



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

The Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and
Sheffield Combined Authority

The West Yorkshire Combined Authority

The Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens,
Sefton and Wirral Combined Authority

Summary of responses to consultations on proposals to
establish the Combined Authorities

© Crown copyright, 2014

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/dclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, email contactus@communities.gov.uk or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

February 2014

ISBN: 978-1-4098-4138-8

Contents

Section 1 Introduction.....4

Section 2 The consultations.....5

Section 3 Summary of responses.....6

Section 1: Introduction

1. The Secretary of State has laid before Parliament draft Orders, which if approved by Parliament and subsequently made, will establish the Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority; the West Yorkshire Combined Authority; and the Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton and Wirral Combined Authority. In each case the Order will also abolish the Integrated Transport Authority for the area. These Orders are to be made under the Transport Act 1985, the Local Transport Act 2008 and the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act).
2. Under the 2009 Act it is for the councils concerned to initiate the process for establishing a combined authority, by undertaking a governance review and publishing a scheme for such an authority, which will, across the area concerned exercise transport, economic development and regeneration functions. In each of the three cases, the councils concerned have done this and come forward with a scheme to establish the Combined Authority.
3. Thereafter, as required by the 2009 Act, the Secretary of State has consulted all authorities which are within the proposed area of the Combined Authority, and other persons considered appropriate, on proposals to make Orders to establish the Combined Authority. This paper summarises the responses received to the consultations on proposals to establish each of these three Combined Authorities.
4. As the 2009 Act also requires, in each case the Secretary of State:
 - considers that establishing the combined authority is likely to improve the following (the “four statutory tests”)
 - the exercise of statutory functions relating to transport in the area,
 - the effectiveness and efficiency of transport in the area,
 - the exercise of statutory functions relating to economic development and regeneration in the area, and
 - economic conditions in the area; and
 - has had regard to the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and to secure effective and convenient local government.
5. In reaching his conclusion to lay these draft Orders the Secretary of State has adopted the policy that whilst considering the circumstances of each case, where councils come forward with proposals for a combined authority which command wide local support and meet the statutory conditions, he will invite Parliament to approve the Order establishing that combined authority. He also had regard to the fact that the case for these combined authorities is reinforced by the commitments in the City Deals for the areas concerned, which Government has agreed.

Section 2: The consultations

6. Each consultation sought views on the proposal to establish the Combined Authority concerned and in particular:
 - on whether it was considered that establishing the proposed combined authority would be likely to improve the provision of transport in the area and its effectiveness and efficiency, the provision of economic development and regeneration in the area, and the economic conditions in the area;
 - on how establishing such an authority may impact on the identities and interests of local communities and on securing effective and convenient local government;
 - on the proposed constitutional arrangements (including the formal name of the combined authority) and functions for a combined authority, and
 - on how such an authority and the local enterprise partnership can work in a seamless manner to ensure the private sector is 'hardwired' into the leadership and decision making for the functional economic area.
7. Each consultation ran for eight weeks, starting with Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority on 12 August 2013 and ending with Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton and Wirral Combined Authority which closed on 22 January 2014. The consultation documents¹ were available on the GOV.UK website and responses could be returned to the Department for Communities and Local Government by email or by post. Local authorities consulted were invited to draw the consultation to the attention of members of the public, local businesses and their representative bodies and the voluntary sector.

¹ The consultation proposing the establishment of the Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helen, Sefton and Wirral Combined Authority was entitled "Proposal to establish a combined authority for Greater Merseyside."

Section 3: Summary of responses

Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority

Overview

8. The consultation ran from 12 August to 7 October 2013. The Government received twenty one representations on the proposal to establish a combined authority for the area of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield. Of these there were:
 - seven from local organisations delivering public services and their representative bodies (including four from local government).
 - ten from parish and town councils; and
 - four from local residents.
9. An additional six responses received did not respond directly to any of the consultation questions: three sought clarification on the organisation of local government should the combined authority be established; two sought clarification on the status of the combined authority as an administering authority for the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Pension Fund and one contained no relevant material.
10. The statutory consultees other than the Integrated Transport Authority (Barnsley Council, Doncaster Council, Rotherham Council, and Sheffield City Council) in conjunction with the five non-constituent councils of Bassetlaw, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales and North East Derbyshire districts submitted a joint response.

