



Notes of the meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire – 14 July 2016

1 Welcome, introduction and apologies

Name	Organisation	Apologies
Cllr Mark Hawthorne (Chair) Pete Bungard	Gloucestershire County Council	
Cllr Steve Lydon David Hagg	Stroud DC	
Cllr Dave Norman Jon McGinty	Gloucester City Council	Cllr Paul James
Cllr Patrick Molyneux Peter Hibberd	Forest of Dean DC	
Cllr Steve Jordan Pat Pratley	Cheltenham BC	
Cllr Christopher Hancock David Neudegg	Cotswold DC	
Cllr Robert Vines Rachel North	Tewkesbury BC	Mike Dawson
Martin Surl Richard Bradley	Police and Crime Commissioner's Office	Paul Trott
	Gloucestershire Constabulary	Suzette Davenport
Dr Andy Seymour	NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group	Mary Hutton
Adam Starkey David Owen	GFirst LEP	Diane Savory
Katie Jenkins	Government representative – Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS)	
Jane Burns Simon Harper Shihana Samad	Gloucestershire County Council	Jo Walker
Andrew Pollard	Place Partnership	
Joanna Killian Clare Whelan Paniz Gederi Michael Williams	KPMG	

2 LAST MEETING

2.1 Action notes

The notes of the meeting held on 26 May 2016 were agreed.

2.2 Matters arising

The Chair welcomed Cllr Steve Lydon, Leader of Stroud District Council, to his first meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire.

3 PLACE PARTNERSHIP

Jane Burns advised that she had been involved in an LGA peer review of Worcestershire County Council. She said that she had been impressed with the innovative property management arrangements that had been established in the county. The Chair welcomed Andrew Pollard, the Managing Director of Place Partnership.

Andrew explained that Place Partnership was the first multi-agency joint property vehicle to be established in the UK and was a development of the One Public Estate Programme. The shareholders were Worcestershire County Council, Redditch Borough Council, Worcester City Council, West Mercia Police, Warwickshire Police and Hereford and Worcester Fire Authority. The company facilitated change in public service delivery, provided opportunities for regeneration and growth within communities and delivered savings that the partners were unlikely to achieve on their own.

The company had close working relationships with other public service providers within Worcestershire and further afield. A portfolio of 1,400 assets was managed through a workforce of 200 specialists. The service delivery arms of the business were split between property and asset management and project and facilities management.

Andrew said that the collaborative approach was very different to outsourcing but brought together expertise from both the public and private sectors. The organisation was large enough to bring the benefits of scale and efficiency but not too large that it could not be close to its customers. He referred to a number of recent projects including a joint venture with Wychavon District Council to provide a new fire station in Evesham. The fire station had been built on a contaminated site with land being released for a new supermarket in the town. Another project had resulted in a multi-agency hub in Bromsgrove with funds available for improvements in the town. Outside Worcestershire, project development work for a new school had been carried out in Birmingham and agency work was being undertaken in Shropshire and Berkshire.

Answering questions, Andrew explained that shareholders were equal partners but the ownership of assets remained with the organisations themselves. The proceeds of sales therefore stayed with the organisation that owned the asset. There were no plans to pay dividends to shareholders arising from surpluses but it was likely that organisations would receive discounts on future contributions depending on their involvement in particular projects. He said that there were no plans at present to become a housing developer but opportunities were taken to work in partnership with developers where appropriate.

In terms of further education, higher education and the health community, he stated that there were joint working arrangements which might become more formalised in future. The capability of the company in terms of asset and facilities management would allow it to expand when suitable opportunities arose in Worcestershire and further afield.

Andrew explained that Place Partnership acted as property advisers to their shareholders and were experienced in dealing with conflicts between partners. This could arise with planning applications when a district council was responsible for determining a planning application made by one of the other shareholders. If Place Partnership needed to provide advice to more than one shareholder then mechanisms were in place to ensure that confidentiality was maintained on each side.

The Chair thanked Andrew for his informative presentation and recognised that Gloucestershire could learn from the innovative arrangements in Worcestershire. He requested a position statement on the One Public Estate programme in Gloucestershire at the next meeting. This should provide information on the progress to date and the options for the county moving forward.

Action – Jo Walker (Neil Corbett)

4

GLOUCESTERSHIRE DEVOLUTION – REVIEW BY KPMG

Pete Bungard explained that following the decision at the last meeting, KPMG had been engaged to review the Gloucestershire devolution deal and encourage a more ambitious approach.

