

APPENDIX 3

Liverpool City Region Governance Review

Summary Report of Consultation

Final Report – 11 September 2013

APPENDIX 3

1. Introduction

- 1.1 It was agreed at the Liverpool City Region Cabinet meeting on 21 June 2013 that a review of strategic governance arrangements in the Liverpool City Region area should be undertaken. This area includes the authorities of Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St. Helens and Wirral, as well as the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority. The approach taken to undertake this governance review was in accordance with Section 108 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.
- 1.2 After evaluating the current available evidence and the options available to the City Region, it was proposed to explore further the option of a Liverpool City Region Combined Authority model, and to include the functions currently exercised by the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority and Halton's strategic transport function. This would give legal form to the close working relationships that already exist between the six local authorities, the Integrated Transport Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership by creating a sub-regional body with legal personality and a governance mechanism that can act across the combined area.
- 1.3 This course of action was approved by each of the constituent authorities during July and August 2013.
- 1.4 The statutory process to establish a Combined Authority or Economic Prosperity Board has three main steps:
 - First, a review of existing governance arrangements for the delivery of economic development, regeneration and transport. This must lead to the conclusion that there is a case for changing these arrangements based upon real improvements.
 - Second, drawing up and consulting on a scheme for the new body upon which the authorities are required to engage to secure support amongst stakeholders. All constituent Councils are required to approve the scheme for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
 - Finally, the Secretary of State will consider the scheme and undertake a formal consultation. If satisfied with the proposals, a draft order will be laid before both Houses of Parliament for adoption by affirmative resolution.
- 1.5 To this end, a report outlining the potential role for a Liverpool City Region Combined Authority was produced, and published for consultation in summer 2013. This Report of Consultation presents the findings of the consultation undertaken on the potential role for the new body. It also sets out how the authorities and their partners have engaged with stakeholders regarding the proposals, through workshops, events and meetings. The report also contains a summary of the findings of this consultation exercise, including the detail of how stakeholders have responded to the proposals.

APPENDIX 3

2. About the Consultation

- 2.1 The consultation ran from until 2 August until 12 noon on Friday 6 September 2013. The documents made available included:
- Liverpool City Region Strategic Governance Review: Draft for Consultation (August 2013)
 - Liverpool City Region Governance Review: Outline of the Potential Role for a Liverpool City Region Combined Authority: Draft for Consultation (August 2013)
 - Review of Governance arrangements in Liverpool City Region - Frequently asked questions (August 2013)
 - Liverpool City Region Governance Review Feedback form (August 2013) – see Appendix A of this report.
- 2.2 **Publication of Materials** – Consultation materials were published online, on each of the constituent authority websites. The publication of materials was accompanied by media releases, which led to articles in a range of online publications and newspapers.
- 2.3 **Targeted Consultations** – Each of the constituent authorities, as well as the Local Enterprise Partnership, targeted a wide range of stakeholders and interested organisations / individuals across the geographical area of the Liverpool City Region and also in surrounding areas. This included over 10,000 business (targeted through the Local Enterprise Partnership members, Chambers of Commerce and Local Authority contacts) and 500 partner organisations (contacted by Local Authorities and the Integrated Transport Authority). Appendix A of this report lists the types of organisations and individuals in receipt of this targeted consultation.
- 2.4 These consultees were invited to events and meetings and/or provided with a specific feedback form setting out key questions to respond to (see Appendix B of this report).
- 2.5 **Events and Meetings** – The constituent authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership held a wide range of events and meetings with key stakeholders, as well as public drop-in sessions, across the consultation period.
- 2.6 **Online Consultation** – As noted, each of the authorities made available the consultation materials on their websites. The consultation was publicised through news stories on each of these websites, and also by complementary promotion through social networking tools of Facebook and Twitter. Each of the authorities also included the consultation as new items for circulation on internal and external online briefings for employees, partners and customers.
- 2.7 **Accessibility** – The consultation materials were made available in other languages and formats on request from the local authorities.

