services, suggesting that it can be a more effective use of resources and a way of maintaining service delivery; and that the services that are being delivered are more important than where they are based. Respondents pointed out that the use of shared spaces in communities would need to be carefully marketed to ensure that people knew about them.

Having local services was a key theme also. People commented that face to face contact is very important because it prevents new parents from being isolated and suffering from issues with mental health as a result. A concern was expressed that people in rural villages would become more isolated as a result of changes to children’s centres buildings. A similar concern was expressed by people who felt that travelling further to attend building-based services was very difficult, both in terms of travelling between villages and within Cambridge on public transport and by car. There were people who defined ‘local’ as within walking distance.

There were people who commented that wrap around child care locally was important to them.
• Some particular locations were mentioned in the comments, particularly where people were commenting that they wanted service to be maintained in the area. Locations mentioned included Caldecote, Romsey Mill, Homerton, Histon, Gamlingay, Abbey ward in Cambridge, Murrow, Linton, Fawcett, Sutton, Somersham, Cherry Hinton, the southern part of Cambridge, Bottisham, Wisbech and Whittlesey.

• More generally, respondents were concerned about the potential redesignation of services in South Cambridgeshire, highlighting the rurality of the district.

• People commented that further information on the detail of the proposal would be useful, particularly about what services would be offered from where in shared community spaces and outreach work. There were people who commented that the proposal was ‘just cost-cutting’, with a few suggesting they would be willing to make a larger contribution to services.
Question 5: Have you read our full proposals in the consultation document?

Question 5 asked respondents if they had read the full proposal that is available from the consultation document. 2231 respondents answered this question. 75.1% of respondents had read the full proposal while 24.9% did not.

Figure 15: Percentage of Respondents Answer For Question 5

The following chart breaks down the responses by area:

Figure 16: Percentage of Response for Question 5 by Area

Slightly less respondents with children under 5 had read the full proposal, at 72.7%, with 27.3% not having read it. Slightly more respondents with children over 5 had read the full proposal, at 77.8% and 22.2% having not read it. Slightly more respondents with children
with illness or disability had read the full proposal, at 76.5%, while 23.5% had not. The following chart breaks down these responses:

**Figure 17: Percentage of Response for Question 5 From Respondents With Children**

![Chart showing percentage of respondents with children who read the full proposal](chart.png)

Less young parents had read the full proposal, at 71%, while 29% had not. More respondents with no children had read the full proposal, at 83.2%, while 16.8% had not. More of those respondents with disability or illness had read the full proposal, at 82.7%, while 17.3% had not.
Themes in the comments across all districts

- People felt the consultation document was misleading, confusing, does not contain sufficient information or data was inaccurate. Questions people asked included:
  - What does split site mean?  
  - Shared staff?  
  - Split opening hours?  
  - What is a zone?  
  - What hours will it open?  
  - What can you access at a zone?  
  - What are the implications for activities delivered by partners, for example Health, childminders, voluntary sector?  
  - What does ‘redesignate’ mean?

- There were people who questioned whether libraries are the right space for Children’s Centres. People were concerned about confidentiality, privacy and the noise levels that will be caused by bringing small children on site.

- People expressed concerns around the risk of the proposals in the longer term for children in terms of safeguarding, development and the impact on other services such as social care and health.

- People commented that they wished to see more funding for Early Intervention services.

- People made general comments about their disagreement with proposals to redesignate centres or reduce funding. A particular concern was maintaining the quality of service delivery whilst reducing funding by £1 million.

- People were concerned about the accessibility and suitability of venues that might be used for outreach services, especially for people with limited mobility.

- There were queries around whether or not future growth has been taken into account in the proposals.

- People made references to the increase in councillor allowances.

- Respondents made the comment that they do not live in or do not know enough about the District in question, and a high level of respondents also did not leave a comment to the District specific question.

The Cambridge proposals

1356 respondents answered this question, 662 of which were from Cambridge. Residents of Cambridge were more unsupportive (75.8%) than supportive (15.8%) of proposals for their area, with 8.3% unsure. When including all respondents, overall views of the Cambridge proposals were also more unsupportive (60.2%) than supportive (21.8%), with nearly one fifth unsure (18%).

Figure 18: Percentage of Cambridge Respondents Supporting the Cambridge Proposal
**Figure 19: Responses from people living in Cambridge with children about the Cambridge proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents living in district</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Children</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children under 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children all over 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children with additional needs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has additional needs themselves</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment analysis**

- Respondents want to retain Romsey Mill, Homerton, Fawcett & Cherry Hinton as designated sites.
- Respondents proposed a second site is needed in the South of the City.
- Responses were received relating to transport – difficult accessing public transport with small children & buggies, cost, and accessibility.
- There were responses regarding the service provided by centres proposed for redesignation.
- There were responses regarding library space not being suitable.
- There were responses querying Brookfields as a site – queries include parking, being 0.2 miles from Romsey Mill & some respondents referenced the substance misuse treatment service located on the site.
- There was support for the proposals for this area.
- There were comments about the cost of parking at the Grand Arcade & across the City.
- There were comments about the suitability of an online offer.
- There were responses asking about the future of the Romsey Mill young parent offer/contract.
- Respondents asked for clarity around the future of staff jobs at Homerton, Fawcett & Romsey Mill.

