

Office of the Chief Executive

City of York Council
West Offices
Station Rise
York
YO1 6GA

DRAFT RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON USE OF LEGISLATIVE REFORM ORDER TO GIVE LOCAL AUTHORITIES GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN FORMING COMBINED AUTHORITIES OR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY BOARDS

I am writing in response to the invitation to submit comments on the above proposal. City of York Council is currently a non-constituent member of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, as well as a member of the Leeds City Region and York, North Yorkshire & East Riding Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs).

I set out below the Council's comments on the consultation questions:

Question 1: do you agree that the proposal to enable local authorities that do not have contiguous boundaries to form combined authorities and economic prosperity boards will reduce a burden to collaboration? Why?

Yes. I refer to my response of 24 June 2014 to the previous consultation (attached for reference).

Question 2: do you agree that the proposed safeguards are necessary and sufficient? Why?

As set out in my response of 24 June 2014, it is important that any adverse impacts on neighbouring areas not covered by the Combined Authority are identified and mitigated. The safeguards proposed appear proportionate and appropriate in that regard.

Question 3: do you agree that the proposal to enable a county council to delegate its function to a combined authority for part of the county council's area will reduce a burden to collaboration? Why?

Yes. I refer to my response of 24 June 2014.

Question 4: do you agree that the proposal to remove the review and scheme requirements for changes to a combined authority's or economic prosperity board's constitution, functions or funding will reduce a burden to collaboration?

Yes.

Question 5. Do you agree that the three proposed changes meet the preconditions for use of a Legislative Reform Order as set out above, in particular:

• Do you have views regarding the expected benefits of the proposals as identified in Chapter 3 of this consultation?

As set out in my response of 24 June, I believe that the proposals would deliver the benefits of reducing burdens on local authorities wishing to form Combined Authorities or Economic Prosperity Boards, and through process simplification, make the benefits of enhanced governance and decision-making over true functional economic areas available more quickly.

• Is there any empirical evidence that you are aware of that supports the need for these reforms? please provide details

In respect of the proposal to allow non-contiguous areas to join Combined Authorities, OECD research (Redefining Urban: a new way to measure metropolitan areas: 2013) shows that non-contiguous functional economic areas are common. The benefits of allowing enhanced governance and decision-making over true functional economic areas is well-attested in academic literature and Government policy, not least in the Review of Sub National Economic Development & Regeneration (July 2007) which led to the provisions in the Local Democracy Economic Development and Construction Act (2009) allowing the formation of Combined Authorities and Economic Prosperity Boards.

• Are there any non-legislative means that would satisfactorily remedy the difficulty which the proposals intend to address?

I agree with the contention in the consultation that there are not.

Are the proposals put proportionate to the policy objective?

I agree with the contention in the consultation that they are.

• Do the proposals taken as a whole strike a fair balance between the public interest and any person adversely affected by it?

I think that they do.

Do the proposals remove any necessary protection?

I think they do not.

• Do the proposals prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right or freedom which he might reasonably expect to continue to exercise? If so, please provide details. I think they do not.

Kind regards,

Kersten England

Kersten Englid.

Chief Executive City of York Council