



## BRIEFING PAPER

Number 07029, 4 May 2018

# Devolution to local government in England

By Mark Sandford

### Inside:

1. Devolution in England: inception
2. Devolution deals: key components
3. The Greater Manchester devolution deals
4. Deals in other localities
5. Analysis and perspectives
6. Further reading



# Contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Devolution in England: inception</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Background: 2010-15	4
1.2 Devolution deals	4
1.3 Devolution deals to date	5
Table 1: Devolution deals	5
1.4 Implementation of deals	6
1.5 Deals under negotiation	7
<b>2. Devolution deals: key components</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Deals: the 'menu'	9
2.2 The 'specials'	10
Housing	10
Health	11
Transforming Cities	11
Local industrial strategies	12
<b>3. The Greater Manchester devolution deals</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 The Greater Manchester Agreement	13
3.2 Health devolution in Greater Manchester	14
<b>4. Deals in other localities</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 London	16
Further proposals in London	16
4.2 Cornwall	17
4.3 Yorkshire	17
4.4 Liverpool: March 2016	19
4.5 West Midlands: November 2017	19
4.6 North of Tyne	20
<b>5. Analysis and perspectives</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1 2017: devolution perspectives	22
5.2 The available powers	23
5.3 Governance	23
5.4 Reactions	24
5.5 Public consultation	26
<b>6. Further reading</b>	<b>27</b>

## Summary

This note summarises the main developments regarding the process of devolution of powers to local government within England since 2014. It covers the devolution deals agreed between the Government and local areas up to April 2018, including the powers to be devolved, the procedures required for devolution to take place, and reactions to the policy from the local government and policy-making worlds.

This note addresses the debate around devolution of power to local government in England only. Local government is a devolved matter in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Library has also published notes on the [West Lothian Question; the English Question; English Votes for English Laws](#); and notes on the [Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill](#) of 2016, its [progress through Parliament](#), and the aborted [Local Government Finance Bill](#) of 2017.

# 1. Devolution in England: inception

## 1.1 Background: 2010-15

Following the 'no' vote in the September 2014 Scottish independence referendum, the then Prime Minister, David Cameron, announced that, alongside proposals for additional devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland:

It is also important we have wider civic engagement about how to improve governance in our United Kingdom, including how to empower our great cities — and we will say more about this in the coming days.<sup>1</sup>

This followed the production of several reports during 2014 making proposals for the transfer of additional powers to local authorities, or to local areas. These built upon the 2012 report [\*No Stone Unturned: in Pursuit of Growth\*](#) ('the Heseltine report'), which recommended the merging of various national funding streams to provide much greater local responsibility for economic development.

## 1.2 Devolution deals

The first 'devolution deal' was announced by the Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority in November 2014. Following the 2015 General Election, the then Chancellor, George Osborne, gave a speech on 14 May in which he outlined the then Government's approach:

Here's the deal:

We will hand power from the centre to cities to give you greater control over your local transport, housing, skills and healthcare. And we'll give the levers you need to grow your local economy and make sure local people keep the rewards.

But it's right people have a single point of accountability: someone they elect, who takes the decisions and carries the can.

So with these new powers for cities must come new city-wide elected mayors who work with local councils.

I will not impose this model on anyone. But nor will I settle for less.<sup>2</sup>

The Government indicated subsequently that Government departments were expected actively to consider devolving powers wherever possible:

3.15 The government is committed to building strong city regions led by elected mayors, building on the ground-breaking devolution deal with Greater Manchester in November 2014. The Chancellor has asked all relevant Secretaries of State to proactively consider what they can devolve to local areas and where they can facilitate integration between public services.....

<sup>1</sup> See BBC, [David Cameron's statement on the UK's future](#), 19 September 2014

<sup>2</sup> HM Treasury, ["Chancellor on building a Northern powerhouse"](#), 14 May 2015

## 5 Devolution to local government in England

3.16 As part of the Spending Review, the government will look at transforming the approach to local government financing and further decentralising power, in order to maximise efficiency, local economic growth and the integration of public services.<sup>3</sup>

To have their proposals taken into account in the autumn 2015 Spending Review, initial proposals for devolution from local areas were required to be submitted to the Treasury by 4 September 2015. The Government received [38 bids for devolved powers](#) by 4 September 2015.<sup>4</sup> Some of the bids explicitly stated that they are intended to begin a discussion with Government rather than representing a final position.<sup>5</sup> The *Local Government Chronicle* has produced [a map of the state of play](#) in different parts of England as of February 2017.

### 1.3 Devolution deals to date

As of April 2018, devolution deals with twelve areas have been agreed. Three have collapsed, and two have collapsed then been partially revived (see Table 1). Discussions have also taken place on further devolution to Greater London (see section 4.1).

The main powers that Government has agreed to devolve in multiple areas in the devolution deals agreed to date can be found in Appendix 1. A number of core powers have been made available to most areas, whilst most areas have also been provided with one or more unique responsibilities (see section 2.1). Details of the local authorities participating in each devolution deal area, together with other reported interest, can be found in Appendix 2.

**Table 1: Devolution deals**

	<b>Devolution deal agreed</b>	<b>Bid document</b>
<a href="#">Greater Manchester</a>	<a href="#">3 Nov 2014</a> <a href="#">27 Feb 2015</a> <a href="#">8 Jul 2015</a> <a href="#">25 Nov 2015</a> <a href="#">16 Mar 2016</a>	Not published
<a href="#">Sheffield City Region</a>	<a href="#">5 Oct 2015</a> <a href="#">12 Dec 2014</a>	Not published
<a href="#">West Yorkshire</a>	<a href="#">18 Mar 2015</a>	Not published
Cornwall	<a href="#">27 July 2015</a>	<a href="#">March 2015</a>
<a href="#">North-East</a>	<a href="#">23 Oct 2015 (rejected)</a>	<a href="#">2015 (undated)</a>

<sup>3</sup> HM Treasury, *A country that lives within its means*, 2015, p. 15

<sup>4</sup> This figure included bids from Cardiff, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Inverness; and the deals that had already been agreed with Greater Manchester, Sheffield, West Yorkshire and Cornwall. The geographical areas of some of the bids overlapped with one another e.g. North and East Yorkshire vs West Yorkshire.

<sup>5</sup> See David Paine, "Power to shape economies tops devolution demands", *Local Government Chronicle*, 17 September 2015.

<a href="#">North of Tyne</a>	<a href="#">24 November 2017</a>	None published
<a href="#">Tees Valley</a>	<a href="#">23 Oct 2015</a>	Not published
<a href="#">West Midlands</a>	<a href="#">17 Nov 2015</a> 23 Nov 2017	<a href="#">July 2015</a>
<a href="#">Liverpool City Region</a>	<a href="#">17 Nov 2015</a> <a href="#">16 Mar 2016</a>	<a href="#">2015 (undated)</a>
<a href="#">Cambridgeshire / Peterborough</a>	<a href="#">20 June 2016</a>	Not published
Norfolk / Suffolk	<a href="#">20 June 2016 (rejected)</a> (East Anglia: <a href="#">16 Mar 2016</a> )	<a href="#">4 Sep 2015 (Suffolk);</a>
<a href="#">West of England</a>	<a href="#">16 Mar 2016</a>	<a href="#">4 Sep 2015</a>
Greater Lincolnshire	<a href="#">16 Mar 2016 (rejected)</a>	<a href="#">4 Sep 2015</a>

## 1.4 Implementation of deals

Devolution deals are negotiated in private between Government teams and local authority leaders. Once the deal document has been agreed and published, each council involved must then itself approve its participation in the deal. This has been referred to by the Government as 'ratification'. At this stage a number of councils have voted against further participation (see 'authorities rejecting membership' in Appendix 2).