APPENDIX 3

3. Collection and Analysis of Consultation Responses



- 3.1 **Receipt of Responses** – Responses were returned to each authority and collated centrally for the purpose of summary and analysis. Where requested, confirmation of receipt was given. In addition, the location of the respondent was requested, to determine the local authority, or wider area if relating to a cross boundary or sub-regional organisation, from which the response came.
- 3.2 **Coding and Summarising Responses** – Each of the responses received were analysed in detail, and the key messages from each recorded. This includes analysis of specific feedback forms, as well as general letters and emails received during the consultation period. This process is described in more detail, as follows.
- 3.3 **Feedback Form** – For those respondents filling in the detailed consultation feedback form (Appendix A), their responses were quantified in terms of the “yes”, “no”, or “other” answers, for each question element of the form (questions 1 to 5). Those questions which were returned unanswered were marked as “no response”. In addition, qualitative analysis was undertaken on any supplementary comments or explanations made in relation to questions 1 to 5, and also in response to question 6, which asked for any further comments.
- 3.4 **General Feedback** – For those respondents returning an email or letter, their responses were analysed initially relation to the questions on the feedback form. This involved interpreting their answers in relation to any specific or general positive or negative comments made in relation to the themes of the questions on the form. In many cases, the specifics of the consultation questions were not covered in the email or letter, and hence the ability to ascertain a “yes” or “no” response to the question was limited. In this case, a “no response” category was recorded.
- 3.5 Many of the letters or emails received included detailed commentary regarding the proposals, which may not have been linked to any of the specific questions on the feedback form. These comments were recorded in summary, in the same manner as specific responses to question 6, i.e. as “any other comments”.
- 3.6 The following sections set out the findings of the consultation using both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the feedback received.

4 Summary of Responses – Quantitative Analysis

- 4.1 **Quantity of Responses** – In total, 176 responses were received. This includes 65 emails and letters, and 111 specific consultation feedback forms.
- 4.2 **Sources of Responses** – Of the 176 total responses received, the largest proportion, a total of 47 responses, were from Local Authority Representatives. In addition, 26 were from Members of the Public and 32 from Other Public Sector Organisations. Several neighbouring authorities responded to the proposals, including West Lancashire Borough Council and the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities.

APPENDIX 3

4.3 The following charts set out the breakdown of responses by the location from which the response was sent (local authority area / wider area) and by the type of respondent recorded.




APPENDIX 3

4.3 Responses to Feedback Form Questions – the following sections set out the quantitative analysis of the responses to the feedback form questions 1 to 5, either given as part of response submissions, or attributed through the process of analysis of the general feedback received, as described in paragraph 3.4.

1. Does the evidence presented enable you to arrive at the conclusion that a Combined Authority for Liverpool City Region would improve:

(a) The exercise of statutory functions relating to economic development, regeneration and transport in the area?




Key feedback:

- 153 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 23 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 87% responded “yes”
 - 8% responded “no”
 - 5% answered with a different response

1. Does the evidence presented enable you to arrive at the conclusion that a Combined Authority for Liverpool City Region would improve:

(b) The effectiveness and efficiency of transport?




Key feedback:

- 147 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 29 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 84% responded “yes”
 - 9% responded “no”
 - 7% answered with a different response

APPENDIX 3

1. Does the evidence presented enable you to arrive at the conclusion that a Combined Authority for Liverpool City Region would improve:


(c) The economic conditions in the area?



Key feedback:

- 152 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 24 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 87% responded “yes”
 - 8% responded “no”
 - 5% answered with a different response

2. Do you think the draft Scheme proposed supports the economic rationale for Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral to come together to drive jobs and growth in the Liverpool City Region?




Key feedback:

- 152 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 24 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 88% responded “yes”
 - 7% responded “no”
 - 5% answered with a different response

APPENDIX 3


3. Can you support the establishment of a Combined Authority which will provide strategic leadership on economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills?



