**Appendix I**

**Devolution in the South East – March 2017**

**NOTE:**

There are three key criteria that any proposal for a Combined Authority (CA) must meet:

• Will the CA improve the delivery of its functions in the area it covers?

• Will the CA help to secure effective and convenient local government?

• Does the proposed CA reflect local identity and the interests of local communities?

The Local Government Association has published helpful guides to the process to create a Combined Authority (CA) and the requirements that need to be met.

The first is titled what next for devolution, a discussion paper.<http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/7632544/3.5+What+next+for+devolution+-+final+WEB.pdf/77125fcd-4035-443c-b98c-2da62c644548>

The second is titled Combined Authorities, a plain English guide. <http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/7632544/3+1+-+A+guide+to+setting+up+a+combined+authority_06WEB2.pdf/5da3e7b6-e1b6-4e41-ace4-59ebedd9c9e6>

**Hampshire & the Isle of Wight**

**Hampshire County Council**

The Council consultation on options as below closed on 20 September 2016 <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/serving-hampshire-consultation-information-pack.pdf>

Option one: create one, or possibly two, combined authorities

Option 1a: create a single combined authority called the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Combined Authority

Option 1b: create two separate combined authorities called Heart of Hampshire and Solent

Option two: reorganise to a unitary council model

Option 2a: create a single unitary council for the existing Hampshire County Council area

Option 2b: create three new unitary councils for the existing Hampshire County Council area and neighbouring areas of Portsmouth and Southampton

The Council commissioned Deloitte to undertake initial analysis of these options for local government in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/communications/HampshireCountyCouncilFullReport.pdf>

<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/communications/HampshireCountyCouncilExecutiveSummaryReport.pdf>

On 14 November 2016 Cabinet received a report on the outcome of the consultation (23 pages) and decided not to pursue any option for a CA, record of decision below. The report and formal decision are available on line; see link for Executive Decision Record (Final) and Report. <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/councilmeetings/advsearchmeetings/meetingsitemdocuments.htm?sta=&pref=Y&item_ID=7925&tab=2&co=&confidential>=

**Solent Mayoral Combined Authority**

Separate to the Hampshire County Council consultation, The [Isle of Wight Council](https://www.iwight.com/), [Portsmouth City Council](https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/) and [Southampton City Council](https://www.southampton.gov.uk/) sought to establish a Solent Mayoral Combined Authority to secure extra powers and funding for their area. The deal would give the region £900 million over the next 30 years to improve infrastructure, transport and housing, and provide training and skills and support for business; with £30 million per year in new funding. The consultation outcome supported establishing a Combined Authority. Website established with details. <http://www.solentdeal.co.uk/further-information/> This includes a link to the report on the outcome of the public consultation at <http://www.solentdeal.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Solent-Deal-Consultation-Report.pdf>

**Portsmouth City Council**

The Solent Combined Mayoral Authority was considered at full Council on 11 October and by Cabinet on 12 October 2016.

A report of over 200 pages was considered by Cabinet, see link <http://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/documents/g3577/Public%20reports%20pack%2012th-Oct-2016%2011.00%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Cabinet agreed to submit a request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to establish a Solent Combined Authority provided the other two Councils also resolved to publish the final Scheme and review).

**Southampton City Council**

The Solent Combined Mayoral Authority was considered by Cabinet on 19 October 2016. <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/documents/g3281/Printed%20minutes%2019th-Oct-2016%20Cabinet.pdf?T=1>

See, SOLENT COMBINED AUTHORITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW AND SCHEME DECISION MADE: (CAB 16/17 18028)

Full report to the meeting is at pages 3 – 212, <http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/documents/g3281/Public%20reports%20pack%2019th-Oct-2016%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Cabinet agreed to submit a request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to establish a Solent Combined Authority provided the other two Councils also resolved to publish the final Scheme and review).

