



Notes of the meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire held on
Thursday, 7 January 2016

1 Welcome, introduction and apologies

Name	Organisation	Apologies
Cllr Mark Hawthorne (Chair)	Gloucestershire County Council	
Pete Bungard	Gloucestershire County Council	
Cllr Geoff Wheeler	Stroud District Council	
David Hagg	Stroud District Council	
Cllr David Norman	Gloucester City Council	Cllr Paul James
Jon McGinty	Gloucester City Council	
Cllr Christopher Hancock	Cotswold District Council	Cllr Lynden Stowe
David Neudegg	Cotswold District Council	
Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Forest of Dean District Council	
Peter Hibberd	Forest of Dean District Council	
Cllr Steve Jordan	Cheltenham Borough Council	
Pat Pratley	Cheltenham Borough Council	Andrew North
Cllr Robert Vines	Tewkesbury Borough Council	
Mike Dawson	Tewkesbury Borough Council	
Martin Surl	Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner	
Paul Trott	Police and Crime Commissioner's Office	Richard Bradley
Suzette Davenport	Gloucestershire Constabulary	
Dr Andy Seymour	NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group	Dr Helen Miller
Mary Hutton	NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group	
Ellen Rule	NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group	
Diane Savory	GFirst LEP	
David Owen	GFirst LEP	
Jane Burns	Gloucestershire County Council	
Jo Walker	Gloucestershire County Council	
Simon Harper	Gloucestershire County Council	
Katie Jenkins	Government representative – Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS)	

2 **Last meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on 9 December 2015 were approved.

3 **We are Gloucestershire Devolution bid – update and next steps**

The Chair welcomed Katie Jenkins, the Government representative from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

A paper had been circulated summarising the outcomes from the meeting of the Leadership Gloucestershire Devolution Working Group on 5 January. The meeting had been attended by Mary Hutton, Geoff Wheeler, Steve Jordan, Patrick Molyneux and Brian Robinson with Pete Bungard as clerk.

Leadership Gloucestershire agreed the following principles:

a) Working arrangements

Terms of reference noted with meetings to be arranged as necessary between meetings of Leadership Gloucestershire. GFirst LEP to be represented at future meetings of the working group.

b) Role of the chair of the combined authority

Key responsibilities: chair meetings, lead spokesperson, advise on communications and main link with local MPs. However, the important message was that the chair could only perform these roles for combined authority business.

c) The role of lead members and vice chairs

No individual decision making but each member of the combined authority would take on a portfolio of responsibility and act as champion for that area. Each portfolio should reflect an element of the devolution package. There should be some allocation of cross-cutting issues with provision for portfolios to be adjusted to match the interests of particular individuals. It was recognised that this area would need further work.

d) Appointment of chair

The working group had considered this issue at length with different models being put forward. The conclusion was appointment of the chair by the members of the combined authority but with a review of this mechanism within three years of the establishment of the combined authority.

e) Partnership decision making structures

Acknowledgement of the devolution bid: Leadership Gloucestershire and the Economic Growth Joint Committee to be abolished and a review of the Health and Wellbeing Board, the Police and Crime Panel and boards associated with the Economic Growth Joint Committee within 12 months.

f) Scrutiny arrangements

Scrutiny lead members from across the seven councils to design an appropriate structure for the combined authority. Key principles: strong accountability, respecting the statutory areas of scrutiny (health and police), no net rise in costs (with an expectation of efficiency savings) and no increase in the number of administrative bodies.

g) Local devolution

One page documents were in the final stages of development setting out the benefits to each partner of devolution. These were being tailored for individual organisations. A key element was an early agreement with Cheltenham BC on traffic, parking and place issues.

There was recognition that the constitution was a key document setting out the procedures and working arrangements for the combined authority including voting.

Katie Jenkins advised that Gloucestershire was among a number of non-metropolitan deals that hopefully would be agreed before or at the time of the Chancellor's Budget on 16 March. There was a clear way forward on housing with Mike Dawson coordinating a response on a small number of outstanding issues. In terms of business rates, it was noted that no further work was required at the present time other than maintaining a local dialogue with the government.

There was a discussion on the potential sign-up process for each organisation ahead of the Chancellor's announcement. Katie Jenkins undertook to seek the views of ministers and senior officials at the DCLG on the preferred approach. There was recognition of the important role to be played by the local MPs in promoting a devolution deal for Gloucestershire.

4 Financial settlements and funding implications

Updates were provided by each organisation following the Chancellor's announcement on public sector funding for 2016-17. The position for everyone was extremely challenging with most organisations facing significant reductions in central government funding. Even those organisations with standstill or increased funding would need to make significant efficiencies due to increasing levels of demand and inflationary pressures.

The position for the county council was particularly challenging for 2016-17 with a £23 million reduction in revenue support grant. The changes that the government had made to the funding formula appeared to have had a disproportionate affect on non-metropolitan county areas.

The impact on the district councils in the county for 2016-17 was not as bad as some had anticipated but there were severe pressures from 2017-18 onwards that would need to be addressed.

5 Future meetings

25 February 2016

31 March 2016

It was noted that further meetings might need to be arranged to meet the requirements of the devolution timetable.