Key feedback:

- 165 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 11 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 85% responded “yes”
 - 13% responded “no”
 - 2% answered with a different response

4. Based on the proposed membership of the Combined Authority, will it be able to provide strong strategic leadership to drive jobs and growth in the City Region?




Key feedback:

- 150 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 26 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 76% responded “yes”
 - 10% responded “no”
 - 14% answered with a different response

APPENDIX 3

5. Do you feel the proposed links between the Combined Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership would be strong enough? If not, how do you think this relationship should be further strengthened?



Key feedback:

- 109 out of 176 respondents provided an answer to this question
- 67 respondents did not answer this question
- Of those responding:
 - 68% responded “yes”
 - 5% responded “no”
 - 27% answered with a different response

5. Summary of Responses – Qualitative Analysis

5.1 In addition to quantitative analysis undertaken, the detailed comments made in association with responses have been recorded and summarised. This includes analysis of the general feedback submitted by email or letter, but also analysis of the additional commentary added to the consultation feedback form, as described in paragraphs 3.4 – 3.6.

5.2 Several broad themes have been identified in terms of qualitative responses. These are listed below:

- **Theme 1 – Overall proposal** – comments relating to the overall proposal to create a Combined Authority in the Liverpool City Region
- **Theme 2 – Governance and accountability** – issues raised relating to the potential operation of the Combined Authority, and how it will be held accountable for its responsibilities once operational
- **Theme 3 – Strategic leadership**– comments regarding the potential leadership and governance arrangements within the proposed Combined Authority
- **Theme 4 – Strategic priorities** – issues raised regarding the thematic priorities which could be addressed by the Combined Authority
- **Theme 5 – Geographical coverage** – comments regarding the coverage of the Combined Authority across the Liverpool City Region and wider area
- **Theme 6 – Role of authorities and partners** – comments regarding the relative role of authorities within the Combined Authority, and the roles of partner organisations
- **Theme 7 – Additional partner involvement** – comments regarding the widening of the Combined Authority activities to include additional partners or stakeholders

APPENDIX 3

- **Theme 8 – Wider Impacts** – issues raised regarding the wider impacts of the proposal on local authority activities and the wider sub-region
- **Theme 9 – Miscellaneous** – further issues and matters raised.
- **Theme 10 – Consultation Process** – comments regarding the process of governance review and the corresponding consultation activities.

5.3 The responses are analysed under these themes and shown in Appendix C.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1 From 2 August 2013 until 6 September 2013, a consultation was undertaken on a proposed review of strategic governance in the Liverpool City Region. The review proposed the creation of a Combined Authority covering all six Liverpool City Region Local Authorities of Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral, as well as the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority. The authorities and their partners led an extensive consultation exercise, which included a range of targeted communications with key partners and stakeholders, as well as a number of drop in events for local businesses and members of the public. Consultation materials were made available by each authority online, including a set consultation feedback form.
- 6.2 Overall, 176 responses to the consultation were received. Responses came from varied sources, including members of the public, political representatives, local businesses, as well as other public and private sector organisations. Responses were received from across the Liverpool City Region area, including several from each of the local authority areas.
- 6.3 In summary, there was overwhelming support for the proposals to create a Combined Authority in the Liverpool City Region. Many key partners voiced their strong support, and stated that the proposals would bring many economic benefits to the Liverpool City Region. In addition, significant support was expressed for the transport arrangements proposed. It was also considered that proposed changes to statutory functions would be largely beneficial. The impacts of the proposed Combined Authority on partnership working, collaboration and ability to access funding for the Liverpool City Region authorities were widely praised. Many respondents voiced their support for the proposed operation, accountability and leadership of the proposed Combined Authority, as well as strong support for the involvement of the Local Enterprise Partnership.
- 6.4 A significant number of respondents were keen to extend and expand the Combined Authority proposals, to include additional geographical areas, different functions and further identified partners both in the public and private sector. Further suggestions were made in relation to the operation and governance of the proposed Combined Authority.
- 6.5 Some respondents did voice opposition to the proposals. This opposition included views regarding the role of the proposed Combined Authority, as well its geographical coverage, operation and accountability, and proposed leadership mechanisms. Respondents also voiced conflicting views regarding the strategic priorities which should be pursued by any Combined Authority.