A number of Orders under the [Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016](#), transferring or creating powers included in the deals, have passed through Parliament. Other elements of the devolution deals do not concern statutory functions, and therefore do not require Orders. The deal documents themselves are not statutory.

Six combined authorities held mayoral elections in May 2017. Detailed results can be found in the Library briefing paper [Local election results 2017](#). A further election, in the Sheffield City Region, was held on 3 May 2018.

The Government published the first 'devolution report' required under the 2016 Act on 2 December 2016,<sup>6</sup> and the second in January 2018.<sup>7</sup> The reports cover the powers devolved under the 2016 Act.

In November 2017, Sajid Javid, secretary of state for communities and local government, announced that his department was working on a devolution 'framework':

<sup>6</sup> See DCLG, [Secretary of State's annual report on devolution 2015-16](#), 2 December 2016

<sup>7</sup> See DCLG, [Secretary of State's annual report on devolution 2016-17](#), 10 January 2018



## 7 Devolution to local government in England

“Work is still in the early stages – and I’d welcome your support in shaping the final product. But I want a framework that, above all else, provides clarity and consistency about what a successful devolution agreement looks like.

What standards will need to be met, what outcomes will need to be delivered, what red lines there are for the whole process. Expectations about leadership, scope and levels of local support.

...With a clear position on how devolution negotiations should proceed, authorities at all levels will be much better placed to develop and put forward proposals that suit the unique needs of their residents and businesses”.<sup>8</sup>

### 1.5 Deals under negotiation

Deals have been reported as under negotiation in a number of areas:<sup>9</sup>

- Talks are under way with Liverpool City Region and Tees Valley on further deals;<sup>10</sup>
- A report emerged in November 2017 that a devolution deal for the **Solent** (Southampton, Portsmouth and Isle of Wight) was still with the Secretary of State a year after being submitted.<sup>11</sup> This had followed a previous bid for the whole of [Hampshire and the Isle of Wight](#) in 2015;
- **Lancashire** was reported in November 2016 as being likely to accept a deal including a directly-elected mayor.<sup>12</sup> A later report in September 2017 suggested Government support for a deal without a mayor, both in Lancashire and **Devon / Somerset**. This is in line with the commitment in the 2017 Conservative manifesto:

For combined authorities that are based around our great cities, we will continue to support the adoption of elected mayors, but we will not support them for the rural counties.<sup>13</sup>

- **Dorset** was reported as pursuing a deal and combined authority alongside local government reorganisation, but no deal has yet been published;<sup>14</sup>
- Devolution bids, or expressions of interest / prospectuses, have been published in [Gloucestershire](#), [Cheshire and Warrington](#), [Cumbria](#), [Leicestershire](#); [North and East Yorkshire](#); [Surrey and Sussex](#); [Greater Essex](#); and [Devon / Somerset](#).
- A proposal for devolution of power and joint working for [Derby](#), [Nottingham and their hinterlands](#) was published in November 2017 by the consultancy MetroDynamics. Discussions for an ‘East Midlands’ combined authority covering Nottinghamshire,

---

<sup>8</sup> Nick Golding, [“Javid: Devo framework to provide ‘clarity and consistency’”](#), *Local Government Chronicle*, 21 November 2017. The text in the quote is all a quote of Mr Javid speaking at the County Councils Network annual conference.

<sup>9</sup> See also David Paine and Sarah Calkin, [“New devo deals expected in Autumn Statement”](#), *Local Government Chronicle*, 16 November 2016

<sup>10</sup> HM Treasury, *Budget 2017*, p54

<sup>11</sup> Jon Bunn, [“Leaders frustrated at Solent devo deal delay”](#), *Local Government Chronicle*, 28 November 2017

<sup>12</sup> Helen Pidd, [“Lancashire likely to be first county to elect mayor”](#), *Guardian*, 9 November 2016

<sup>13</sup> Conservative Party, *Forward Together*, 2017, p32

<sup>14</sup> See House of Commons [PQ 49624 2016-17](#)

Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Leicestershire were reported in April 2018.<sup>15</sup>

Three devolution deals have run into obstacles:

- The North-East deal collapsed on 7 September 2016. Three of the seven authorities have subsequently pursued the 'North of Tyne' deal (see section 4.6 below);
- Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council rejected the Greater Lincolnshire deal in November 2016. The deal was subsequently withdrawn by the DCLG;<sup>16</sup>
- Five district councils pulled out of the Norfolk / Suffolk deal (see Appendix 2). The deal was subsequently withdrawn.<sup>17</sup> This deal had in turn emerged from the East Anglia devolution deal, which was announced in March 2016 but subsequently abandoned.

---

<sup>15</sup> Jon Bunn, "[Leaders discuss 'combined authority' across four counties](#)", *Local Government Chronicle*, 25 April 2018

<sup>16</sup> Lincolnshire County Council, "[Council Leader intends to say 'no' to a Mayor for Greater Lincolnshire](#)", 11 November 2016

<sup>17</sup> George Nobbs, "Whatever this is, it is not devolution", *Municipal Journal*, 15 November 2016;



## 2. Devolution deals: key components

### 2.1 Deals: the 'menu'

The devolution deals agreed to date can be characterised as consisting of a 'menu with specials'. A number of items have been made available to most areas, but each deal also contains a few unique elements or 'specials' (typically consisting of commitments to explore future policy options). The following sections outline the nature of the 'menu' powers that have been made available to most of these areas. The exact nature of the powers devolved can be seen in the deal documents (see section 1.3 for links).

The core powers devolved include the following:

- **Restructuring the further education system.** This typically consists of local commissioning of the Adult Skills Budget from 2016-17, followed by full devolution of the budget planned from 2019-20.<sup>18</sup> Areas will be required to undertake a full review of further education and skills provision, and to have agreed arrangements with the Government for managing financial risk. The November 2017 Industrial Strategy White Paper announced 'skills advisory panels', which will be "integrated into Mayoral Combined Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships to inform the analysis that feeds into Local Industrial Strategies".<sup>19</sup>
- **Business support.** In most areas, local and central business support services will be united in a 'growth hub'. UK Trade and Investment will be required to partner with local business support services.
- **The Work Programme.** Devolved areas were to participate in the commissioning of the Work Programme in their areas. This was superseded in July 2017 by a decision to create a new grant, totalling £28 million, to allow devolved areas to develop a programme for 'harder-to-help' benefit claimants, supplementary to the main Work Programme.<sup>20</sup> This grant does not cover Greater Manchester or Greater London, which have negotiated separate arrangements;
- **EU structural funds.** A number of areas were to become 'intermediate bodies', which means that they, instead of the Government, would have taken decisions about which public and private bodies to give EU structural funds to. It is not clear whether devolved areas will have any role in the 'Shared Prosperity Fund' that has been mooted to replace structural funds post-Brexit;
- **Fiscal powers.** Most deals include an investment fund; some areas are piloting full retention of business rates from 2017-18 onwards (London, Manchester, Cornwall, Liverpool and West

<sup>18</sup> See the Commons Library debate pack [Skills devolution in England](#), 19 January 2018, for further details. Skills devolution was delayed from its original start date of April 2018.

