

**Minutes of a meeting of the Joint Corporate,
Environment and Waste Management & Regeneration
and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on
Tuesday, 10 October 2017 in Committee Room 1 - City
Hall, Bradford**

Commenced 5.30 pm
Concluded 8.10 pm

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT	GREEN	INDEPENDENT
Gibbons Heseltine Mallinson Senior BM Smith	A Ahmed Bacon Berry Duffy Farley Arshad Hussain	Stubbs J Sunderland	Love	K Hussain

Observers: Councillors Mohammed and Watson

Apologies: Councillor Simon Cooke, Councillor Dominic Fear, Councillor Rizwana Jamil, Councillor Nussrat Mohammed, Councillor H Khan, Councillor Adrian Naylor, Councillor Sarfraz Nazir, Councillor Naveed Riaz, Councillor David Warburton, Councillor Salam and Councillor Rosie Watson

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR (Standing Order 35)

Resolved –

That Councillor Farley be appointed as Chair for the purpose of the Joint Corporate, Environment and Waste Management and Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Action: City Solicitor

2. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillors, Hasan Khan, Watson and Mohammed disclosed an interest as Members of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority - Transport Committee respectively. They did not participate in the meeting as Members of their

respective Bradford Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

Action: City Solicitor

3. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

4. JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY UPDATE REPORT ON WEST YORKSHIRE COMBINED AUTHORITY (WYCA) AND LEEDS CITY REGION ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP)

JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY UPDATE REPORT ON WEST YORKSHIRE COMBINED AUTHORITY (WYCA) AND LEEDS CITY REGION ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP)

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “A”**) provided progress, plans and performance for West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) and Leeds City Region Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The report included details on shared ambitions, regeneration, transport, public service reform and partnership working. It also described that work in relation to the priorities, challenges and opportunities for Bradford District.

Headline information was also presented which was tailored for the three Overview and Scrutiny Areas brought together for the joint meeting.

Following a detailed presentation a Member requested clarity between the WYCA and LEP. The Managing Director of WYCA explained that the LEP was a voluntary partnership established in 2010/11 involving the public and private sector. The body must comprise of a private sector Chair and include a balance of private sector members and elected leaders of the constituent local authorities. WYCA was a local government body, established under statute, with a remit to support and drive forward regeneration, infrastructure and transport investment and to undertake key transport and development services. Both bodies were supported by an officer organisation which undertook the Boards’ policies and actions. The LEP developed strategy and policy aimed at meeting both the current and the future needs of the city region’s economy. Spending accountability lay with the WYCA.

The WYCA Corporate Plan’s statement that it had helped 732 households in the region to reduce their heating bills by installing energy saving measures was discussed and it was questioned how that work could be expanded. In response it was explained that the programme around warm homes began as part of the Green Deal and when that funding had ceased the LEP had used its own resources to carry on that work. One issue was that the available funding from Government was ‘revenue’ funding and there were strict criteria for those funds. The Housing Standards Team had developed an energy programme and aimed to access funds from other sources. It was stressed that Government restrictions would be relaxed through devolution.



A Member expressed concern that people affected by benefit caps and with limited funds were not in properties which were able to access the 'warm homes' schemes. He questioned the connection between creating pathways to develop the skills of residents within communities to have the ability to take advantage of energy deals/energy management. His comments were acknowledged and it was agreed that many programmes were demand led. WYCA was evolving and aimed to assume a different model where schemes were built up from communities.

The impact on funding received from the European Union following Brexit was queried and it was explained that EU funds were managed by Government. The WYCA/ LEP had a role to play through the European Structural Investment Fund (ESIF) committee to influence programmes. The Sustainable Urban Development strategy SUDS fund provided £15m for regeneration and energy efficiency.

In the context of Brexit work would be required to ensure EU funds were provided directly to regions.

A Member was concerned that there were 140,000 houses in fuel poverty and that funding needed to retrofit those properties was limited. He believed that sourcing funding for those projects would also create jobs in the area and he questioned officers from the WYCA, were likely, in their dealings with the Government to secure that funding. In response it was explained that the challenge was that those properties were difficult to retrofit. Efforts were being made to secure stability through future devolution deals to develop long term programmes.