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX A: FULL LIST OF RESPONDENTS

Category	Responses	Specific Responses
Local Authority Representative	47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 Knowsley Elected Members • 2 Liverpool Elected Members • 1 Sefton Elected Members • 29 Wirral Elected Members • 1 Wirral Officer
Integrated Transport Authority Representative	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority • Merseyside Passenger Transport Executive
Government Department / Agency Representative	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWP – Merseyside Job Centre Plus District • BIS North West
Other Political Representative	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Twigg MP • Dave Watts MP • Halton Liberal Democrats • Jacqueline Foster MEP • Knowsley Town Council • West Lancashire Borough Council • Manchester City Council / GM Combined Authority • George Howarth MP • Esther McVey MP • Shaun Woodward MP • Bill Esterson MP • Joe Benton MP
Local Business Representative	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peel Holdings (Management) Limited • Lisa Simpson Inclusive Dance Ltd • PWD Solutions • Marshall Turner • Brabners LLP • Burgundy Gold Ltd • Crowne Plaza Liverpool • RTC North Ltd • Liverpool John Lennon Airport • Local Solutions • A4E • Knowsley Chamber of Commerce • St.Helens Chamber of Commerce • Arup • Getrag Ford / KCC • Barnhodge Veterinary Hospital • Synchronise Careers Consultancy • Netrespect Training Ltd • Scribe Shop Fitting Ltd • PKT Solutions Ltd

APPENDIX 3

Category	Responses	Specific Responses
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowsley Safari Park • Wild Vision TV Media • Cleargound Ltd • Jaguar Land Rover • Peel Group
Voluntary / Community Sector Representative	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Halton and St.Helens Voluntary Community Action • Churches Together in Wirral • Wirral Country Park Friends Group, Wirral OPP, Vintage Community Radio Station, Wirral Parks Friend Forum • Anglican Deanery • Comtechsa • Hoylake Village Life Community Interest Company • Vauxhall Neighbourhood Council • Greater Merseyside ChangeUp Consortium • Knowsley Community and Voluntary Services • Platform 51 • Various (Member of the Public) • Care and Respite Support Services • Big Help Project • Big Help Project – Knowsley Good Bank • Church & Society, Liverpool Diocese • Kirkby Team Ministry • Knowsley Supported Lodgings • Vee's Place • Sefton Community and Voluntary Services • Social Enterprise Network • St.Helens Christian Life Centre • Greenbank Tenants and Residents Association
Local Transport Provider Representative	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arriva North West and Wales • Merseyrail
Other Public Sector Representative	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helena Partnerships • Merseyside Police (St.Helens) • Royal Liverpool and Broadgreen University Hospitals NHS Trust • St.Helens Clinical Commissioning Group • Liverpool Institute of Performing Arts • Chief Constable Merseyside Police • Greater Merseyside Learning Provider Federation • Myerscough College • North West Trades Union Congress • Hugh Baird College (2) • First Ark Group

APPENDIX 3

Category	Responses	Specific Responses
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plus Dane Group • Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority • University of Liverpool • Knowsley Housing Trust • Merseyside Police • One Ark (KHT) • North Huyton NDC • Southport College • Wirral University Teaching Hospitals • Halton Housing Trust • Cheshire & Wirral Partnership NHS Foundation Trust • Villages Housing Trust • The Riverside Group • Liverpool Housing Trust • Merseyside Police and Crime Commissioner • Bridgewater Community Hospital Trust • Home Group • Carmel College • St.Helens College • Knowsley Community College • Liverpool Mutual Homes
Member of the Public	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 Members of the Public
Other	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlock Democracy Merseyside and West Cheshire Group • Liverpool LEP • Mersey Dee Alliance • Local Nature Partnership • Sefton Green Party • St Helens Green Party
Total	176	

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX B: CONSULTATION FEEDBACK FORM

LIVERPOOL CITY REGION GOVERNANCE REVIEW

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Liverpool City Region is conducting a review of its' strategic governance. Based on the current available evidence, this review has recommended that the City Region would be better served in terms of its prospects for economic growth if it established a Combined Authority. The Combined Authority would provide strong governance, democratic accountability and an opportunity for powers and funding to be devolved from national Government.