<sup>19</sup> HM Government, [Industrial Strategy White Paper](#), 2017, p114

<sup>20</sup> David Paine, ["DWP hands devo areas £28m for work programme 'alternative'"](#), *Local Government Chronicle*, 1 August 2017

Midlands). Elected mayors were to have the power to add a supplement of up to 2% on business rates, but this power is now on hold due to the falling of the *Local Government Finance Bill* in the first part of 2017;<sup>21</sup>

- **Integrated transport systems.** Many deals include the power to introduce bus franchising, which would allow local areas to determine their bus route networks and to let franchises to private bus companies for operating services on those networks (see the Library briefing paper on the [Bus Services Act 2017](#) for further details). Each deal also includes a unified multi-year transport investment budget, and most commit to improving joint working between the combined authority and Network Rail, Highways England, and (where relevant) plans for the HS2 line. Some deals include a ‘key network of local roads’ to be controlled by the combined authority. This will consist of roads currently managed by the participating local authorities;
- **Planning and land use.** Many deals include the power to create a spatial plan for the area, and/or the power to establish Mayoral Development Corporations. Some deals will also permit the combined authority to use Compulsory Purchase Orders, with the consent of the local authority in which the land or property is located. Non-statutory joint bodies (‘Land Commissions’ or ‘Joint Asset Boards’) will be established to improve the management of surplus land and buildings across public sector bodies, making joint decisions on whether to re-use, share, or sell unused land and buildings within the public estate.
- A £12 million ‘**capacity fund**’ for mayoral combined authorities for 2018-19 and 2019-20 was announced in the November 2017 budget;

## 2.2 The ‘specials’

Devolved powers in the following areas have been offered to a more limited selection of combined authorities:

### Housing

In early 2018, ‘housing deals’ were agreed with Greater Manchester (see section 3.1), West Midlands (see section 4.5), and the West of England. West of England’s deal includes £3m capacity funding, a possible deal on affordable housing, and the intention to “accelerate housing delivery to 7,500 homes per year”.<sup>22</sup>

A housing deal has also been agreed with Oxfordshire County Council and its districts. This does not have any implications for governance in Oxfordshire: it forms part of the Government’s plans for growth in the Oxford – Cambridge – Milton Keynes corridor.

These deals sit alongside the bid-based [Housing Infrastructure Fund](#) of £4 billion available between 2018 and 2021, to which combined authorities and other localities have bid during 2017 and 2018.

<sup>21</sup> The provision for the agreement of the LEP did not appear in the Bill.

<sup>22</sup> MHCLG, [Outline of interim housing package for the West of England](#), 21 March 2018

## Health

The chief executive of the NHS, Simon Stevens, said in December 2015 that ‘not many’ other areas (alongside Greater Manchester) were likely to take on health responsibilities in the near future.<sup>23</sup> A document entitled [NHS Devolution: Proposed Principles and Decision Criteria](#), published in September 2015, sets out the NHS’s preferred approach to proposals for health and social care integration.

Cornwall’s devolution deal (see section 4.4 below) included provision for the integration of health and social care. This has been pursued as part of the national requirement for CCGs and local authorities to produce a ‘sustainability and transformation plan’. Details of progress can be found on the joint website [Shaping our Future](#).

The GLA published a document in London setting out the intended benefits of health devolution in London.<sup>24</sup> These will include:

- establishing a London Estates Board, to involve local government and other bodies in strategic NHS estates decisions. This will also mean that proceeds from land sales can be reinvested in the healthcare system;
- ensuring funds from the ‘sugar levy’ are used to tackle obesity in London;
- Greater local design of health-related employment support services;
- A London Workforce Board, to co-ordinate training between health and social care staff, promoting more integrated roles to support an integrated model of care.

This follows a series of pilots in 2015-16 exploring health and social care collaboration between groups of London boroughs, the GLA, and London CCGs.<sup>25</sup>

## Transforming Cities

A new Transforming Cities investment fund of £1.7 billion was announced in the November 2017 Budget. Half of this fund is to be split between the six mayoral combined authorities on a per capita basis, as per Table 2 below. The other half will be available to other areas on a competitive bid basis.

**Table 2: Transforming Cities Fund allocations**

Mayoral area	Funding
West Midlands	£250 million
Greater Manchester	£243 million
Liverpool City Region	£134 million

<sup>23</sup> David Williams, “Exclusive: Stevens casts doubt over NHS devolution outside Manchester”, *Health Service Journal*, 14 Dec 2015

<sup>24</sup> GLA, [Health and Care Devolution: What it Means for London](#), November 2017

<sup>25</sup> HM Treasury, [London health devolution agreement](#), 15 December 2015. See also Heather Jameson, “‘Giant leap’ for capital care after health deal is unveiled”, *Municipal Journal*, 17 Dec 2015

Tees Valley	£59 million
West of England	£80 million
Cambridgeshire / Peterborough	£74 million

The funding will “support intra-city transport” and “will target projects which drive productivity by improving connectivity, reducing congestion and utilising new mobility services and technology”.<sup>26</sup>

### Local industrial strategies

In the Industrial Strategy White Paper, published in November 2017, the Government signalled its intent to develop ‘local industrial strategies’:

We will work in partnership with places to develop Local Industrial Strategies, which will be developed locally and agreed with the government. These strategies will help identify priorities to improve skills, increase innovation and enhance infrastructure and business growth. This will guide the use of local funding streams and any spending from national schemes.

Local Industrial Strategies will be long-term, based on clear evidence, and aligned to the national Industrial Strategy.<sup>27</sup>

The first Local Industrial Strategies are to be agreed by March 2019. In combined authority areas, they will be led by the combined authority; elsewhere, they will be led by Local Enterprise Partnerships. The 2017 Budget included funding of £243 million for a local industrial strategy in Greater Manchester, and the second West Midlands devolution deal included a commitment to a local industrial strategy in the West Midlands.

