MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO. 61

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:	Agenda – Part: 1	Item: 17
Cabinet – 16 th September 2015	Subject: LOCAL LONDON – proposals for North/East London devolution governance	
REPORT OF:	Wards: All	
Chief Executive	Cabinet Member consulted: Cllr. Doug Taylor	
Contact officer and telephone number:		

Alison Trew 020 8379 3186

E mail: alison.trew@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Eight boroughs, Barking and Dagenham, Enfield, Greenwich, Havering Newham, Redbridge Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest, members of the Growth Boroughs and/or the North East London Strategic Alliance (NELSA), have joined together to form the LOCAL LONDON partnership.
- 1.2The Government has indicated that devolved responsibilities to regions and subregions will be dependent on there being formalised governance arrangements and new decision-making processes. With this in mind, LOCAL LONDON Leaders and Mayors have outlined a process for formalising governance arrangements.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 Cabinet are asked to note the process for formalising the Local London governance arrangements.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Eight boroughs, Barking and Dagenham, Enfield, Greenwich, Havering Newham, Redbridge Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest, members of the Growth Boroughs and/or the North East London Strategic Alliance (NELSA), have joined together to form the LOCAL LONDON partnership.
- 3.2 Working across party lines they are developing devolution proposals in six policy areas business growth, community safety, education and skills, employment, health and social care and housing that demonstrate where

collaboration and greater powers would bring benefits to residents and drive growth across the north and east London sub-region.

3.3 The Government has indicated that devolved responsibilities to regions and sub-regions will be dependent on there being formalised governance arrangements and new decision-making processes. With this in mind, LOCAL LONDON Leaders and Mayors have outlined a process for formalising governance arrangements.

3.4 It is recommended that.

- I. In principle all boroughs in NELSA and the Growth Boroughs work toward integration into a new alliance called LOCAL LONDON by May 2016
- II. Between now and May 2016 an interim LOCAL LONDON would exist and operate with joint chairs
- III. Chief Executives of the boroughs affected will agree a paper on finance, resource support and scope of the new LOCAL LONDON by December 2015
- IV. In May 2016 following the London Mayoral elections the new LOCAL LONDON will hold its inaugural meeting.

A new single chair will be elected for a 2 year term of office.

V. In May 2018 following the local government elections a new chair will be elected on a rotational basis and thereafter for 2 years of office.

These proposals will be endorsed by the Leaders and Mayors of the Growth Boroughs and NELSA at their meeting on 18th September 2015.

Any LOCAL LONDON partnership agreement that results from this process will be subject to the Council's formal decision - making process.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The Local London councils could retain their current informal relationship. However, it is unlikely that Government will consider any devolution of functions and resources without there being a formal governance arrangement.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Formalising the Local London governance arrangements will place the north and east London sub regional grouping in a stronger position to bid for the devolution of functions and resources to the sub-region or individual boroughs as appropriate.

6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Financial Implications

The subscription costs have not yet been finalised but will cost between $\pounds 10,000 - \pounds 60,000$ p.a. The costs of the subscription will met from an existing corporate budget.

6.2 Legal Implications

- 6.2.1 The Council has power under section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals generally may do provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles. Creating stronger more sustainable communities and building on the local economy are key priorities for the Council. There is no express prohibition, restriction or limitation contained in a statute against use of the power in this way.
- 6.2.2 In addition, section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 gives a local authority power to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of its functions. The recommendations are in accordance with these powers.

7. KEY RISKS

The major risk would be not to agree formal governance arrangements for Local London, as this would mean that the Government would not consider devolving functions and resources to the north and east subregional grouping.

8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Fairness for All, Growth and Sustainability, Strong Communities A formalised Local London partnership will be able to present compelling business cases that demonstrate that local councils are best placed to design and deliver services that best meet our residents' needs and address local deprivation and inequality; deliver increased housing and encourage business growth and lobby for improved transport; and ensure that our residents feel safe and have improved health.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

Corporate advice has been sought in regard to equalities and an agreement has been reached that an equalities impact assessment is not relevant for the approval of this report. Equalities impact assessments will be undertaken when the formal partnership arrangements have been developed.

10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

A Local London performance management framework will be developed when the partnership has been formalised

11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

Improving the health and wellbeing of all residents in North East London is one of Local London's priorities and will enable better promotion of the strong case to Government and other public bodies for breaking down organisational boundaries, greater collaboration and gaining more control over particular funding streams.

Background Papers

None