Name	
Organisation	
Date	
1. Does the evidence presented enable you to arrive at the conclusion that a Combined Authority for Liverpool City Region would improve: a. The exercise of statutory functions relating to economic development, regeneration and transport in the area? b. The effectiveness and efficiency of transport? c. The economic conditions in the area?	
2. Do you think the draft Scheme proposed supports the economic rationale for Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral to come together to drive jobs and growth in the Liverpool City Region?	
3. Can you support the establishment of a Combined Authority which will provide strategic leadership on economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills?	

APPENDIX 3

4. Based on the proposed membership of the Combined Authority, will it be able to provide strong strategic leadership to drive jobs and growth in the City Region?

5. Do you feel the proposed links between the Combined Authority and the Local Enterprise Partnership would be strong enough? If not, how do you think this relationship should be further strengthened?

6. Do you have any other comments on this proposal?

Recording officer _____

Date _____

This form should be sent through to lcr.governance@knowsley.gov.uk by 12 noon on Friday 6 September 2013.

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX C – COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS

Theme 1 - Overall proposal

The evidence provided suggests establishment of a Combined Authority would be both beneficial to the Region and consistent with the findings of the review undertaken by Rt Hon the Lord Heseltine and Sir Terry Leahy in 2011.

Jon Murphy, Chief Constable, Merseyside Police

In broad terms, the Trust supports the proposals to create a combined authority. The overall case set out in the consultation documents is well presented and argued to the extent that none of the alternative options outlined appear to be viable going forward in comparison.

Nick Atkin, Chief Executive, Halton Housing Trust

There was general support for the recommendation of the governance view, and the role that this would play in promoting and securing economic growth. The Combined Authority would also allow the City Region to punch its weight and above at a national and international level. Respondents were also clear that the Combined Authority recommendation would allow an integration of existing services, which should improve their effectiveness and the overall economic conditions of the area. The focus on the City Region as the right geographical level was supported.

The opportunity to deliver more through collaboration was welcomed by many respondents, with the consequent positive impact of jobs and growth. This was felt to be particularly important in dealings with Government and business. It was considered that this would lead to additional funding and investment.

Some concerns were expressed about whether a Combined Authority is needed given the existing governance arrangements, which were seen to be effective. There were also issues raised around the whether changes needed to be made to existing transport activity and delivery, which was seen to be effective. There was a desire to capture learning from elsewhere and ensure that the mistakes of the past with Merseyside County Council were avoided.

Liverpool City Region Response

The overall support from consultees for the proposal to create a Combined Authority for the Liverpool City Region is welcome. This will not recreate Merseyside County Council but will instead formalise the existing informal arrangements that have been in place across the City Region since 2007. This will provide clear, transparent and accountable leadership for strategic economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills, which will command greater confidence of businesses and Government alike as the City Region seeks to support economic growth and the creation of more and better jobs.

The City Region has seen some narrowing of the gap with national performance around productivity, economic output, skills and income in recent years, but there is still a distance to travel. The introduction of a Combined Authority for the City Region will provide the framework to accelerate this process.

APPENDIX 3

Theme 2: Governance and accountability

We have all acknowledged the need to develop new and deeper collaborations to deliver our key objectives, and I see these governance review proposals as a further sign of that commitment and an illustration of the growing political maturity in the City Region. The creation of a Combined Authority will undoubtedly lead to an improvement in the local economic environment through transparent, visible and accountable leadership, which should command greater confidence from businesses.