A new “Strength in Places Fund” of £115 million was announced in the Industrial Strategy White Paper in November 2017. This will

...support collaborative programmes based on research and innovation excellence in places right across the UK which can demonstrate a strong impact on local productivity and enhance collaboration between universities, research organisations, businesses, local government and Local Enterprise Partnerships in England and relevant agencies in the devolved nations.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> HM Treasury, *Budget 2017*, p51

<sup>27</sup> HM Government, [Industrial Strategy White Paper](#), 2017, p219

<sup>28</sup> HM Government, [Industrial Strategy White Paper](#), 2017, p85

## 3. The Greater Manchester devolution deals

This section outlines the devolution deals agreed with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

### 3.1 The Greater Manchester Agreement

Five different deals have provided the following powers for the Greater Manchester Combined Authority:

- A consolidated, multi-year transport budget;
- Responsibility for bus services, railway stations, and ‘smart ticketing’ (an example of this is London’s Oyster Card) in Greater Manchester;
- A Housing Investment Fund of £300m over 10 years, making loans to housebuilders (and thus being self-sustaining over time);
- The power to produce a statutory spatial strategy; to introduce Mayoral Development Corporations; make Compulsory Purchase Orders; set a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); and establish a non-statutory Land Commission;
- An enhanced form of the Manchester ‘earn-back’ agreement;
- The elected mayor becomes the Police and Crime Commissioner for Greater Manchester.<sup>29</sup>
- Devolved business support budgets: the Growth Accelerator, Manufacturing Advice Service and UKTI Export Advice;
- Power to restructure further education in Greater Manchester, plus control of the Apprenticeship Grant for Employers before its closure in mid-2017;
- Joint commissioning, with the Department for Work and Pensions, of the next stage of the Work Programme;
- Transfer of the Greater Manchester Fire Service and the Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority to the GMCA;
- Control over EU structural funds (the implications for the ‘Shared Prosperity Fund’, mooted to replace these when the UK leaves the EU, are not clear);
- A Life Chances Investment Fund, incorporating funding from Troubled Families, Working Well, and joint work on children’s services;
- Piloting the full retention of business rate revenue;
- £28 million to develop the new Work and Health Programme. This programme began in late 2017.<sup>30</sup>
- An agreement on [devolution of powers associated with the justice system](#), published in July 2016.

A ‘housing package’ was agreed in March 2018, which included a £50 million ‘land fund’ for remedial work to brownfield sites; capacity funding of ‘up to £8 million’; £10.25 million for the Collyhurst Estate; and greater flexibility around the moving of funds between years for the £300 million loan fund. Greater Manchester has agreed to “accelerate

---

<sup>29</sup> HM Treasury, [Greater Manchester Agreement](#), November 2014, p. 1

<sup>30</sup> DCLG, [Work, health and disability green paper: improving lives](#), 2 November 2016

delivery rates to 12,375 homes per annum to 2026".<sup>31</sup> The agreement is still awaiting Government approval at the time of writing; it is also contingent on adoption of the statutory spatial framework.

Tony Lloyd acted as 'interim mayor' between 29 May 2015 and the election of Andy Burnham on 4 May 2017.<sup>32</sup>

## 3.2 Health devolution in Greater Manchester

The Government published the [Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Devolution Memorandum of Understanding](#) on 27 February 2015.

This paper envisaged a new Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership Board (GMHSPB), which will produce a joint health and social care strategy for Greater Manchester.

The GMHSPB ran in shadow form in 2015-16, before going live in April 2016. It has two sub-groups: a Greater Manchester Joint Commissioning Board (JCB) and an Overarching Provider Forum. Members of the former are the 12 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in Greater Manchester; the 10 Greater Manchester boroughs; and NHS England. Members of the latter are service providers: acute care trusts, mental health trusts, ambulance trusts, LMCs (local medical committees), and others.

Through the JCB, strategic decisions regarding commissioning of health and social care services in Greater Manchester are agreed by NHS England, CCGs, and local political actors. [A strategy was published in December 2015](#). The JCB commissions health and social care services across Greater Manchester on behalf of its constituent organisations, pooling the pooled commissioning budgets of the CCGs and the social care budgets of the boroughs.<sup>33</sup>

At local (borough) level, Health and Wellbeing Boards, made up of representatives from CCGs and boroughs, ensure that health and social care services are provided in a joined-up fashion, in line with the GMHSPB's Strategic Sustainability Plan.

The proposals do not constitute a wholesale transfer of functions or funds from the NHS to local authorities, or vice versa. Chris Ham, chief executive of the Kings Fund, stated:

Devolution to Greater Manchester should enable decisions to be taken much closer to the population being served, with councillors having a bigger influence on future decisions. ...The unanswered question is how much freedom public sector leaders will have to depart from national policies in taking greater control of NHS resources.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> MHCLG, [Outline of a housing package for Greater Manchester](#), 21 March 2018

<sup>32</sup> See the [Greater Manchester Combined Authority \(Amendment\) Order 2015](#) (SI 2015/960). The interim mayor must be a councillor, MP, MEP or Police and Crime Commissioner in the Greater Manchester area.

<sup>33</sup> See the Greater Manchester Commissioning Strategy, [Commissioning for Reform, 2016](#)

<sup>34</sup> Chris Ham, "What Devo Manc could mean for health, social care and wellbeing in Greater Manchester", [Kings Fund](#), 2 March 2015

## 15 Devolution to local government in England

These proposals are being implemented via section 75 of the *National Health Service Act 2006*, which permits agreements to share functions and budgets between NHS bodies and local authorities. The elected mayor, Andy Burnham, has no formal power over the integration of health and social care. The GMHSPB has appointed its own chief executive, Jon Rouse, as of 31 March 2016.

Criteria for national intervention in the Greater Manchester devolved arrangements were published in March 2016.<sup>35</sup> A [dedicated website](#) covering new arrangements for health and social care has also been established. Greater Manchester has been awarded £450 million health service transformation funding over five years.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> See Greater Manchester Combined Authority, [Accountability Agreement](#) (paper 5b), 18 March 2016

<sup>36</sup> David Paine, "Greater Manchester receives £450m to spur health transformation", *Local Government Chronicle*, 21 Dec 2015



## 4. Deals in other localities

### 4.1 London

Greater London is not covered by the *Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016*. Alongside the 'devolution deals' agenda, negotiations have progressed for devolution to London of many of the powers noted in section 2 above (where these were not already devolved to the GLA).

A [memorandum of understanding on further devolution to London](#) was published in March 2017, alongside the Budget. This included commitments to devolve the Work and Health programme, the Adult Skills Budget, and to progress towards devolution of matters associated with health and criminal justice. Sign-off of the deal was delayed to November 2017.<sup>37</sup>

A memorandum of understanding entitled [Working towards Justice Devolution to London](#) was published in March 2018. This proposed joint responsibility for various probation functions and victim services to pass to a London Justice Devolution Board. The document aims to implement the plans for devolution from April 2019.

#### Further proposals in London

In addition to these changes, the London boroughs and the GLA have put forward a number of plans for further devolution to London.<sup>38</sup> Most recently, in November 2015, a joint document produced by the Mayor, London Councils, and the London LEP, entitled [Skills Devolution to London](#), was submitted to the Government. This contained a series of high-level outcomes sought for the skills system in London by 2020, and set out a prospectus for devolving power in order to achieve them:

- Devolution of the Adult Skills Budget, Adult Community Learning, and discretionary support for 19+ learners;
- Devolution of London's share of advanced learning loans;
- A guaranteed 'proportionate return' to London from the apprenticeships levy introduced at the 2015 Spending Review;
- Transfer of the Secretary of State's appointment powers over college boards;
- Protection of London's share of 16-19 skills funding;
- Creation of a Skills Commissioner for London.