The LCR Strategic Economic Plan stated that a key ambition was to support LCR to become a net contributor to UK public finances and the wider economy, addressing local financial self-reliance for the public sector, investing in prosperity and well-being as well as the response to central Government and the local public fiscal consolidation. Clarification on that statement was requested and it was explained that this was intended to demonstrate the cost to the public purse was greater than value added and was an aspiration to grow and become a net contributor. This was meant as an aspirational comment to show the direction of travel desired and would not be achieved in the foreseeable future.

The link between WYCA /LEP and ESIF was questioned and it was explained that the ESIF was a structural fund.

A Member questioned funds received through the European Social Fund. He believed that, changes to the welfare system were resulting in people who had been told that they were fit for work being moved to an 'at risk' category. Concern about the lack of pathways for young people to work was expressed. His comments were acknowledged and it was explained that the majority of skills funding received was capital funding and used for investment in colleges. The WYCA/LEP's ability to influence education had not been successful. A view that the main challenges for the area were better jobs and higher skills levels and that



these must be addressed through a combination of funding sources was expressed.

Clarification on the organisational structure of the WYCA was requested. It was explained that the combined authority was an officer led organisation which supported local authority collaboration and the LEP. The authority previously comprised multiple organisations, with different teams supporting the LEP, inward investment and Metro. The WYCA comprised of 450 people half of which worked in the 'back office' and the remainder on front line public transport services. The five new directorates in the organisation were outlined in Appendix 1 to Document "A".

In response to questions it was confirmed that the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) representation in the organisation was behind in terms of representation. It was clarified that the underrepresentation was being targeted. The apprenticeship programme was one opportunity to bring more people into the organisation.

Governance arrangements were queried and it was confirmed that the authority had the same checks and balances as local authorities. Governance and Audit and Overview and Scrutiny Committees were all held in public. The scrutiny committees were now able to challenge and 'call-in' decisions. The method for the authority to receive feedback from the WYCA committees was questioned and it was explained that all committee minutes were published on line and highlights reported to Full Council.

The Growth Deal dashboard appended to the report was discussed and a Member questioned why the Keighley schemes were depicted as 'red' – at risk under WYCA criteria for programme management and reporting to Government. The Assistant Director, Planning, Transport and Highways explained that the Hard Ings Road, an important scheme in the District, was identified as 'red' due to the lengthy process required for delivery. Land assembly was needed to implement the scheme and may require the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs). The 'red' status was flagging up the uncertain time scales required. Members referred to the approval of funds for the scheme in 2012 and requested details of the timescales envisaged. In response it was explained that the scheme was a key priority and needed to be delivered by 2021.

The need for the Bradford District to receive additional amounts of available funding was raised and the per capita investment was questioned. The level of funds to corporate/global companies was queried. The Chief Executive confirmed that the Business Innovation and Growth Panel had looked at those statistics. Assurances were provided that the funding was not going to large corporations and the economic base in Bradford, advanced engineering, was benefitting as much, if not more, than others. It was confirmed that Bradford had the second largest economic area in the Combined Authority. In response the need to dispel the myth that the area was a poor relation to its neighbours was stressed.

It was queried if strategy beyond the six year programme to 2021 had been



progressed. The Chief Executive, WYCA, reported that the majority of the funding was time limited to 2021 so the focus had been to ensure the delivery of outcomes by that time. Progress beyond that time would be dependant on finance and linked to devolution. The WYCA would endeavour to ensure that Government funding did not cease and investments continued. The Strategic Director - Place, explained that although the Growth Fund was fully subscribed, the WYCA had recently issued a call for new projects and there were a number of projects in the pipeline for future growth fund/reserve schemes.

The report revealed plans to create 36,000 new jobs in the Leeds City Region and a Member questioned the proportion of those jobs in Bradford was questioned. It was confirmed that the Leeds City Region had secured £10 million and a significant proportion of that award would be allocated to Bradford. Over the next two years work would be undertaken to continue the Get Bradford Working Project which would target young people between the ages of 18 to 24.