Prof Sir Howard Newby, Vice Chancellor, University of Liverpool

There was support for the model of the Combined Authority to add value to the work of local Councils. The governance model was thought to be transparent, with support provided for the co-option of the Chair of the LEP Board. The outlined role for Scrutiny was welcomed, but a number of respondents considered that this could be strengthened. Respondents supported building on existing assets and strengths, and ensuring that the City Region could evidence the additional outcomes that a Combined Authority would deliver.

The streamlined approach to governance was generally understood and supported, but some concerns were expressed as to whether views and insights from other groups would be missed; this could be addressed through advisory and partnership structures, which allow the involvements of additional local voices.

Liverpool City Region Response

The remit of the Combined Authority around strategic economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills is defined by primary legislation and can only be extended via a change to legislation.

The Combined Authority will be formed by the Elected Mayor / Leaders of the 6 Councils, who will co-opt the Chair of the LEP with voting rights. The Combined Authority will agree a Constitution, which will be underpinned by a detailed operating agreement.

The meetings of the Combined Authority will be held in public and there will be a cross party scrutiny function which will be made up of Elected Members from the 6 constituent Councils. Additional Boards and Committees will be asked to lead areas of activity for the Combined Authority as outlined in the Governance Review report.

The Combined Authority will provide an annual update on the state of the City Region's economy and set out its plans to achieve its targets.

APPENDIX 3

Theme 3: Strategic leadership

I believe the Combined Authority would provide more effective arrangements for key strategic decision making in the Liverpool City Region and strengthen our competitiveness in attracting inward investment for economic development and regeneration. There are clear benefits to a more joined up approach to transport planning which I believe would be more efficient and effective.

Steve Logan, Principal, Knowsley Community College

Respondents generally considered that the proposals would strengthen strategic leadership in the City Region, which would be accountable and transparent, although there were some dissenting views on this. A number of respondents supported rotating the Chair of the Combined Authority regularly and ensuring that all areas would benefit from the work of the Combined Authority.

The openness and accountability offered was strongly welcomed by many respondents, along with the input from a business perspective.

Liverpool City Region Response

The Combined Authority will be able to provide clear, transparent and accountable leadership for strategic economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills across the City Region as a whole and for the benefit of the City Region as a whole: there is no body at the current time who can do this.

Each of the six Councils will have one representative on the Combined Authority, who will be charged with acting in the best interests of the City Region as a whole. There will be an annual election of Chair of the Combined Authority. Unanimous support of the Combined Authority will be required to co-opt additional members of the Combined Authority and to make changes to the Constitution of the Combined Authority.

Theme 4: Strategic priorities

We are keen to ensure the City Region has a clear and unified voice to articulate priorities and to ensure they are driven through. Streamlining the structures and clarifying accountability should help to do this – and will benefit conversations with central government as well as with national organisations delivering in the city region such as A4e.

Annie Smith, Development Director – North West, A4e

There was strong support for the inclusion of transport within wider priorities and the opportunities that this would offer for economic growth. Further detail was requested by some respondents on the role that the Combined Authority would have on housing, given the existing statutory planning role that Councils currently have and would retain. There was widespread support for the integrated approach that the proposed Combined Authority would bring to promoting and securing economic growth.

APPENDIX 3

There was strong support for a clear and consistent set of strategic priorities for the City Region. Respondents identified a wide range of areas in which the Combined Authority could add value, which would be within the remit of the proposed organisation. A number of respondents identified further areas where the Combined Authority could be involved, which are currently outside of its legislatively enabled role.

Liverpool City Region Response

One of the key drivers behind the proposal to create a Combined Authority is the need to draw together activity from across the City Region that enables economic growth and job creation. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery in economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills, and draw together place and people interventions.