In July 2016, Sadiq Khan reconvened the London Finance Commission in the wake of the June 2016 vote to leave the European Union.<sup>39</sup> Its final report, [Devolution: a capital idea](#), was published in January 2017. The report recommends the devolution of several taxes to London government, such as stamp duty, Air Passenger Duty, Vehicle Excise

<sup>37</sup> See Jon Bunn, "[London health devolution deal agreed](#)", *Local Government Chronicle*, 16 November 2017; GLA, [Health and Care Devolution: What It Means for London](#), November 2017

<sup>38</sup> These proposals have not been formally published. See also the London Assembly report [A New Agreement for London](#), September 2015

<sup>39</sup> See GLA, [London Finance Commission](#), n. d.

Duty, together with a share of income tax and VAT revenue. A tourism tax was also proposed.

The report stated that any tax devolution would be 'revenue neutral' at the point at which tax powers were passed to Greater London. It also suggested that other cities with devolution deals were looking with interest at the proposals.

### 4.2 Cornwall

A devolution deal with Cornwall was agreed in July 2015.<sup>40</sup> The deal was agreed with Cornwall Council and the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly NHS Trust. The deal does not require a combined authority or elected mayor to be established.

This is the only deal so far to be agreed with a single unitary authority: the powers to be devolved will be devolved to Cornwall County Council. The deal follows Cornwall Council's publication of a document entitled [The Case for Cornwall](#) in March 2015.

Cornwall has also progressed the joint delivery of health and social care services between Cornwall Council and NHS Kernow CCG).

### 4.3 Yorkshire

Devolution deals were agreed with the West Yorkshire and the Sheffield City Region combined authorities in March 2015 and December 2014 respectively.<sup>41</sup> A further deal, including provision for a directly-elected mayor, was agreed with the Sheffield City Region in October 2015.

The Sheffield City Region launched a consultation in mid-2016 on two district councils from outside Yorkshire becoming full members. This would have meant electors in those councils taking part in the mayoral election. The two were Bassetlaw (in northern Nottinghamshire) and Chesterfield (in Derbyshire). Chesterfield Borough Council is not geographically linked to the Sheffield City Region, though both councils, along with three others, were 'associate members'.

Derbyshire County Council launched a judicial review of Chesterfield's participation in the Sheffield deal. The case was heard on 11-12 November 2016. The judge found that the consultation was defective and ordered that it be rerun. This led to the Sheffield City Region mayoral election being delayed by a year, to 2018. Subsequently, Chesterfield and Bassetlaw withdrew their applications for full membership.

In consequence, the idea of a pan-Yorkshire devolution deal acquired fresh impetus.<sup>42</sup> On 18 September 2017, a meeting of the Sheffield City Region took place at which consent was sought for a new consultation. This is a statutory requirement in advance of the devolution of the

---

<sup>40</sup> HM Treasury, [Cornwall Devolution Deal](#), July 2015

<sup>41</sup> See Deputy Prime Minister's Office, ['Oyster-style' cards for Sheffield as Deputy PM agrees devolution deal](#), 12 December 2014; [HCD 18 Dec 2014](#) WMS 141

<sup>42</sup> LGC Briefing, [Devolution by judicial review](#), 11 November 2016; James Reed, ["Fresh attempt to revive Yorkshire-wide devolution"](#), *Yorkshire Post*, 16 November 2016

powers agreed in the October 2015 deal. Barnsley and Doncaster did not give their consent, stating that they would seek to take part in a pan-Yorkshire deal.<sup>43</sup> On 22 December 2017, the two authorities published the results of local referendums held on the two options:

**Table 3: Barnsley and Doncaster community poll results**

	<b>Barnsley</b>	<b>Doncaster</b>
Yorkshire-wide deal	84.9%	85.2%
Sheffield City Region deal	15.1%	14.8%
Turnout	22.4%	20.1%

The Minister for the Northern Powerhouse, Jake Berry, [indicated in July 2017](#) that the Government would not agree to a pan-Yorkshire deal. He said in a letter to the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority that “consent by the 20 councils for such an approach is very unlikely. Nor do I believe that a deal and governance across the whole of Yorkshire, given its scale and diversity, would in practice deliver the benefits that the proponents of such a deal seek”.<sup>44</sup> This position was reiterated in [an adjournment debate in the House of Commons](#) on 10 October 2017. However, subsequent negotiations suggested that the Government would be willing to see a One Yorkshire deal replacing the Sheffield deal, provided that all participating authorities agreed and the Sheffield City Region mayor would serve out his or her term.<sup>45</sup> This position was made clear in [a Westminster Hall debate on 9 January 2018](#).

Dan Jarvis MP was elected as mayor of the Sheffield City Region on 3 May 2018. When he announced his candidacy, Mr Jarvis said that he intended to remain an MP and to work towards establishing a One Yorkshire devolution deal. The mayor and combined authority do also have the option of progressing the October 2015 deal for Sheffield if they so choose. At present, the powers in that deal cannot be exercised locally.<sup>46</sup>

Eighteen local authorities submitted a proposed deal under the title of ‘One Yorkshire’ to the Government in January 2018.<sup>47</sup> This sought devolution of the following powers, many of which are recognisable from the ‘menu’ noted in section 2.1:

- Adult skills funding;
- Integrated business support, including DIT export support;
- A multi-year consolidated transport budget;
- Bus franchising in all or part of the region;

<sup>43</sup> See [the minutes of the meeting](#) on the Sheffield City Region website.

<sup>44</sup> Quoted in David Paine, “Yorkshire devo dissenters seek deal for ‘coalition of the willing’”, *Local Government Chronicle*, 22 June 2017

<sup>45</sup> See the House of Commons Library debate pack [Yorkshire devolution](#), 8 January 2018

<sup>46</sup> Mr Jarvis has committed not to taking a salary as mayor. At present the combined authority has no power to pay the mayor a salary.

<sup>47</sup> See [Yorkshire Devolution Agreement Submission](#), January 2018

## 19 Devolution to local government in England

- Business rate supplements;
- Mayoral development corporations, compulsory purchase powers and a Yorkshire Land Commission;
- A £125 million per year investment fund;
- A £500 million Housing Investment Fund;
- Acting as a pilot of 100% business rate retention;
- National programmes addressing unemployment, health barriers to work and in-work poverty;
- Borrowing powers;
- Powers to acquire and dispose of land, and a 'strategic infrastructure investment framework'.

A single Mayor and combined authority covering Yorkshire would be established. This would require the existing combined authorities to be wound up or merged in to the new one.

### 4.4 Liverpool: March 2016

A second devolution deal for the Liverpool City Region was announced alongside the March 2016 budget. The city region will take on the following additional responsibilities:

- Beginning to plan for integration of health and social care;
- A review of the delivery of children's services;
- The Apprenticeship Grant for Employers, accompanied by discussions on the use of funding from the apprenticeship levy;
- Additional, unspecified transport and highway powers to accompany the city region's Key Local Roads Network;
- work on developing a Clean Air Zone.