Statutory consultees

11. The councils' joint response confirmed support for the establishment of a combined authority. It also confirmed the view that a combined authority would improve transport, economic development and regeneration and deliver growth across the functional economical area. This view was also supported by the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority.
12. These respondents made representations about the proposed name for the combined authority that the Government consulted upon ("South Yorkshire Combined Authority"). They indicated that they would prefer either the "Sheffield City Region Combined Authority" or the "Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield and North East Midlands Combined Authority."

Other organisations invited to respond by the Secretary of State

13. All organisations that the Secretary of State invited to comment support the Combined Authority. The county councils, Derby City Council and the Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) Local Enterprise Partnership supported the principle of establishing the combined authority but expressed

concerns that the overlap of areas involving the non-constituent councils could lead to additional complexities which could prove damaging to the long term economic development of their area. Nottinghamshire County Council made representations that the establishment of the combined authority should be delayed. Subsequently there have been discussions involving the councils' chief executives resulting, the department has been informed, in agreements to put in place a clear structure for future joint working in order to overcome the complexities of any overlap.

Other responses

14. Ten parish and town councils responded to the consultation. Whilst two of these were supportive of the establishment of the Combined Authority, the remainder saw no benefit in the establishment of this body or felt it could take away the identity of parish councils and diminish their role. Of the four responses to the consultation from members of the public, two were in favour of the establishment of the combined authority whilst two were against it.

Local support

15. To shape the Governance Review and Scheme that was submitted to the Department by the 'Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership' an iterative period of consultation was undertaken with all stakeholders including proposed members of the combined authority, the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority, neighbouring authorities, the local enterprise partnership and neighbouring Local Enterprise Partnerships, local MPs, public bodies, the Chambers of Commerce, the Company of Cutlers and other private sector bodies, regulatory bodies and third sector bodies. The local enterprise partnership has suggested that the conclusion of this local consultation was that there was overwhelming support for the proposal.

West Yorkshire Combined Authority

Overview

16. The consultation ran from 7 November 2013 to 2 January 2014. The Government received sixty one representations on the proposal to establish a combined authority for the area of West Yorkshire, of which twenty two did not respond directly to the consultation questions and made comments which did not relate to the proposals within the consultation document. Of the remaining thirty nine responses, there were:
- one joint response from the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership, authorised by the individual West Yorkshire Councils (the constituent members of the combined authority), York Council, and the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority;
 - nineteen local government bodies and their representatives including the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the Integrated Transport Authority and twelve local authorities;
 - eleven from local residents;
 - two from the community and charity sector;
 - six others- three from business (the Federation of Small Businesses, a property developer and a solicitors); and one each from Leeds Bradford International Airport, Visit York and UNISON.
17. Of the twenty two which did not address the consultation issues, comments were particularly made around York's proposed role (for example, not wishing for York taxpayers to be required to fund improvements in West Yorkshire and concern that York's autonomy would be compromised). The consultation proposed the City of York as a non-constituent member of the combined authority, meaning that it would not form part of the combined authority's area; and they would face no financial obligations.
18. Of the thirty nine representations, twenty seven (69%) supported the proposal to establish a combined authority for the area of West Yorkshire, four (10%) did not express a view on whether they supported the proposals, and eight (21%) did not agree.