The Combined Authority would add value to what we do already in terms of economic development in three further respects:

- Responsibility and accountability for setting the strategic vision, outcomes and agreeing priorities for the Liverpool City Region (single Evidence Base, Single Local Growth Plan, Single Investment Framework, developing a strategic pipeline of projects);
- Improved ability to target resources – (acting as Accountable Body for Single Investment Fund for devolved funding, responsibility for making decisions on the allocation of those resources, aligning funding streams); and
- Improved co-ordination of City Region wide activities (place based marketing, inward investment and international strategy etc).

Theme 5: Geographical coverage

Liverpool Liberal Democrats support the proposal to develop a combined authority to cover the economic development and transport functions within Greater Liverpool. Any comments outlined below should be seen as part of an overall backing for the proposals. It has been clear to us for many years that 'Greater Liverpool' is an area that will prosper or decline together and that by much closer working together the former is more likely.

Cllr Richard Kemp, Liverpool City Council

The periphery of the City Region as a whole has enormous potential and there exists a significant requirement for investment at all levels in order to realise that potential, which will be of lasting benefit to the wider region.

Mark Howard, Director, Hoylake Village Life

There was strong support for the geographical coverage of the proposed Combined Authority for the City Region, with a desire to see the benefits of jobs and growth being felt across the City Region as a whole, and not just in particular localities. There was recognition that a community identity was emerging for the City Region. However, a

APPENDIX 3

number of respondents identified concerns about particular geographic areas not benefiting from the improvements in jobs and growth.

A number of alternative geographies were suggested, which varied between respondents and were not consistently proposed. However, there was support for the City Region to engage more intentionally with neighbouring Councils.

Liverpool City Region Response

Liverpool City Region area is considered to be a functional economic area, with 84% of employed residents working within the City Region (Annual Population Survey 2012): 75% of residents living and working in an area is sufficient to justify a functional (or natural) economic area. It is considered an economic entity by the European Commission.

The Combined Authority will act in the best interests of the City Region as a whole and ensure that benefits are widely shared.

The recommendation to create a Combined Authority for the City Region would provide a transparent and robust decision making process to improve the economic wellbeing of the constituent Local Authorities as part of a stronger Liverpool City Region economy. This would enable the City Region to close the £8.2bn economic output gap, the deficit of 18,500 businesses, the 90,000 jobs gap and the £1,700 per capita income gap.

Theme 6: Role of authorities and partners

I am pleased to see that the LEP will have representation at the highest levels of the Combined Authority, representing the views of the private sector.

Matt Thomas, Chief Executive, Liverpool John Lennon Airport

We feel the proposals represent a sensible way forward. Our position as a Chamber is that we support this in principle and would wish to be part of the process so that we can see the implications when more detail emerges. It would be important that all Merseyside Boroughs had an equal standing, for example by rotating the chair of the Combined Authority between the six Boroughs annually.

Kath Boullen, Chief Executive, St Helens Chamber of Commerce

Respondents support Councils, authorities and businesses working together to promote and secure economic growth and jobs. There are clear benefits expressed as part of this, linked to improvements in service delivery which would lead to increases in growth and jobs.

The inclusion of Merseytravel and the LEP within the Combined Authority proposal were generally welcomed, along with the different perspective that they would bring. A number of respondents wanted greater clarity on how the LEP would work with the proposed Combined Authority, given the potential for overlap and duplication. This will need to be addressed and widely communicated.

APPENDIX 3

Liverpool City Region Response

The Combined Authority will provide strategic leadership for economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills. It will be a lean strategic body and will not have significant delivery functions, but will commission other organisations to deliver on its behalf. This will include the LEP, who will retain a key role in promoting economic growth in the City Region, as evidenced by the commitment to co-opt the Chair onto the Combined Authority. It is expected that this will lead to improved effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery. The Combined Authority will agree a Constitution, which will be underpinned by a detailed operating agreement.

There will be a range of strategic partners and businesses involved in the work of the Combined Authority through their inclusion on the Boards and Committees who will lead areas of work on behalf of the Combined Authority.