### 4.5 West Midlands: November 2017

A second deal for the West Midlands was published at the November 2017 Budget. This included the following commitments:

- Government agreement to the Mayor absorbing the Police and Crime Commissioner and the West Midlands Fire Service;
- A business rate supplement for the Mayor (though legal powers to implement this do not yet exist);
- A capacity fund of £1 million for the combined authority;
- Funding for the extension of the Midland Metro to Brierley Hill, plus seeking opportunities for funding cycling infrastructure;
- Government support for a local air quality strategy;
- A local industrial strategy;
- £6 million for a Mayoral Housing Delivery Team, boosting the capacity of the combined authority;
- A skills advisory panel, plus £5 million for a construction training programme;
- An Employment Support Framework Agreement, to integrate, health, skills and employment provision. This will sit on top of the combined authority's employment support programme and apprenticeship-related programmes run by JobCentre Plus and the Department for Work and Pensions;
- Funding support for a local energy strategy;

- Government funding for a Housing First pilot, mental health innovation, and a Social Care Academy.

The West Midlands was also offered a housing deal on 13 March 2018. This included a land fund of up to £100 million for remedial work on “land around priority sites across the area”; working towards a deal with housing associations on affordable housing; and a partnership with Homes England involving a number of strands of joint work. This deal is subject to “business case approval from Government”, which is expected to be agreed in May 2018.<sup>48</sup>

## 4.6 North of Tyne

A devolution deal for ‘North of Tyne’ was announced in the 2017 Budget.<sup>49</sup> The participants are Newcastle City Council, Northumberland County Council and North Tyneside Council. This deal has been agreed after the failure of the original North-East devolution deal in late 2016. The three councils will form a ‘North of Tyne Combined Authority’ (NTCA) in shadow form from summer 2018. A mayoral election will take place in May 2019. It is not yet clear whether the ‘rump’ of the North-East Combined Authority (Durham, Gateshead, Sunderland and South Tyneside) will remain in existence.

The North of Tyne Combined Authority will receive the following:

- An investment fund of £20 million per year;
- Adult skills funding (but apprenticeships funding is not covered);
- Powers to acquire land to build “houses, commercial space and infrastructure”: establishing a housing and land board;
- powers to create Mayoral Development Corporations, compulsory purchase powers, and borrowing powers;
- Power to set a precept on council tax;
- A framework agreement for locally funded employment support schemes;
- Collaboration on export advice for industry, including the GREAT Britain campaign and the Department for International Trade;

The three councils will appoint two members each to the NTCA alongside the elected mayor. The North-East LEP (which covers the *current* area of the North-East Combined Authority) will also have non-voting membership; and the mayor will become a member of the LEP board. The mayor will not have the power to veto a NTCA decision, instead having a power of “mayoral review”. This will allow the mayor to refer decisions with which s/he disagrees back to the NTCA ‘cabinet’ (of local authority members).

The North of Tyne deal includes only part of the area of the Tyne & Wear Passenger Transport Executive, currently managed as Nexus. This manages the Tyne & Wear Metro and local bus services. Because of this, the North of Tyne mayor will have no responsibilities for transport, nor will they take on bus franchising powers. A statutory joint committee will be established between North of Tyne and the remaining North-East

<sup>48</sup> MHCLG, [Outline of a housing package for the West Midlands](#), 13 March 2018

<sup>49</sup> See NTCA, [North of Tyne ‘minded-to’ devolution deal](#), November 2017

## 21 Devolution to local government in England

Combined Authority, with three members from the former and four from the latter. This committee will be responsible for the Passenger Transport Executive and the local transport plan.

## 5. Analysis and perspectives

### 5.1 2017: devolution perspectives

A number of reports urging a refreshing of the devolution process in England were produced during 2017.

IPPR published a report in February 2017 entitled *Rebooting Devolution*. This argued for a framework of powers that could be taken on by local authorities. These would be accessible alongside additional accountability requirements (though elected mayors are not regarded as essential). The report argued for local bodies to cover county areas in most cases:

...any proposed devolution area must be based around existing institutions and a shared sense of place. ... there is little merit in creating new structures across a large economic area that means little in the public imagination...<sup>50</sup>

In similar terms, Reform's report *Vive la devolution* argued for decentralisation of public services commissioning to 38 devolved bodies across England.

The Centre for Cities produced [a number of progress updates](#) entitled 'six months of..' each of the metro-mayoral areas in November 2017.

The Local Government Information Unit produced a report entitled *Beyond Devolution*, produced following several meetings of a Local Democracy Network. It recommended that:

- A Mayors' Senate should be established, giving directly elected mayors from individual and combined authorities a firm constitutional role, shaping Brexit and scrutinising legislation.
- A Local Finance Commission, led by local government, should carry out a systematic review of how local areas are funded based on the expertise, knowledge and experience of local leaders.
- A constitutional settlement should be pursued in order to provide a framework and consistency over the roles and responsibilities of central and local government.
- An immediate 'devolution reboot' to continue devolving power to the cities and regions of England.

A report for the County Councils Network by Oxford Economics, in 2017, argued that county economies should feature prominently in the forthcoming industrial strategy. Combined authority areas should not be the only focus. Manufacturing forms a significant element in county economies, and potential exists to drive productivity gains there.<sup>51</sup>

The Centre for Cities has produced a ['six months of'](#) analysis of each of the six metro-mayors in November 2017.

---

<sup>50</sup> Jack Hunter, *Rebooting devolution: A common sense approach to taking back control*, IPPR, 2017, p10

<sup>51</sup> CCN, *Understanding County Economies*, Oxford Economics, 2017



## 5.2 The available powers

The elected mayors have differing degrees of power over different matters. In most areas, they will have an effective veto over decisions made by the combined authority. Mayoral spending plans are, in most cases, to be subject to rejection by cabinet members on a two-thirds majority. Where powers to create a spatial strategy are available, this requires unanimous approval from the mayor and combined authority members.

This contrasts with the situation in London (see the Library briefing paper [The Greater London Authority](#)). The Mayor of London can take decisions without reference to the London boroughs. The London Assembly only has the power to veto a small number of high-level Mayoral decisions.

Despite the differing levels of formal power, mayors' profile will be such that they are likely to become associated, in the public eye, with any new initiatives or policy changes in all of the 'devolved' areas. For instance, in Greater Manchester, the mayor has no formal responsibility for the integrated health and social care bodies, but Andy Burnham has already pushed forward some initiatives around mental health. Mayors may face being held accountable for things that they do not control. This points towards a reliance on 'soft power' and informal governance skills, rather than formal proceedings and votes, to achieve desired outcomes. This would be at one with practice so far: Lord Smith of Leigh, the chair of the Greater Manchester combined authority, noted in June 2015 that "I have still not had a vote as chairman of the combined authority, and if I did have one I would think of it as a failure".<sup>52</sup>

## 5.3 Governance

Most of the deals agreed so far have featured a new directly-elected mayor covering a combined authority area. The Government has stated that a directly-elected mayor will be required where substantial powers are to be devolved.<sup>53</sup> Baroness Williams, speaking for the Government in the House of Lords, has said:

First, nobody has been required to have a mayor. Secondly, it would be irresponsible of any Government to put in place devolution of the scale and ambition as in Tees Valley and Greater Manchester without the clear, single point of accountability that an elected mayor can bring.<sup>54</sup>