Joanna Killian from KPMG provided background information on the devolution deals that had been agreed by the Government elsewhere. To date, all the deals except Cornwall included directly elected mayors. She said that some commonality was emerging with deals covering all or a combination of the following:

- Finance
- Transport and infrastructure
- Skills

- Enterprise and growth
- Employment
- Housing and assets
- Energy and environment
- Health, care and wellbeing
- Criminal justice

It was evident that the initial deal was the start of the process with Greater Manchester now negotiating on its sixth deal for further devolution of powers and funding flexibilities.

Joanna stated that it was important that Gloucestershire told its own story. The county needed to create a compelling case for devolution backed by evidence. The key to success was engaging with partners, the public and businesses to build trust in the process.

Partners' initial discussions with KPMG had revealed the following:

- Big ambitions but 'no skin in the game' (not ambitious enough?)
- We need more trust
- What are our true priorities?
- We need to grip our economic strategy
- We need to sort out the skills mismatch
- Better partnerships including incentives to deliver housing
- Do we need devolution? What can we do alone?

The key components of public sector reform were leadership and influence, leaving no stone unturned, public assets, education and skills and prevention (health, care and wellbeing). More work was required on the level of scale and what happened next.

For governance, fantastic opportunities were afforded by the coterminous boundaries of partners, but Gloucestershire was not grasping those opportunities. Other parts of the country had been preoccupied with sorting out boundary issues but Gloucestershire was almost unique in not facing the same constraints. It was recognised that a directly elected mayor was contentious but there might be a different approach with a change of personnel in Government. Leadership and influence remained critical to building trust and confidence in the process.

Partners expressed the following views on priorities for KPMG:

- The role of KPMG was to provide 'stretch' and if that could not be achieved, what were partners turning their backs on, where is there innovation?
- The Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) process lead by Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group could be the 'game changer'. It could be the driver for public sector partners to work

together to improve the health and wellbeing of the local community and get people into work.

- It was a bit too easy in Gloucestershire and partners should be challenged to realise the benefits of co-terminousity. It was about public service reform in delivering change for the public not about public sector reform and local government reorganisation.
- A 'rethink' not a 'refresh' of the devolution deal was required. All the options should remain on the table including local government structures.
- To engage with other public sector partners, MPs, the public and businesses including the big employers to 'tell the Gloucestershire story' and seek their views on a vision for Gloucestershire.
- To concentrate on those areas that will deliver real change a return on investment rather than trying to cover everything.
- Employment growth was outstripping housing supply and there was an urgent need for more housing and employment land. If this was not addressed, there was a real danger that people and employers would be drawn to neighbouring areas that had grasped the devolution agenda.
- To think big and look for the infrastructure projects that could deliver more employment and housing. A third river crossing of the Severn could be a major driver for economic growth on both sides of the river.

Reflecting on the Gloucestershire devolution deal, Joanna Killian recognised that so much more could be achieved without self-imposed restrictions and the Government's reluctance to hand-over powers in some areas. It was evident that there were clear priorities around housing supply, employment growth, infrastructure development and health and care. She said that radical reform of health and social care in Greater Manchester relied on co-operation and trust between leaders and the same approach was needed in Gloucestershire.

The next stage in the process involved two workshops with lead officers on 18 and 25 July to look in more detail at the priorities and review the devolution bid. It was agreed that a workshop would be held for political leaders in coming weeks. KPMG would be reporting back on their findings to the next meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire on 8 September.

Action – KPMG, Jane Burns and Simon Harper

Pete advised that the County Council was funding the Local Enterprise Partnership to do a 'think' piece around a 2050 vision for Gloucestershire. This would involve a panel of experts identifying the key projects for the county. The outcome of this work would be presented to a future meeting.

It was noted that the Higher Education Funding Council and the Local Government Association were collaborating on a pilot project called 'Leading Places'. Gloucestershire University had been asked to be involved as it was a

university with a rural hinterland. The value of the work was £40,000 over 9 months. Leadership Gloucestershire partners indicated support for the project and a willingness for the study to take forward the outcomes from the KPMG work.

5 OTHER ISSUES

5.1 Membership of Leadership Gloucestershire

Cllr Steve Lydon requested that some consideration be given to having a representative from the University of Gloucestershire. The Chair said that the position was not straightforward as there were a number of higher education establishments in the county. He recognised that it was timely to review the membership of Leadership Gloucestershire and he also asked that some thought be given to the representation of higher education and further education.

Action – Jane Burns

5.2 Brexit

Cllr Steve Jordan advised that an event for businesses had been held in Cheltenham. He said that a report had been produced summarising the views expressed and he undertook to circulate details to partners.

Action – Steve Jordan

Joanna Killian stated that KPMG had produced an analysis of the potential implications of Brexit and she said that she would make that available after the meeting.

Action – Joanna Killian, KPMG

6 FUTURE MEETINGS

8 September

27 October

15 December

All 10am at Shire Hall