**Isle of Wight Council**

Full Council considered the outcome of the public consultation on 19 October and narrowly voted against a Solent Combined Authority by 17 votes to 16. Extract from minutes below, see link <https://www.iwight.com/Meetings/committees/mod-council/19-10-16/minutes.pdf>

On 24 October the Executive Committee met and advised by the Leader of the Council that no alternative recommendation had been submitted at Full Council. Technically, therefore, it had not expressed a formal view about the report and its recommendations, although the comments at the meeting gave a sense of individual members’ views. The Executive agreed to submit a request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to establish a Solent Combined Authority provided the other two Councils also resolved to publish the final Scheme and review). See link to minutes <https://www.iwight.com/Meetings/committees/Executive/24-10-16/minutes.pdf>

The Isle of Wight Council changed from being under the control of the Independents to the Conservatives on 16 January 2017. A week later the Conservative administration announced it did not support the proposal for a Combined Authority.

**Basingstoke, Hart and Rushmore**

On 18 January 2017 Districts in northern Hampshire announced that they are exploring the possibility of creating a unitary after lack of progress with creating a combined authority in the county. A report for Basingstoke & Deane BC’s cabinet recommends it “further explore options for becoming a unitary authority, either in isolation or preferably in partnership with neighbouring authorities”. These would be Hart DC and Rushmore BC, creating a council covering a population of 363,000 people. Communities secretary Sajid Javid said in November that the Department for Communities & Local Government “typically look for” proposals for unitary councils to represent “anywhere between 300,000 and 800,000” people.

Basingstoke & Dean Conservative Leader Clive Sanders was quoted saying that the current two-tier system of local government will become unsustainable in the medium term and that we have to start the process of change now to avoid collapse and or a panic reaction in a few years’ time. He said a combined authority should cover only the Heart of Hampshire, not the whole county as there was “little mutual interest between those [councils] in the north and those in the south of the county and that a Hampshire-wide combined authority, as advocated by the county council, could see his residents subsidising the services of those on the south coast.

**Oxfordshire**

In Oxfordshire, every Council now agrees that it is time to move to unitary local government, but not on how many there should be.

There are currently two tiers of local government: the county council covering the whole of Oxfordshire and five district/city councils.

In April 2016 the County Council commissioned a study to look at all the options for local government restructuring in Oxfordshire, namely:

A single unitary council for the whole County

Four Unitaries covering council areas administered by: Oxford City; West Oxfordshire and Cotswolds (Gloucestershire); South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse, and Cherwell and South Northamptonshire (Northants)

Three unitary authorities covering areas currently administered by Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire; Oxford city; and Cherwell and West Oxfordshire

Two unitary authorities, with one covering the city based on expanded boundaries and the other covering the remaining area of Oxfordshire

Status quo based on the current arrangement of county and district councils

Separate to the County Council consultation, the District Councils proposed abolishing all six of the existing local councils and the creation of new Unitary Councils that would be responsible for running all of the local services within their local area. These new councils would come together to form the Oxfordshire Combined Authority to take decisions on strategic matters that cross Unitary boundaries. One of these models would see West Oxfordshire and the Cotswolds form a new Unitary Authority, crossing UNISONs South West and South East regional boundaries.

They commissioned PwC to undertake a separate review which reported on 8 August and proposed 3 Unitary authorities for Oxfordshire. Northern Oxfordshire comprising of current Cherwell and West Oxfordshire District Councils. Oxford City comprising the current Oxford City Council and Southern Oxfordshire comprising of current South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils. <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/2819/summary_of_pwc_study_and_district_proposition.pdf>

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/2820/pwc_review_of_proposed_unitary_authority_options_with_a_combined_authority.pdf>

The County Council announced on 17 August 2016 the outcome of their report and the possibility of creating a “Strategic Unitary Body” for Oxfordshire which would replace existing districts with area committees and made the case for creating a County-wide Unitary Authority, claiming it provides the best opportunity to deliver interconnected services at scale.

The five District leaders all agreed to press ahead with a 3 Unitary option under a Combined Authority.

Oxfordshire leader Ian Hudspeth (Conservative) welcomed the publication of both reports and said he would be looking to work with the districts on areas of common ground in the hope of finding a way forward in the interests of residents of Oxfordshire. Peter Clark, Oxfordshire County Director put together a [short note](https://oxfordshire-gov.pmail4.com/PoliteMail/files/All%20Councillor%20Unitary%20Briefing%20Sept%202016.pdf) (4 pages). This identifies the areas of broad agreement between the two reports.