At the outset of the policy, reference was made to 'alternative governance arrangements' (see the Library briefing *Combined authorities*). The 2015 IPPR report *Empowering Counties* suggested that elected mayors were inappropriate for areas which did not have a single urban centre, and urged the Government to clarify what alternative

---

<sup>52</sup> HLDeb 22 Jun 2015 c1413

<sup>53</sup> For instance, see [HCDeb 26 Nov 2015](#) c473WH

<sup>54</sup> [HLDeb 23 Mar 2016](#) c2414

governance arrangements would find favour in devolution deal negotiations.<sup>55</sup>

Professor Francesca Gains, of the University of Manchester, has stated:

Research at the University of Manchester examining the first city mayors suggests that there are reasons why an elected mayor is the right model for the new settlement. The visibility of a mayor means the public knows who to hold to account for the spending decisions now to be made in and across the region. Being directly elected will keep the mayor responsive to all communities.<sup>56</sup>

The Centre for Public Scrutiny, which is pursuing research into the governance and accountability surrounding combined authorities, has stated:

... the asymmetry involved [between the deals] also provides an additional impetus for transparency. Local people – anyone, indeed, not involved in the negotiations – need to understand what devolution priorities are being arrived at and agreed on. ... At the very least, the broad shape and principles of a bid for more devolved powers should be opened up to the public eye.<sup>57</sup>

## 5.4 Reactions

The Engineering Employers' Federation (EEF) published a report in September 2017 entitled *Fostering more industrious places*. This reflected increasing attention given to the Northern Powerhouse agenda in the second part of 2017. The EEF said:

Spreading devolution to all areas of England needs to be the main ambition behind the Government's policy on place as part of the industrial strategy. Establishing strong governance of place through Devolution deals will subsequently allow a more meaningful conversation to take place on how each area can support the industrial strategy.<sup>58</sup>

The EEF suggested that LEPs should be appointed as 'deal-making agents' on behalf of local areas to push this agenda forward. Areas should also be able to retain the benefits of productivity increases in the form of additional funding, or reduced spending.<sup>59</sup>

Much reaction from the local government world to the proposals has been positive, though this has not been a universal response.<sup>60</sup> Professor Francesca Gains has noted:

The interim mayor has to champion the region, and the idea of devolved powers, without having the budgets and powers fully in

<sup>55</sup> Ed Cox and Jack Hunter, [Empowering Counties: Unlocking County Devolution Deals](#), 2015, p.4

<sup>56</sup> Francesca Gains, "The making of the Greater Manchester mayor – what next?", [On Devo](#), policy@manchester, 2015, p. 6

<sup>57</sup> Ed Hammond, *Devo Why? Devo How?*, Centre for Public Scrutiny, 2015, p.8

<sup>58</sup> EEF, *Fostering more industrious places*, 2017, p.3

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5

<sup>60</sup> For supportive responses, see Local Government Association, [LGA response to government announcement of devolved health budget to Greater Manchester](#), 27 February 2015; more cautious responses include Daisy Sriblin, [Unanswered questions on devolved healthcare in Manchester](#), Fabian Society; Chris Ham, "What Devo Manc could mean for health, social care and wellbeing in Greater Manchester", [Kings Fund](#); Joy Furnival, [What Health and Social Care can learn from UK Devolution](#), University of Manchester.

place. In the face of welfare cuts, cuts in adult social care and other non-protected spending areas locally, early visible signs of economic and infrastructural benefits of the devolution agenda will be important to demonstrate to the public the potential benefit of devolution ahead of the full devolution of powers and election of the mayor proper in 2017.<sup>61</sup>

Helen McKenna, of the King's Fund, has suggested that health and social care integration in Greater Manchester could have a transformative effect:

Although what is currently happening in Manchester is technically more a case of delegation than devolution, particularly as formal accountabilities will remain with the national NHS bodies, it is nevertheless a far cry from 'business as usual'....In exchange for more of a say over its own future, Greater Manchester is promising to deliver changes to health and care services that we and many others have long been calling for... But what makes Greater Manchester's devolution project so exciting is the fact that their ambitions go much further than the integration of health and social care to consider public services in the round. This creates the opportunity to look beyond the role of health services in determining health outcomes to the (Far more influential) wider social determinants of health – for example, the roles of early years, education, employment and housing.<sup>62</sup>

Iain Wright MP expressed a more critical view in a Westminster Hall debate in June 2015:

...the areas that are being identified for devolution are those that have suffered the greatest cuts. Areas are being set up to fail, which feeds my concern, shared by many others, that the primary thing the Government want to localise is the blame for cuts they have made in Whitehall.<sup>63</sup>

Phillip Blond, director of ResPublica and co-author of *Devo Max – Devo Manc*, was quoted as saying:

These deals are fairly average and fairly small. It's all sub-Manchester and a lot of the innovation hasn't really made its way past the first tier of negotiations.<sup>64</sup>

Ben Harrison, of the Centre for Cities, suggested that the devolution offered to Greater Manchester may turn out to be 'a process not an event', as with devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland:

The devolution settlements that have been struck in the UK over the last fifteen years have not remained static – the prize for city-regions vying for devolution is not just what is on offer in 2015, but what could end up being on the table in the decade to come....Rather than being evidence of some kind of Whitehall favouritism or political game-playing, these decisions ultimately illustrate the fact that the presence of strong, democratically accountable institutions, at the right geographic scale, makes a

---

<sup>61</sup> Francesca Gains, [The future of metro mayors – all eyes on Greater Manchester](#), 25 June 2015

<sup>62</sup> Helen McKenna, "Devo Manc is a far cry from 'business as usual'", [Manchester Policy Blogs](#), 1 April 2016

<sup>63</sup> [HCDeb 9 Jun 2015](#), c76WH

<sup>64</sup> See Sam Clayden, "Deals of the century?", [Municipal Journal](#), 26 Nov 2015, p. 12

significant difference when it comes to decisions on where and how funding and functions are allocated.<sup>65</sup>

The House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee published a report in February 2016 entitled *Devolution: the next five years and beyond*. The Committee commended the general approach of devolving power, whilst recommending that greater attention be paid to transparency and accountability – both in the negotiation and implementation of deals.

## 5.5 Public consultation

A number of criticisms were made of the lack of public consultation in most devolution negotiations. The 2009 and 2016 Acts require a statutory consultation process when a new combined authority is created or when new powers are devolved to it. These have taken place in the areas that have been offered devolution deals.

However, the negotiations *leading to* devolution deals are non-statutory and informal, and have been conducted confidentially to date. Professor Robin Hambleton of the University of the West of England has described the Government's policy as 'centralisation on steroids':

Ministers, not elected local politicians, still less local citizens, will decide whether the deals are acceptable. The accountability is up to distant figures in Whitehall, not down to local people.<sup>66</sup>

The University of Sheffield and the Electoral Reform Society, with other partners, held two "citizens' assemblies" in autumn 2015, in Sheffield and Southampton. Over two weekends, selected members of the public discussed devolution options in their local areas. Details of the assemblies and the outcomes of the public discussions can be found at <http://citizensassembly.co.uk/>. Similarly, Coventry held a [one-day citizens' panel](#) on 9 September 2015, discussing whether the city should participate in the West Midlands combined authority.