Statutory consultees

19. The statutory consultees of the district councils of Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield and Leeds City Council and the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority provided a joint response (along with the non statutory consultee of the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership). The West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority also responded separately.
20. All statutory consultees support the establishment of the combined authority. Their responses:
- confirm the view that a combined authority would improve transport, economic development and regeneration and deliver growth – considering that the absence of a single strategic transport and economic development decision making body for West Yorkshire has prevented the area from fully realising its

City Deal ambitions and is a key reason why the economy has been underperforming;

- state that a combined authority would not adversely affect the identity and interests of local communities and that it would provide effective and convenient local government - because the connection with district authorities would be retained, and the combined authority will only lead where it makes sense, in terms of efficiency or effectiveness;
- support the proposed membership and constitutional arrangements, including the proposed name of the combined authority; and
- set out in further detail how the combined authority and local enterprise partnership will work together, supporting democratic accountability and a clear business voice through the local enterprise partnership's representation.

Other organisations invited to respond by the Secretary of State

21. The local enterprise partnership, the non-constituent council of the City of York, and the neighbouring local authority councils of Craven, Harrogate, North Yorkshire, Oldham, Rochdale, and Rossendale provided responses to the consultation document at the invitation of the Secretary of State. All of the organisations that responded support the proposal to establish the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. In addition Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership's response outlines how all of the statutory tests are met by the combined authority and sets out how the seamless relationship between the local enterprise partnership and the combined authority will be secured.
22. North Yorkshire Council – whilst explicitly stating that they did not wish to raise objections to the principle of the establishment of a combined authority across West Yorkshire covering the areas of Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds and Wakefield – they voiced concern about any future change that would undermine its ability to coordinate across the whole county of North Yorkshire.
23. The City of York Council is supportive of its proposed membership as a non-constituent authority, citing its growing connectivity with the Leeds City Region in transport and economic development and affirming its commitment to working with West Yorkshire. Its response also reaffirms its commitment to continue to work with North Yorkshire authorities as well, reflecting the city's complex overlapping economic geographies.

Other responses

24. Responses were received from others including Leeds Bradford International Airport, UNISON (West Yorkshire Transport Branch), businesses and their representative organisations, local government bodies and their representative bodies, community and charity organisations and members of the public. The responses in favour of the proposed combined authority cited the potential to maximise economic growth through coordinated governance arrangements. Concerns were voiced regarding tax issues, environmental comments, and concerns about an additional layer of government.

25. Ten members of the public offered a view on the proposed combined authority, of which five were in support and five were not. Responses in favour of the combined authority cite the benefits of cross-border integration of transport functions. Those who disagreed are all from York residents and concern York's perceived junior position within the combined authority and the lack of consultation in York.

Local support

26. The five local authorities and the Integrated Transport Authority concerned undertook public consultation prior to their governance review from their residents and local businesses. One hundred and four responses were received from this consultation, 68% of which were from members of the public and 23% from business. 67% of the respondents supported the Interim Review recommendations, 76% supported the proposed geography of the combined authority and 68% felt that a combined authority would improve statutory council functions. Where respondents expressed support for the combined authority, reasons typically cited were the enhanced bargaining power a combined authority provided, potential efficiency savings, and the opportunity for integrated planning and reduced fragmentation.

Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton and Wirral Combined Authority

Overview

27. The consultation ran from 28 November 2013 to 22 January 2014. The Government received one hundred and thirty representations on the proposal to establish this Combined Authority.

28. Of the ninety eight responses received that offered an opinion on the combined authority, seventy (71%) responses were in favour of the combined authority and twenty eight (29%) were against it. A further thirty two responses (24% of the total received), all from members of the public, offered no opinion on the combined authority.

29. Responses came from:

- 9 local authorities including the constituent councils
- 12 businesses
- 4 NHS trusts
- 3 faith/church groups
- 3 travel bodies (the Merseyside ITA, Merseyrail, and Arriva)
- 2 MPs
- 2 think tank/campaign groups
- 1 local petition
- 1 Local Enterprise Partnership
- 1 Combined Authority
- 1 charity
- 1 Chamber of Commerce
- 1 Police and Crime Commissioner
- 1 Liberal Democrat Group for Sefton
- 1 University
- 87 members of the public.