Transport issues were raised by Members and included unreliable buses and overcrowded trains. The detrimental impact that could have on young people's ability to access employment was discussed and it was acknowledged that the bus or train was ordinarily the only method of transport for the majority of young people.

In response the Chief Executive, WYCA, explained that the WYCA had spent a great deal of money to support public transport and to link socially isolated communities. Concessionary fares had been provided for Old Age Pensioners (OAPs) and young people. The challenge was how to make those concessions viable and to provide connectivity through different products. The rise of companies such as Uber, providing cheaper travel than the bus in some instances, and work being undertaken to understand how young people wished to travel was discussed. Assurances were provided that the WYCA were focussed on making bus travel accessible and affordable for young people and in increasing access to public transport.

The report referred to the Strategic Economic Plan statement that "*poor air quality and fuel poverty will be a thing of the past – homes will be well-insulated, while efficient energy generation, usage and smart networks will ensure everyone is actively in control of their energy consumption*". It was questioned, given the low numbers of properties which had been retrofitted, if that was an aspiration or genuine target. In response it was explained that the statement was a mix between target and aspiration. The strategic Economic Plan had begun as a bidding document for Government funding and the WYCA Corporate Plan was more realistic on those issues.

Document "A" made reference to connectivity and the work of Metro and passenger services, to ensure effective provision across the District for urban and rural communities and in the context of mobility and accessibility for West Yorkshire and wider connectivity. It was questioned how connections to Leeds Bradford International Airport would be included in those plans. The Assistant Director, Economy and Development explained that the new Chief Executive,



LBIA, was planning to expand and improve facilities. A bid had been submitted to become a logistic hub for Heathrow expansion increasing the capacity of flights to Heathrow. A decision will be made in November and would be hugely important for the economic offer of the Leeds City Region. There were a number of on going projects to increase connectivity in the District including bus accessibility; a new link road to LBIA and a new station on the existing Harrogate train line.

Clarity on work to ensure effective investment in the Green Economy and the timescale for completion of that work was requested. The Chief Executive WYCA explained that work was underway but was unsure when that would be completed. It was agreed that the information would be provided in future reports.

Members referred to policies contained in Document “A” such as “*de-coupling growth from carbon emissions and pollution*” but concern was expressed that the growth driven projects referred to did not fit comfortably with efforts to increase renewable energy. New roads would impact on air quality. In response it was explained that a balance must be sought between the requirements of the funding streams and the impact on the climate. Assurances were provided that the WYCA and LEP Transport Committee ensured transport fleets produced as low carbon emissions as possible. It was explained that the committee did have influence over companies who wanted its support. The Leader of Council reiterated that it was Government Departments which set the priorities for the growth deal; however, efforts were being made towards devolution to provide the flexibility required to set appropriate priorities for the region.

The Assistant Director, Economy and Development, explained that the Resource Efficiency Fund for Business advised businesses of environmental benefits they could make to ensure their businesses were more profitable and improved build standards ensured homes were cheaper and more efficient to run reducing the need for more costly retrofits. The Strategic Director, Place, explained that Outline Business Cases submitted to obtain WYCA funding for highways must demonstrate reductions in carbon dioxide.

A Member requested that, to utilise elected members’ knowledge of local communities, they be involved in the specification and delivery of projects. In response the Leader of Council confirmed that the WYCA was a resource for the district to obtain growth and it would respond to the priorities of which they were advised. The Leader’s report did include progress on WYCA activities in the area. The Growth Deal Dashboard, which had been presented to WYCA Investment Committee September 2017, appended to Document was a recent addition and was a portrayal of progress on all projects in the District.

It was accepted that future reports on the WYCA and LEP’s progress, plans and performance, should contain more focus on the benefits to the Bradford district but it was hoped that Members could see the positives of ESIF funding being directed to the district. The Managing Director, (WYCA), explained that he was attempting to build a partnership culture as all activities were with partners. It was agreed to intensify engagement with elected members.