In December 2016 Ian Hudspeth confirmed his support for a unitary model that could ‘flex its strategic muscles by speaking up for the area to central government; protecting frontline services through back office economies of scale; and supporting our thriving local economy’ He noted that reorganisation means abolishing all the existing six councils: no takeovers and no mergers. The new Council would have five powerful area executive boards, built on the geography of the current districts, made up of the unitary councillors who represent that area, with meaningful powers at that level. Draft proposals were published at the end of January.

On 8 February 2017, Vale of Wight Horse and South Oxfordshire District Councils changed their position and came out in favour of a single Oxfordshire Unitary Council. Cherwell, West Oxfordshire and Oxford City have all subsequently again confirmed their opposition to such a plan.

**Milton Keynes**

There have been discussions between Milton Keynes, Bedford, Central Bedfordshire and Luton authorities.

In November 2016 it was announced that a partnership made up of eight top-tier councils and four local enterprise partnerships hopes to submit a bid to government to become a sub-national transport body in spring 2017.

The transport and infrastructure strategic alliance known as England’s Economic Heartland is made up of representatives from Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, and Oxfordshire CCs, Central Bedfordshire and Milton Keynes councils, Bedford and Luton BCs, as well as Buckinghamshire Thames Valley, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire, and South East Midlands local enterprise partnerships.

**Berkshire**

Berkshire’s Unitary Councils are developing plans that could result in them sharing chief executives and services. In June 2016 it was reported that proposals are being drawn up as an alternative to a devolution bid due to authorities’ resistance to the imposition of an elected mayor. Bracknell Forest Council leader Paul Bettison (Con), who chairs the Berkshire leaders group, said some councils in Berkshire could move to share Chief Executives and Directors, as the arrangements develop.

Discussions are underway to extend existing shared arrangements in strategic planning and careers advice services to adoption, legal services, children’s services and adult social care. The councils rejected a devolution bid, over the requirement to have an elected mayor.

Consideration of a Tri-borough-style arrangement raises questions about the viability of any new Unitary Councils in the current round of proposed restructuring, unless authorities share services. Department for Communities & Local Government officials have suggested unitary councils created under restructuring should aim for population of at least 300,000. The Berkshire Unitaries range from 118,025 people (Bracknell Forest) to 160,825 people (Reading BC).

Cllr Bettison said he believes the arrangements offered a realistic alternative to devolution and restructuring, by providing an efficient scale of service delivery. After studying the Tri-borough arrangement between Hammersmith & Fulham LBC, Kensington & Chelsea RBC and Westminster City Council, Cllr Bettison said the councils agreed to share services in different combinations, with a built-in flexibility to accommodate different political priorities.

The model is said to offer an effective way to scale-up services for smaller Unitaries outside London that wished to retain political sovereignty, with the benefit of not needing legislation and retention of local control.

**Buckinghamshire**

On 17 May 2016 the County Council agreed to prepare an outline Business Case to explore the benefits of a new model of local government for Buckinghamshire and to authorise the Leader to write to key partners in Buckinghamshire, including the four District Councils, together with strategic stakeholders, such as Bucks Thames Valley LEP, to invite them to collaborate with the County Council in discussions on how local government in Buckinghamshire might be modernised.

Local authorities are at loggerheads about how changes should happen. In 2015 the districts commissioned consultants LG Futures to assess whether going unitary would be viable. It found a unitary for Aylesbury Vale would have a population of 181,000 while a unitary in the south of the county – made up of Chiltern, South Bucks, and Wycombe DCs – would have a population of 335,000. The report warned “ministers could see a unitary with a population of only 181,000 as being too small” while in its conclusion it said it was “difficult to determine whether the new unitary council would be financially viable”. That was because Aylesbury Vale would be “likely to inherit county services that are under considerable pressure, reserves that are much reduced, and potentially a budget that is difficult to balance”.

The Districts then commissioned Deloitte to undertake a strategic options appraisal for local government across Buckinghamshire. Their report was published on 10 October 2016 and its conclusion was that a 2 or 3 unitary model provides the best opportunity to transform local government and provide financial stability.