In addition, relevant partners and subject matter experts will be brought into the Scrutiny work of the Combined Authority as and when required.

Theme 7: Additional partner involvement

Supporting the growth of jobs and the delivery of employment and skills opportunities has to be a strong driver for the Combined Authority. We would hope that the strong history and current practices of partnership working would be incorporated in the work of the Combined Authority.

Lynn Collins, Regional Secretary, Trades Union Congress

There was support for the balance proposed between a lead strategic decision maker and including a wide range of partners: it was hoped that the proposed Combined Authority would add value to existing partnership arrangements.

Many partners and stakeholders, for example Merseyside Police and the Local Nature Partnership, identified how they could get involved in the work of the proposed Combined Authority, and what they could do to support its proposed mission to secure growth and jobs. Support was also expressed for the approach to bring in subject matter experts to enhance specific discussions.

Liverpool City Region Response

The remit of the Combined Authority is limited by statute but there are opportunities to work together with partners through the Boards and Sub-Committees being proposed for the benefits of businesses and residents in the City Region. The Combined Authority would also need to continue to engage with partner organisations on a wide range of matters.

APPENDIX 3

Theme 8: Wider impacts

A number of responses raised questions regarding the potential impact of the proposed Combined Authority on a number of local and sub-regional matters, both related to and unrelated to the proposed remit of the Combined Authority.

Sefton CVS supports Option 4 and the rationale to develop a Combined Authority. We believe it creates a vital springboard to support the best chance of underpinning sustained growth of our economy. Better connectivity, through an integrated approach to transport, creates efficiencies and enhances effectiveness. A strategic governance approach is essential to achieve transformational change and to acquire the necessary investment to maximise growth and fulfil potential of people and place in the City Region.

Angela White, Chief Executive, Sefton CVS

I fully endorse the proposal that Option 4, creating a Combined Authority, should be pursued. I believe that this option, whilst not being overly bureaucratic, would create the right structure to attract additional resources to the region and would make best possible use of them.

John Clarke, Principal, Southport College

Liverpool City Region Response

The remit of the Combined Authority is limited by statute to economic development, transport, housing and employment and skills. The enhanced commitment to joint working and the culture that this will engender would have other benefits in time.

Theme 9: Miscellaneous

Having first hand experience of cross city region working with Project Viridis, a collaboration of all 6 LAs and 14 RSLs from across the LCR, I wholeheartedly welcome the combined authority approach, as I'm sure it will help officers to be able to pull together more effectively on this shared agenda

Maggi Howard, Liverpool Mutual Homes

Respondents raised some points which were largely unrelated to the Combined Authority proposals directly, but may be of interest to the local authorities involved. Examples included comments about local area issues, specific highway issues and existing projects.

Liverpool City Region Response

The specific points will be picked up with individual Councils who have these responsibilities.

APPENDIX 3

Theme 10: Consultation Process

[This] provides a great opportunity to be more efficient and to develop a much stronger joined up brand for the area with decisions made based on strategic fit and benefit for the wider area rather than local political struggles.

Garry Banks, Arup

A number of respondents expressed concerns about the consultation process and suggested that the timescale for response was too short. This is balanced by the 176 responses that were submitted to the process, the overwhelming majority of which did not see fit to mention this.

Liverpool City Region Response

The six Councils in the Liverpool City Region have a strong track record of working together on areas of mutual benefit, dating back before the Liverpool City Region Development Plan, which was agreed in 2007. Collaborative working has evolved over the years and a number of City Region Boards bring together democratic leadership and senior business leaders, including the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

The Review of Strategic Governance was open for consultation for 5 weeks. Details of the proposals were sent to over 10,000 businesses and partner organisations in the City Region, with over 500 people attending a range of consultation events. The questions asked in the feedback form were based on the statutory tests that have to be met.

Should the proposals be approved and submitted, there will be a further consultation process before the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government seeks approval to establish a Combined Authority.