**The South Cambridgeshire proposals**

1236 respondents answered this question, 519 of which were from South Cambridgeshire. Residents of South Cambridgeshire were more unsupportive (71.1%) than supportive (15.8%) of proposals for their area, with 13.1% unsure. When including all respondents,
overall views of the South Cambridgeshire proposals were also more unsupportive (62.9%) than supportive (20.2%), with 16.9% unsure.

**Figure 20: Percentage of South Cambridgeshire Respondents Supporting the South Cambridgeshire Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Support for South Cambridgeshire Proposal From South Cambridgeshire Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Support for South Cambridgeshire Proposal From South Cambridgeshire Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21: Responses from people living in South Cambridgeshire with children about the South Cambridgeshire proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7. To what degree do you support our proposals in South Cambridgeshire? -South Cambs residents only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has children with additional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children all over 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 5% 6% 7% 8% 9% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree                                     Agree                                      Unsure                        Disagree                      Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents living in district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children all over 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children with additional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has additional needs themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment analysis

- There were responses received relating to transport – poor links, cost, traffic & travelling with small children.
- There were responses received regarding the proposal to have one centre in Cambourne; and a general feeling this is not sufficient for an area as large as South Cambs.
- Responses queried if future growth in the District has been considered.
- Responses highlighted isolation across the District.
- There were responses specific to the future of the after school club provision in Caldecote.
- There were responses highlighting the building at Bassingbourn as being very good & fit for purpose.
- There was support to retain services delivered from Sawston and Linton.
- There was support for proposals in this area.

The East Cambridgeshire proposals

1078 respondents answered this question, 269 of which were from East Cambridgeshire. Residents of East Cambridgeshire were more unsupportive (49.1%) than supportive (30.5%) of proposals for their area, with 20.4% unsure. When including all respondents, overall views of the East Cambridgeshire proposals were also more unsupportive (54.9%) than supportive (24.8%), with 20.3% unsure.

Figure 22: Percentage of East Cambridgeshire Respondents Supporting the East Cambridgeshire Proposal
Figure 23: Responses from people living in East Cambridgeshire with children about the East Cambridgeshire proposals

Q8. To what degree do you support our proposals for East Cambridgeshire?

- Has children with additional needs
- Young Parents
- Has children all over 5
- Has children under 5

% of Support for East Cambridgeshire Proposal From East Cambridgeshire Respondents

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents living in district</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Children</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children under 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children all over 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has children with additional needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has additional needs themselves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment analysis

- Responses were received relating to transport – poor links, cost, traffic and travelling with small children.
- There were respondents wanting to retain services from sites proposed for redesignation (Bottisham & Sutton).
- Responses suggested investigating other sites such as Princess of Wales in Ely & the health centre at the Eastern Gateway in Soham.
- There was support for proposals in Soham and highlighting growth in the town.
The Huntingdonshire proposals

1047 respondents answered this question, 308 of which were from Huntingdonshire. Residents of Huntingdonshire were more unsupportive (55.5%) than supportive (28.2%) of proposals for their area, with 16.2% unsure. When including all respondents, overall views of the Huntingdonshire proposals were also more unsupportive (56.3%) than supportive (23.3%), with 20.4% unsure.

Figure 24: Percentage of Huntingdonshire Respondents Supporting the Huntingdonshire Proposal

Figure 25: Responses from people living in Huntingdonshire with children about the Huntingdonshire proposals
### Comment analysis

- Responses were received relating to transport – poor links, cost, traffic and travelling with small children.
- There were respondents who wanted to retain services from sites proposed for redesignation (Godmanchester, Somersham, Brampton & Farcet).
- There were queries about the proposed location of centres & why St Neots has two?
- There were responses about access to services in Yaxley & cross border into Peterborough.
• There was support for proposals in this area.

The Fenland proposals

1181 respondents answered this question, 430 of which were from the Fenland district. Unlike in other districts, residents of Fenland were more supportive (64.5%) than unsupportive (16.3%) of proposals for their area, with 19.3% unsure. When including all respondents, overall views of the Fenland proposals were only slightly more unsupportive (39.7%) than supportive (38.9%), with 21.4% unsure.