<http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/sites/default/files/page_downloads/Buckinghamshire%20District%20Councils%20Options%20for%20Future%20Local%20Government%20FULL%20REPORT%20101016.pdf>

Buckinghamshire County Council has published plans to create a single county unitary and website to provide details to the public. <http://futurebucks.co.uk/>

The Executive business case for a single county wide unitary is at <http://futurebucks.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Executive-Summary_last-amendments.pdf>

This explored the options for, one, two or three Unitaries and found a single county-wide unitary model for Buckinghamshire offered the greatest likelihood of meeting the needs of Buckinghamshire in the future.

Their proposition is to abolish the county council and the four district councils and establish a brand new, county-wide single unitary council. Under the [county’s plan](http://futurebucks.co.uk/), the number of Councillors would reduce from 238 to 98, saving an estimated £1.2m, and there would be 19 community hubs through which residents could access council services. The projected savings include £3m from reducing senior management numbers, £4m from combined back-office functions and £3.6m from services efficiencies and. A further £48m could be raised by selling surplus council buildings. Buckinghamshire estimated the unitary would have a £16.2m set-up cost, with savings building up to £18.2m a year by the third year.

Parishes that wished to could take ownership of assets such as allotments and leisure centres, and, as in Wiltshire local planning committees and groups of Councillors in each area would take most decisions affecting their locality. Cllr Tett said child and adult social care social services would be among few services that had to be centrally administered.

At a conference in November Communities Secretary Sajid Javed publicly supported the County Councils proposal, commenting that Buckinghamshire has just delivered a detailed, innovative and original proposal to transform the council into a single unitary authority.

The County says that it has plans for a network of 19 multi-agency community hubs that would enable people to talk to someone from the council in a town or village near to where they live, right across the county. The hubs would provide a base for a number of public services, including the new Buckinghamshire Council. Co-locating multi-agency teams in this way will encourage joined-up working.

This plan claims that it would provide the scale to deliver the greatest financial savings; the resilience to manage the growing demand in social care services; and the strategic leadership to build the effective alliances with local, regional and national partners needed to promote the prosperity and wellbeing of residents and businesses.

The leaders of four district councils in Buckinghamshire do not support the proposal and met communities’ secretary Sajid Javid on 19 January to discuss their proposals for the formation of two unitary councils in the county.

Under the proposals, the existing county council and its four district councils – Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Bucks, and Wycombe DCs – would be replaced by two unitary councils: one representing Aylesbury Vale, the other encompassing the remaining three.

Aylesbury Vale DC’s leader Neil Blake (Con) has said: “The north and south of Bucks are very different economic areas. Two new Unitaries would allow each council to pursue its own economic goals.”

The Local Government Chronicle reported on 12 January 2017 that while Mr. Javid is due to make a decision on both sets of proposals early this year, any reorganisation is unlikely to be implemented until spring 2019.

**Kent**

In April 2016 Kent County Council confirmed that it was developing plans for a County-wide devolution deal focused on health and social care integration, education and skills, housing and economic growth.

Medway Council, along with Dartford, Gravesham, Swale, and Maidstone BCs, then confirmed that they had separately commissioned KPMG to look at the options for devolution to their own area. Alan Jarret (Con), leader of Medway Council confirmed that the five councils had had discussions about a devolution deal for that group of councils but “minds are open” to a county-wide devolution deal, but Medway was “not prepared” to adopt an elected mayor.

KCC leader Cllr Paul Carter, who is also chair of the County Councils Network, has said it is important to make sure counties are not “fragmented and broken up”. “Local government reorganisation would put that clock back three or four years delivering that transformation by getting bogged down in this establishment of new authorities,” he said. “We haven’t got time for all of that nonsense.”

In the east of the county, the leader of Thanet Council has said that devolution talks had been “thrown in to chaos” following the announcement in the budget for a Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission. Led by Lord Heseltine it will “develop an ambitious vision and delivery plan for North Kent, South Essex and East London” focusing on “high productivity clusters in specific locations”. Chris Wells (Ukip) said “If that stretches down the Canterbury coast to Thanet then that changes the potential line-up of unified working.” The commission is due to report back by the 2017 autumn statement.