A Member referred to times since the 1960's when money had been directed to Bradford but that, she felt, had not made a difference. It was questioned if meeting the outcomes suggested in Document "A" would actually make a difference in the area. In response it was believed that all projects would make a difference. The impact of Northern Powerhouse Rail was discussed and the necessity for large infrastructure funding in the north was acknowledged.

In response to questions about education and skills in the district it was explained that the majority of WYCA budget was for capital spending. Devolution would allow the region to ensure that projects could be delivered where they were most needed. Work being undertaken with the Department for Education (DfE) to switch the balance from a supplier to demand led provision was reported.

Transport links between WYCA and other authorities were questioned and it was explained that LCR was involved with Transport for the North, a key organisations created by the Government to deal with strategic inter urban key connections. WYCA was also a member of the Urban Transport Group. Schemes were developed in individual areas and compared and contrasted to ensure they provided the best use of resources and were not detrimental to other schemes. Work was also undertaken with the Department for Transport to influence national policy to meet local needs.

The percentage of finances used to promote or facilitate alternate methods of transport was questioned. It was explained that although the resources were allocated from Government via the WYCA it was felt that those decisions should be made with the benefit of local knowledge so the local authority took the lead. A number of programmes had been delivered through the City Connect Scheme and the WYCA co-ordinated a number of funding bids to Government.

A Member suggested adoption of one single payment method for bus and rail transport as was operated in London. It was felt that this would provide a contactless method of payment, which could not overcharge users and prevent the use of many separate charging methods. In response it was explained that it was possible to introduce such a scheme within the Leeds City Region. The scheme would not, however, be as cost effective as purchasing individual independent operator tickets. That was a problem in all cities outside of London where there was a deregulated market. Transport for the North was looking to develop a smart and easy to use payment method which would be cost effective.

Responses to the floods experienced in the district at Christmas 2015 were discussed and, in response to questions, it was clarified that WYCA had made contributions to match Government funding. Funding from other sources had also been redeployed to assist local businesses and measures were being undertaken with the Environment Agency to support flood alleviation schemes. It was also confirmed that the WYCA and LEP had a joint community sub structure with a panel looking at environment and energy issues.

A Member expressed a view that residents encountered problems brought about



by the implementation of major schemes in the area, but were not aware of the longer term benefits provided. An example of which was given as major road works at the Harrogate Road junction. The Leader of Council acknowledged that the delivery of large scale projects could be disruptive. It was imperative that contact with local ward Members and engagement with communities was undertaken to communicate the aims of the projects to residents. The Chief Executive WYCA explained that three quarters of schemes were delivered by local partners and the shared challenge was how communication with local people was conducted. He asked how Members felt that WYCA, as the place where local authorities in the region came together, could be more accessible.

A table depicting Regional Investment into Bradford contained in Document "A" revealed that limited funding was available in 2017/10 and no funds were to be had in 2018-19 for growing business. A Member questioned what would happen to those businesses and it was explained that alternative funding sources were being explored for that purpose.

Resolved –

- 1. That the report be welcomed and officers and senior Councillors thanked for their on going work in relation to WYCA and LEP.**
- 2. That a progress report be presented to a further joint meeting in 12 months time which also focuses on funded projects in the Bradford district.**
- 3. That elected members from Bradford who sit on the WYCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee and WYCA Transport Committee be requested to attend the relevant Bradford Council Overview and Scrutiny Committees to provide feedback on their work.**
- 4. That the fact that "officers are working to develop a long term strategy for the district" in relation to greenhouse gas emissions be welcomed.**
- 5. That WYCA be requested to develop a process to involve Bradford Ward Members in the specification and delivery of projects.**
- 6. That WYCA be requested to include a description of the community benefit, where possible, on the Growth Deal Dashboard included in Document "A".**
- 7. That WYCA schemes and objectives are, where possible, aligned with the priorities of Bradford Council to achieve the best outcome for raising skills and delivering integrated transport schemes.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place



Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Joint Corporate, Environment and Waste Management & Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