30. Ninety four respondents, including all of the statutory consultees, included a request for a change of name from that consulted on ("The Greater Merseyside Combined Authority"). The ninety four consultees that requested a change to the name were strongly in support of a name for the combined authority that included the word 'Liverpool', rather than 'Merseyside', in order to capitalise and build upon Liverpool's global 'brand'.

Statutory consultees

31. The statutory consultees of the local authorities of Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton, and Wirral and the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority provided responses.

32. All statutory consultees support the establishment of the Combined Authority. Their responses:
- confirm the view that a combined authority would improve transport, economic development and deliver growth – considering that the absence of a single strategic transport and economic development decision making body for Greater Merseyside has prevented the area from fully realising its City Deal ambitions;
 - state that a combined authority would not adversely affect the identity and interests of local communities and that it would provide effective and convenient local government – because the connection with the local authorities would be retained, and the combined authority will only lead where it makes sense, in terms of efficiency or effectiveness;
 - support the proposed membership and constitutional arrangements – except for the proposed name of the combined authority; and
 - set out in further detail how the combined authority and local enterprise partnership will work together, supporting democratic accountability and a clear business voice through the local enterprise partnership’s representation.

Other organisations invited to respond by the Secretary of State

33. The local enterprise partnership and the neighbouring local authority councils of Cheshire West and Chester and West Lancashire provided responses to the consultation document at the invitation of the Secretary of State. All of the organisations that responded were in support of the proposal to establish this combined authority, as was the Greater Manchester Combined Authority. The Liverpool City Region Local Enterprise Partnership’s response outlines how all the statutory tests are met by the combined authority, and sets out how the seamless relationship between the local enterprise partnership and the combined authority will be secured.
34. Cheshire West and Chester Council stated their support for the combined authority due to the benefits in provision of transport and economic development and regeneration and economic conditions that would extend into Cheshire and Warrington.
35. West Lancashire Borough Council stated their support for the combined authority due to expected improvements in transport and economic growth in the region. It requests that consideration be given to it having some form of observer status role within the combined authority.

Other responses

36. Responses were received from others including businesses and their representative organisations, representatives of the charity and faith sectors, NHS Trusts, the University of Liverpool, local government bodies, and members of the public. The responses in favour of the Combined Authority included all four of the NHS Trusts, the University, the Chamber of Commerce and the three faith / church groups. Issues cited include the potential to maximise economic growth through coordinated transport and governance arrangements. Concerns over potentially inadequate scrutiny arrangements were raised.

37. Eighty seven members of the public commented on the Combined Authority, of whom fifty five offered an opinion on it. Thirty one (56%) were in favour of the combined authority and twenty four (44%) were against it. The responses in favour cited the increased potential for economic growth that a combined authority would bring. Concerns were raised by residents of smaller local authorities that they may lose out financially and identity-wise to larger centres such as Liverpool. There was one local petition from the St Helens area which was against the combined authority.
38. Of the thirty two responses from the public that offered no opinion on the combined authority, twenty nine (88%) had stated that the name of the combined authority should be changed but did not state whether or not they supported the establishment of the Combined Authority. The remaining three raised queries.

Local support

39. The six local authorities and the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority undertook a local consultation during summer 2013 on draft proposals before publishing their scheme for a combined authority. One hundred and seventy nine stakeholders responded, including the local enterprise partnership, businesses, neighbouring local authorities, members of the public and strategic partners. An overwhelmingly positive response was received from this local consultation. 86% believed that the combined authority would improve statutory functions relating to transport, economic development and regeneration for the area, 83% believed it would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of transport, and 86% believed it would improve economic conditions for the area. Other respondents voiced opposition to the role of the combined authority, as well as its geographical coverage, operation and accountability, and proposed leadership mechanisms.