Durham Council held a referendum in early 2016 on the (now aborted) North East devolution deal. Its cost has been estimated at £325,000.<sup>67</sup> In the event a number of questions were asked, and some 22% of the electorate responded. 60% said they thought the region getting some extra powers and controls from Whitehall would be a 'step in the right direction'. 40% of respondents thought an elected mayor for the North East should have quite a lot of power and influence, while 48% felt the mayor should have limited powers.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Ben Harrison, "There's more to devolution deals than the prizes on offer today", [Centre for Cities blog](#), 13 August 2015

<sup>66</sup> Robin Hambleton, "The devolution deception must be exposed", [Local Government Chronicle](#), 24 November 2015

<sup>67</sup> "Durham reveals devo poll costs", [Local Government Chronicle](#), 18 December 2015

<sup>68</sup> David Paine, "Results in on Durham's devo poll", [Local Government Chronicle](#), 19 February 2016

## 6. Further reading

Reform, [\*Vive la devolution: devolved public services commissioning\*](#), November 2017

LGIU, [\*Beyond devolution: the final report of the Local Democracy Commission\*](#), October 2017

EEF, [\*Fostering More Industrious Places\*](#), August 2017

CCN, [\*Understanding County Economies\*](#), Oxford Economics, 2017

Jack Hunter, [\*Rebooting devolution: A common sense approach to taking back control\*](#), IPPR, 2017

Local Government Association, [\*What next for devolution?\*](#), July 2016

National Audit Office, [\*English devolution deals\*](#), HC948 2015-16, April 2016

Political Studies Association, [\*Examining the role of 'informal governance' on devolution to England's cities\*](#), March 2016

[\*Representation\*](#), special issue, March 2016

Ed Hammond, [\*Cards on the table: English devolution and governance\*](#), Centre for Public Scrutiny, March 2016

Communities and Local Government Committee, [\*Devolution: the next five years and beyond\*](#), HC-369 2015-16, Feb 2016

Joe Randall and Jo Casebourne, [\*Making devolution deals work\*](#), Institute for Government, February 2016

Grant Thornton, [\*Making devolution work\*](#), November 2015

[\*On Devo\*](#), policy@manchester, 2015

Norman Warner and Jack O'Sullivan, [\*Letting go: how English devolution can help solve the NHS care and cash crisis\*](#), Reform, March 2015

Independent Commission on Non-Metropolitan England, [\*Devolution to Non-Metropolitan England: Seven Steps to Growth and Prosperity\*](#), March 2015

Independent Commission on Local Government Finance, [\*Financing English Devolution\*](#), LGA/CIPFA, February 2015

Mark Morrin and Phillip Blond, [\*Restoring Britain's City States: Devolution, Public Service Reform and Local Economic Growth\*](#), ResPublica, February 2015

Centre for London, [\*The Brightest Star: A Manifesto for London\*](#), October 2014

City Growth Commission, [\*Human Capitals, Connected Cities, Powers to Grow, Unleashing Metro Growth\*](#) [four papers], RSA/Core Cities Group, 2014

Ed Cox, Graeme Henderson and Luke Raikes, [Decentralisation Decade: A plan for economic prosperity, public service transformation and democratic renewal in England](#), IPPR/PwC, September 2014

Mark Morrin and Phillip Blond, [Devo-Max, Devo Manc: Place-Based Public Services](#), September 2014

London Finance Commission, [Raising the Capital](#), GLA, 2013

Lord Heseltine, [No stone unturned in pursuit of growth](#), BIS, 2012, plus [Government response](#), 2013

Communities and Local Government Committee, [Devolution in England: the case for local government](#), HC-503 2013-14, July 2014





		Greater Manchester	Sheffield	Tees Valley	Liverpool	West Midlands	Cambs/Pboro	West of England	Cornwall	North of Tyne
<b>Public services</b>	Health and social care integration									
	Children's services									
	Offender management, probation, prison estate									
	Troubled Families / Working Well									
	Police and Crime Commissioner									
	Fire service									
	Intermediate body for EU Structural Funds									
<b>Finance</b>	Investment fund (per year)	£30m	£30m	£15m	£30m	£36.5m	£20m	£30m		£20m
	Pilot retention of 100% business rates revenue									
	Mayor business rates supplement									
	Community Infrastructure Levy									

Note: Cornwall County Council holds a number of the powers set out here in its capacity as a unitary authority (marked in pale green)

Devolution of police and fire to West Midlands is under discussion (marked in yellow)

Powers over business rate supplements are unlikely to be available in the short term due to the falling of the *Local Government Finance Bill 2016-17*.

## Appendix 2: participants in devolution deals

Deal	Full members	Associate members	Authorities rejecting deal
<b>Greater Manchester</b>	Manchester; Salford; Tameside; Oldham; Trafford; Stockport; Bolton; Rochdale; Bury; Wigan		
<b>Liverpool City Region</b>	Liverpool; Wirral; Knowsley; St Helens; Sefton; Halton		
<b>Sheffield City Region</b>	Sheffield; Doncaster; Rotherham; Barnsley	Chesterfield; Bassetlaw; North-East Derbyshire; Derbyshire Dales; Bolsover	
<b>West Yorkshire</b>	Leeds; Calderdale; Bradford; Kirklees; Wakefield	York	
<b>West Midlands</b>	Birmingham; Sandwell; Dudley; Wolverhampton; Walsall; Coventry; Solihull	Redditch; Nuneaton & Bedworth; Tamworth; Cannock Chase; Telford & Wrekin	

<b>Deal</b>	<b>Full members</b>	<b>Associate members</b>	<b>Authorities rejecting deal</b>
<b>Tees Valley</b>	Darlington; Middlesbrough; Hartlepool; Stockton-on-Tees; Redcar & Cleveland		
<b>Cornwall</b>	Cornwall; Isles of Scilly		
<b>Cambridgeshire / Peterborough</b>	Cambridgeshire; Peterborough; Huntingdonshire; Fenland; East Cambridgeshire; South Cambridgeshire; Cambridge City		
<b>West of England</b>	Bristol; Bath & North-East Somerset; South Gloucestershire		North Somerset
<b>North-East / North of Tyne</b>	Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Northumberland; North Tyneside		Gateshead; Durham; Sunderland; South Tyneside
<b>Norfolk / Suffolk</b>	Norfolk; Suffolk; Forest Heath; St Edmundsbury; Babergh; Mid Suffolk; Ipswich; Suffolk Coastal; Waveney; South Norfolk; Broadland		Norwich; North Norfolk; Breckland; Great Yarmouth; King's Lynn and West Norfolk
<b>Greater Lincolnshire</b>	North Lincolnshire; North-East Lincolnshire; West Lindsey; East Lindsey; Lincoln City; North Kesteven; Boston; South Holland		Lincolnshire; South Kesteven

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publically available research briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email [papers@parliament.uk](mailto:papers@parliament.uk). Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email [hcinfo@parliament.uk](mailto:hcinfo@parliament.uk).

Disclaimer - This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).