Four District Councils in Kent, Canterbury City Council, Dover, Shepway and Thanet are working towards creating a single local authority for the east of the county. Ashford BC was previously also involved but withdrew from the talks in January 2017.

Ashford BC has pulled out of plans to merge with four other districts in Kent over concerns about value for money and maintaining the lowest council tax levels in the county.

A business case setting out proposals for a merger between the four districts was published on 25 January 2017. It would not come into being until May 2019 if approved by the authorities involved and subsequently the communities’ secretary and if implemented will serve a population of 518,000 people. A single staffing structure is being proposed, while the number of councillors across the four districts could be cut from 170 to 72.

It is claimed that savings worth of £6.8m could be achieved within the first two years of the new council’s existence. The business case said “whilst the new council would not be a unitary authority” the merger “opens up the possibility of devolution” both from Kent CC and to town and parish councils. The document said Kent CC was engaging with the districts on exploring devolved powers over “aspects of operational highways maintenance” such as street furniture and verge cutting, as well as public health and community safety services.

Meanwhile, powers over public conveniences, open spaces and local assets such as community centres could be devolved from the mega district to town and parish councils, the document said.

Meetings will now be held to formally consider the four way business case before a decision is taken by each council on 22 March 2017 as to whether to move to the next stage of public engagement.

**Surrey and Sussex (3SC)**

East Sussex, West Sussex and Surrey are known as the Three Southern Counties or the 3SC and developed out of SE7. The combined GVA (Gross Value Added) of Sussex and Surrey is £63.5 billion which is bigger than both the whole of Wales (£52 billion) and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (£56 billion). The population (2,507,900) is comparable to that of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2,714,900). The population is forecast to rise to almost three million by 2037.

There is a dedicated website detailing developments at <https://surreyandsussex.wordpress.com/category/updates/>

The site includes a link to the letter to Sajid Javed in July 2016 sent on behalf of 26 Councils setting out aims to be achieved from the development of a 3 Southern Counties (3SC) devolution deal. <https://surreyandsussex.files.wordpress.com/2016/08/3sc-devolution-letter-to-government-19-07-16.pdf>

On 3 October the following update was posted following a Leaders meeting on 19 September 2016.

Leaders from across Surrey, East and West Sussex met on Monday the 19th September to take forward the 3SC proposals for devolution, making significant progress in next steps for the area’s bid.

There was unanimous agreement to move to a more formal structure of a Leader’s Board. Louise Goldsmith, Leader of West Sussex, was elected Chairman with two Vice Chairmen – Moira Gibson, Leader of Surrey Heath Borough Council, and Andy Smith, Leader of Lewes District Council. This board will agree and define the aims and ambitions of the 3SC deal and act as a strong and united voice for the area, ensuring the three counties’ interests are fully represented with Government, acting on behalf of the wider group of Leaders. The Leaders’ Board will be in place until there is an announcement of the deal.

One of the first actions the board agreed was a joint response to Government on the retention of business rates to emphasise the opportunity to support wider devolution plans if it is done in the right way and also to seek assurances that as a minimum the 3SC area would be no worse off.

The board also agreed a broad approach for the next stages of the negotiations with Government and that activity will continue to promote the unique position of the 3SC deal in helping support the economic growth of the UK.

The main factors that make 3SC unique are:

1) The economic opportunity for the UK provided by the 3SC region

2) Significant investment from the local authorities within the 3SC deal;

3) Strength of relationships across the 3SC region.

A key feature of the proposed 3SC deal is the tax dividend it will provide to Government from growth. We are asking for a small percentage of this to be invested in the 3SC area, particularly to improve infrastructure on which residents and businesses depend.

Another focus for the Leaders’ Board is to continue to raise awareness and understanding and promote the 3SC position on devolution among all Members, MPs and local businesses – with our Local Enterprise Partnerships playing a key role – in particular emphasising the key elements that make the deal unique. The next steps include raising the awareness during the party conference season, Ministerial meetings and more proactive engagement with business around economic development.