Figure 26: Percentage of Fenland Respondents Supporting the Fenland Proposal

Figure 27: Responses from people living in Fenland with children about the Fenland proposals
Comment analysis

- There were comments about the proposal to redesignate Murrow.
- Responses were received relating to transport – poor links, cost & travelling with small children.
- Respondents confused proposals to redesignate Murrow CC with closing the preschool provision.
- Respondents stated that the quality of service provision is more important than retaining buildings.
• There were queries about the thinking behind retaining Chatteris and Whittlesey becoming a zone.
• There were responses highlighting the need for outreach services in such a rural area.
• Respondents living in South Cambs & City queried why resource is being allocated in Fenland rather than where they live while others understand & support the proposal.
• Response asking about the availability of translated consultation documents.

Question 22: Your feedback will help inform and shape our proposals. Please feel free to add any further thoughts or comments here

• People wanted to tell us that they value the current services from their Children’s Centre.
• People voiced concern about budget reductions with an addition number saying there should be no cuts in budget.
• People expressed general disagreement with the proposals.
• People were concerned about the wording of the survey with an additional small number questioning the consultation method.
• People voiced concerns about closing centres with an additional number not wanting to see a reduction in services.
• As with other questions, respondents were concerned about transport to services going forward.
• Respondents questioned whether the consultation would have an impact on proposals.
• There were also comments supporting delivery in particular areas or centres, these have been picked up as part of the district questions.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Full Survey

Section 1: Children Centres Future Delivery

Questions related to the user’s views on the substance of the proposals.

1. Do you support our Children’s Centres meeting the needs of a wider age range, from expectant parents to young adults?
   a. Strongly Support
   b. Support
   c. Unsure
   d. Unsupportive
   e. Very Unsupportive

Do you have any additional comments?

2. To what degree do you support the proposal to focus services on those families that need them most?
   a. Strongly Support
   b. Support
   c. Unsure
   d. Unsupportive
   e. Highly Unsupportive

Do you have any additional comments?

3. How important is it to have health services in the same place as your Child and Family services?
   a. Very Important
   b. Good to have
   c. Unsure
   d. Not Important

Do you have any additional comments?

4. Our offer will include the following:
   • Maintaining some of our existing Children’s Centres
   • Delivering services in shared community spaces • Providing outreach programmes at a local level
   • A greater online offer.

To what degree do you support this?
   a. Strongly Support
   b. Support
   c. Unsure
   d. Unsupportive
e. Very Unsupportive

Do you have any additional comments?

Section 2: Districts

Questions relating to proposals for specific districts.

You will now be shown our plans for the 5 districts in Cambridgeshire.

You can respond to any or all of them, or skip through any which are not relevant to you.

5. Have you read our full proposals in the consultation document?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. To what degree do you support our proposals for Cambridge City?
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Unsure
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Skip to the next district Comments:

7. To what degree do you support our proposals in South Cambridgeshire?
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Unsure
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Skip to the next district Comments:

8. To what degree do you support our proposals in East Cambridgeshire?
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Unsure
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Skip to the next district Comments:

9. To what degree do you support our proposals in Huntingdonshire?
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Unsure
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Skip to the next district Comments:
10. To what degree do you support our proposals in Fenland?
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Unsure
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
   f. Skip to the next district

Comments:

Section 3: About You

Personal information asked of respondents for analysis purposes.

*Information will remain confidential and will only be used to analyse this survey*

11. Please define your gender.
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other Definition

12. What age range do you fall into?
   a. Under 18
   b. 18 – 24
   c. 25 – 44
   d. 45 – 64
   e. 65+

13. Are there any children in your household within the following age ranges:
(Please tick all that apply)
   a. I do not have children
   b. Under 12 months
   c. 1 – 2
   d. 3 – 4
   e. 5 – 10
   f. 11+

14. Do you or a child in your household have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity that limits mobility? [respondents can tick both – IN]
   a. You
   b. A child in your household

15. What Cambridgeshire district do you live in?
   a. Cambridge City
   b. South Cambridgeshire
c. East Cambs
d. Huntingdonshire
e. Fenland
f. Other (please specify)

16. Please can you provide your postcode:
(This will only be used to analyse the survey and not for any other purpose)

17. Do you or does anyone in your household drive and own a car?
a. Yes
b. No

18. To which of these ethnic groups do you consider you belong?
a. White British
b. White Irish
c. White Other
d. Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi
e. Asian or Asian British – Indian
f. Asian or Asian British – Pakistani
g. Any other Asian Background
h. Mixed White and Black
i. Black or Black British – African
j. Black or Black British – Caribbean
k. Any other Back Background
l. Mixed Other
m. Chinese
n. Traveller/Gypsy/Roma
o. Any Other
p. Prefer Not to Say

19. Do you or your family currently use a Children’s centre?
a. Yes
b. No

20. How have you become aware of our proposals for Cambridgeshire Children’s Centres?
a. I attended a consultation event
b. I read the proposals online
c. Word of mouth
d. Other (please specify):

21. Have you completed this survey on behalf of someone else:
a. No, this is my own response
b. I am filling this in for someone else

c. I am a member of CCC and am inputting this on behalf of someone else

22. Your feedback will help inform and shape our proposals. Please feel free to add any further thoughts or comments here