The 3SC bid has been developed as a partnership of 3 County Councils, 23 District and Borough Councils, 3 Local Enterprise Partnerships, 2 Police forces, East Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority, the South Downs National Park and 12 Clinical Commissioning Groups.

An update from the Governance Work stream was posted on 11 October 2016. This noted that at the last Leader’s meeting on 19 September they agreed to set up a Sounding Board, made up of a small group of councillors from across the three counties.

This group will discuss debate and agree some of the key issues relating to the governance of the 3SC area, including how decisions will be made. This may include questions around creating a structure with or without a mayor and the implications for the power of the Combined Authority to issue a precept as a way of raising money to contribute to the revolving infrastructure fund.

Council websites still reference the September 2015 prospectus as the latest position. <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/66911/WS31256-Three-Counties-DEVOLUTION-Prospectus-v2.pdf>

The East Sussex County Council website confirms that 3SC covers Infrastructure, Housing and planning, Skills, Public service transformation, financial devolution and Governance and the following information on arrangements being proposed.

What is the relationship between county, district and borough councils in this process? This is a joint venture between county, district and borough councils. We will jointly explore what might be possible; working differently and taking on powers and resources from the Government. It is about authorities at all levels working together on a sensible strategic geography to enable powers to be devolved from Central Government to Local Government. We will use those new powers to build on the partnerships that work well locally. We are also committed to a parallel programme of double devolution between the country and district councils in each county area.

Is this taking power from existing councils? No. The aim of the 3SC is to bring decision-making closer to communities and businesses. By working together, all the partners in the 3SC will have more influence on the national policy and funding they need to tackle the vital issues facing the area – including a creaking infrastructure and recruitment challenges for business. These are decisions that are best made by councils, not central government.

Brighton & Hove City Council has submitted its own Greater Brighton Economic Board devolution bid. We will work with them where this makes sense, for example, there is already joint work underway on infrastructure, skills and transport.

Surrey County Councils website updated as at 16 Dec 2016 also still has the 2015 prospectus and notes the following.

We are making a detailed case for 3SC devolution to the Government and our bid covers six main areas:

Infrastructure, Housing and planning, Skills, Public service transformation, Financial devolution and Governance. In particular, we are asking for a devolution deal with government which allows us to grow our contribution to the national economy.

See link <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/your-council/how-the-council-works/our-performance/devolution>

Proposals for a South East sub-national transport body stretching across Kent, Sussex, Surrey, and Hampshire and also under consideration arising from the SE7 work. In December 2016 the Local Government Chronicle noted that meetings were being held across the region to discuss creating a shadow body known as Transport for the South East (TfSE). The Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016 allows for sub-national transport bodies to be created.

There have been officer level discussions about establishing the body between representatives from East Sussex, West Sussex, Hampshire, Kent, and Surrey CCs, Brighton & Hove City Council, Medway Council, and the four local enterprise partnerships in the region. Isle of Wight Council, Portsmouth and Southampton city councils are due to be invited to join the talks.

The 3SC website posted an update on the Sub National Transport Body for the South East on 28 November 2016. This noted that the 3SC welcomes proposals for a Sub National Transport Body for the South East. There are clear parallels between 3SC and the proposed body, Transport for the South East (TfSE). Both programmes would give a greater say to local decision makers about the strategic growth of their area’s infrastructure and economy and they both reflect the benefits of working in partnership. Continued economic success in the South East is threatened by intense pressure on transport networks. Investment is vital, not only to maintain the existing infrastructure, but also to develop new infrastructure which will help unlock the further growth potential in the area. TfSE would speak with a single voice on the area’s transport needs and develop a single integrated transport strategy for the South East.

The initiative comes from the South East Seven (SE7) councils: Brighton and Hove, East Sussex, Hampshire, Kent, Medway, Surrey and West Sussex. Invitations to join have also been made to the Isle of Wight, Portsmouth and Southampton councils. It is expected that four Local Enterprise Partnerships, Coast to Capital, Enterprise M3, Solent and South East will join. Each local authority will now put the proposal to develop TfSE in shadow form to their elected members for approval. If approved, it could begin full operation from 2018/19, with Government agreement.

A report to East Sussex CC’s cabinet on 13 December said: “Proposals to create TfSE are being drawn up “in parallel” to discussions about a devolution deal for the Three Southern Counties – covering Surrey, East Sussex, and West Sussex but added “they are not dependent on one another to be realised”. TfSE’s transport strategy would “complement” the LEPs’ strategic economic plans and “support the delivery” of councils’ local housing plans, the report said.

It is anticipated it could take up to two years for TfSE to gain ministerial approval. The report added: “As we progress towards a more formal body and develop the necessary governance arrangements, we will also have to consider how we can take on board the voice of the borough and district council colleagues most effectively.” Local authorities in Berkshire could also be asked to become members.

Each council involved is being asked to contribute £20,000 towards the cost of creating an overarching transport strategy.

**Brighton & Hove City Council**

The Council has remained outside of the 3SC bid. It is instead working on a Greater Brighton deal. A copy of the devolution prospectus dated September 2015 is here. <https://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/Published/C00000855/M00005736/AI00048274/$20151005123437_007892_0033227_Appendix2DevolutionProspectus.pdfA.ps.pdf>

The first major hurdle was to develop the City Region’s proposals sufficiently to present them at a Ministerial challenge session, which happened on 14 January 2016. The brochure developed to leave with the Minister is here.<https://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/Published/C00000855/M00005737/AI00050068/$BHCCGBRvisionJan2016v6.pdfA.ps.pdf>

The document notes that a Greater Brighton deal can achieve major improvements to transport, digital infrastructure, housing and education and training, which could generate 24,000 jobs and 22,500 new homes over the next decade.

This bid also includes Adur, Lewes and Mid Sussex DCs and Worthing BC, the universities of Brighton and Sussex, the Coast to Capital LEP and South Downs NPA. The four districts, LEP and NPA are also involved in the 3SC bid. 3SC has said it would draw up a formal concordat on working with Brighton and Hove.

The Greater Brighton Economic Board is overseeing progress. Its last meeting on 18 October 2016 has an update at pages 15-20. <https://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/Published/C00000855/M00006107/$$ADocPackPublic.pdf>

A more detailed 38 page update on the devolution bid from the April Board meeting is at: [Update on Greater Brighton Devolution Bid](https://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=94203)

This noted the overall progress of the Greater Brighton Devolution proposals since the 14 January 2016 Ministerial challenge session and updates from the five work streams. It noted draft proposals for the outline of the Strategic Transport Partnership which is subject to further discussion with 3SC and that further resources will be needed to complete and implement the Devolution Deal.

**Greater Manchester Protocol for Joint**

**Working on Workforce Matters**

***Devolution Initiatives and high quality employment***

The Interim Mayor of Greater Manchester, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), the Chief Executive of the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership Board and the Greater Manchester public service trade unions recognise that:

* Staff play a vital role in the delivery of high quality public services
* High quality employment in public services plays a vital role in the functioning of the Greater Manchester economy and society.

The parties to this protocol are committed to working together and with full employee involvement and engagement to ensure that the devolution of powers to the Greater Manchester level can be of benefit to the citizens and employees of the city-region.

The parties note that the broad GM Devolution agenda involves two strands that impact upon the organisation of public service delivery and on workers employed in public services:

1. Initiatives by Greater Manchester public sector organisations to work together in the delivery of public service functions. Some of these ‘shared services’ initiatives pre-date the formal devolution agreement of November 2014. These developments in part reflect the financial pressures on public bodies and the potential benefits to service provision of collaborative working across geographical and service boundaries. Some of these initiatives to date involve collaboration with public bodies outside the Greater Manchester city-region, and some involve a role for the private sector.
2. The development of a new institutional framework at the local and Greater Manchester levels for commissioning health and social care services following the ‘Memorandum of Understanding’ in February 2015. These new arrangements hold the potential for more integrated forms of service provision, across geographical and service (Health and local government) boundaries.

***Principles***

For public service workers, these devolution-related developments hold the prospect of considerable opportunities as well as some potential concerns.

There are opportunities, because devolution offers the prospect of more integrated service delivery which can involve job enrichment, skills development, career progression and a more fulfilling experience of work through more effective delivery of services to the public providing greater job security. There is also scope for the greater provision of apprenticeship places in Greater Manchester, bringing through the next generation of public service workers.

There are though real concerns because of the possibilities of change that detriment may arise from transfers to new employers, privatisation, worsening of pay and terms and conditions, and in unreasonable relocation.

The parties to this protocol agree that these concerns can be addressed through an undertaking that:

1) Where services are reconfigured involving more than one public service employer a partnership approach will be preferred. In all such cases the existing employees of the public sector/publicly funded service provider bodies within the GM ‘family’ of employers involved should remain in the employ of that particular employer unless there is a clear service benefit rationale and/or legal basis not to do so.

2) Every effort will be made to ensure wherever possible there will be no worsening of the pay arrangements, terms and conditions or pensions of staff during or following a change of employer arising from service reconfiguration or new partnership arrangements.

3) It is understood that future developments may involve direct partnership or framework partnership arrangements with private sector and voluntary sector employers. As a starting position, the existing employees of any public sector/publicly funded service provider bodies within the GM ‘family’ of employers involved will not have their employment transferred to the private sector or voluntary sector employer(s) as part of any such arrangement unless there was a clear service benefit rationale and/or legal basis to do so.

4) Positive employee engagement will be integral to the successful achievement of GM ambitions therefore;

# There will be a properly constituted strategic Workforce Engagement Board comprising senior managers, political leaders and trade union representatives. This board will meet on at least a quarterly basis to exchange ideas and proposals, discuss relevant issues of joint concern and seek to reach agreements as appropriate on matters of workforce implications and workforce skills and development arising from or resulting from the early policy formulation, planning and implementation of GM devolution, decentralisation and public service redesign initiatives.

# There will be a Health and Social Care Engagement Forum comprising trade union and employer representatives which will feed into the strategic Workforce Engagement Board and report to the Health and Social Care Engagement partnership board.

# There will be a nominated GM trade union representative and a nominated GM employer ‘family’ representative who shall jointly and severally act as central contacts to support the strategic Workforce Engagement Board and facilitate clear communication and co-ordination between the GM trades unions and the GM ‘family’ of employers.

These points should guide practice in all shared service initiatives involving Greater Manchester public bodies, and by the new city-region and local level commissioning bodies developed in integration of health and social care.

***Consultation Arrangements***

The treatment of staff is a key component in delivering change and staff engagement via the union’s consultation processes is essential. Trade union involvement is central to the success of devolution. This has been evidenced nationally in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Greater Manchester will seek to build upon these models of partnership working.

In order to ensure maximum staff engagement any proposals which will impact on staff must be the subject of early consultation. This requires meaningful engagement by employers before any major decision is confirmed or agreed.

Where two or more Greater Manchester public bodies propose to deliver a service across geographical and/ or service boundaries, the Greater Manchester trade unions will create Workforce Project Leads to facilitate full consultation and staff engagement with all affected employers. The best means of supporting this work is through joint employer facility release. This approach has been successful in recent years in the implementation of Single Status and Job Evaluation in Local Government and Agenda for Change in Health. Any joint employer facility release would require clarity of outcomes and activity from such release and require agreement with the relevant employers.

Significant proposals such as large scale reorganisation or workforce reconfiguration will be subject to consideration at the Greater Manchester Workforce Engagement Board as detailed below but all negotiation and collective bargaining remain within the existing local employer arrangements.

A Greater Manchester Workforce Engagement Board (WEB) will oversee workforce change in the city-region and the application, continuous review and interpretation of this workforce protocol.

The parties to this protocol agree that a commitment to Greater Manchester-wide principles, overseen by the new WEB, combined with robust arrangements for meaningful local consultation, will together help facilitate consensual change in workforce matters that will best ensure that the potential gains from devolution are realised for Greater Manchester.

The co-ordination of union representatives on the WEB will be overseen by the Public Services Committee of the North West TUC.

It is proposed that these Terms of Reference are agreed as part of the development of the GM Workforce Engagement Board and are submitted to all parties on that basis for consideration.