



Notice of a public meeting of

Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

To: Councillors Semlyen (Chair), Watt (Vice-Chair), Barnes, Burton, D'Agorne, Riches and Hyman

Date: Tuesday, 18 June 2013

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: The Severus Room (F032), 1st Floor West Offices

AGENDA

1. Declarations of Interest (Pages 3 - 4)

At this point in the meeting, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

2. Minutes (Pages 5 - 14)

To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting of the Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 26 March 2013.

3. Public Participation

It is at this point in the meeting that members of the public who have registered their wish to speak can do so. The deadline for registering is **Monday 17 June 2013 at 5pm.**

To register please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of this agenda.

4. Attendance of the Leader (to include information on the City Team)

The Leader will be in attendance at the meeting to give a verbal update on his priorities and challenges for the municipal year.

**5. York Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) (Pages 15 - 16)
Presentation on Volunteering Opportunities for under 16's and the York Charter for Volunteering**

Officers from York Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) will be in attendance to give a presentation to Members on Volunteering Opportunities for under 16's and the York Charter for Volunteering.

6. Verbal Update on Implementation of Recommendations Arising from the Scrutiny Task Group E-Planning Facilities-Reasons for Being Behind Schedule

Officers will give the Committee a verbal update on the reasons for why the implementation of Recommendations arising from the E-Planning Facilities Task Group are behind schedule.

7. Update Report- Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) (Pages 17 - 24)

This report provides an update on progress with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in which the city of York had been involved to date: Leeds City Region and York/ North Yorkshire/ East Riding. It also outlines policy developments which are emerging which might affect the future focus and operations of LEPs.

8. External Funding Scrutiny Review Interim Report (Pages 25 - 64)

This report presents an update on the work of the External Funding Scrutiny Review Task Group to date, and asks for agreement to revise the wording of the review objectives.

9. Workplan 2013/2014 (Pages 65 - 66)

Members are asked to consider the Committee's workplan for the municipal year 2013/2014.

10. Urgent Business

Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Democracy Officer:

Name- Judith Betts

Telephone No. – 01904 551078

E-mail- judith.betts@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business on the agenda
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

This page is intentionally left blank

About City of York Council Meetings

Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088

Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an

interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন ভাষাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোভাষী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ میا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550

Holding the Cabinet to Account

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Cabinet (39 out of 47). Any 3 non-Cabinet councillors can 'call-in' an item of business following a Cabinet meeting or publication of a Cabinet Member decision. A specially convened Corporate and Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Cabinet meeting, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

Scrutiny Committees

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- York Explore Library and the Press receive copies of **all** public agenda/reports;
- All public agenda/reports can also be accessed online at other public libraries using this link

<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?bcr=1>

**MEETING OF ECONOMIC AND CITY DEVELOPMENT
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Agenda item 1: Declarations of interest

The following Members declared standing personal interests.

Councillor D'Agorne- Employee of York College

This page is intentionally left blank

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

MEETING	ECONOMIC & CITY DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE	26 MARCH 2013
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS SEMLYEN (CHAIR), WATT (VICE-CHAIR), BARNES, BURTON, D'AGORNE, POTTER, RICHES AND RUNCIMAN (EXCEPT MINUTE ITEMS 52 & 53)

45. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests, other than those listed on the standing declarations attached to the agenda, that they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Runciman declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4 (Draft Final Report- Youth Unemployment Scrutiny Review) as a Governor of York College.

No other interests were declared.

46. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 29 January 2013 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

47. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Mr Les Popely spoke on Agenda Item 4 (Draft Final Report arising from the Scrutiny Review around Youth Unemployment). He felt that a greater amount of voluntary work experience for young people should be provided in schools for the 14-16 age group.

He felt that this would enable these young people to pick up basic writing and communication skills and boost their confidence and self worth. He added that employers often looked for evidence of voluntary work experience, when people had been unemployed for a significant amount of time. He informed Members that York Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) were due to launch a York Volunteering Charter.

48. DRAFT FINAL REPORT - YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT SCRUTINY REVIEW

Members received a draft final report which presented them with the findings and recommendations of the Youth Unemployment Scrutiny Review Task Group.

Discussion took place on the issue of work experience between Members. They felt that work experience was highly beneficial for young people, not only for observing what the world of work was like, but for taking young people out of school and giving them experiences outside of the school environment. In reference to a comment made by the public speaker at today's meeting Members felt that they would like to consider a briefing note from York Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) on their Volunteering Charter at a future meeting. They requested that the Scrutiny Officer write to York CVS on behalf of the Committee to arrange this.

An Officer update was circulated to Members at the meeting. This update included the latest Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) Figures and Information for February 2013, an update on the success of the free bus travel scheme which was offered in January 2013 and further implications from the recommendations of the Draft Final Report. This was attached to the agenda, which was subsequently republished following the meeting.

Discussion between Members took place on the Officer update. Some Members felt that the statistics did not show that there was a small number of 16-18 year olds who qualified for benefits. They also highlighted that there were differing reasons for why young people took part time roles. For example, some had the choice to take on part time employment but for others these opportunities were the only ones available to them, and they could be overqualified for these positions.

Other Members felt that further opportunities to encourage contractors coming in to look at hiring a local workforce should be explored.

Members agreed to forward to the Scrutiny Officer, some additional wording around the fact that despite its high ranking for high skills levels the city ranked much lower when it came to GVA (Gross Value Added) per capita. This mismatch of skills and productivity suggests that although we have a significant high value skills base, we are not maximising the utilisation of these skills in appropriately high skilled jobs.

In response to points raised by Members, Officers informed the Committee that a construction skills course had been recently developed in conjunction with the Council and local companies. They added that further promotion of this course, could widen opportunities for young people in the construction sector. This was particularly significant given that posts in construction were amongst the highest requested vacancies from young people.

Discussion took place around the Task Group's recommendations, in particular Recommendation 2 (on Apprenticeships) and Recommendation 3 (on Work Experience).

In relation to Recommendation 2, Members suggested that a timescale was not set out clearly in the recommendation and that it might be beneficial to apply a year on year target to apprenticeships offered by the Council.

Regarding Recommendation 3, on work experience, some Members felt that further examination needed to take place on the availability and suitability of placements in order to expand the range of opportunities for young people. Officers reported to Members that work experience placements within the Council were currently under expansion, and although specific schemes such as the Graduate and Student Internship Programme (as mentioned in Recommendation 3ii) was a pilot, it was hoped that this too could be further developed.

One Member raised the point that the success of Recommendation 9 (to investigate the feasibility of funding/providing sustainable subsidised travel that fits shift patterns and would help young people to access entry level jobs outside of the city centre e.g. bicycles, public transport, car share) might depend on the decisions made by external transport companies.

The Chair thanked the Members of the Task Group, and Officers for the work they had carried out on the scrutiny review. Following discussion, it was decided that Councillor D'Agorne, as a member of the Task Group, should present the Draft Final Report at the Cabinet meeting.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the report be noted.
 - (ii) That the ten recommendations set out in the Officer's report be agreed prior to them being referred to the Cabinet for consideration.
 - (iii) That the information circulated at the meeting within the Officer update be woven into the draft final report prior to it being submitted to the Cabinet for consideration.
 - (iv) That the Scrutiny Officer reflects the discussions at this meeting in the draft final report prior to it being submitted to Cabinet for consideration.
 - (v) That the Scrutiny Officer write to York Council for Voluntary Service to request a briefing note be produced for Members of the Committee on York CVS Volunteering Charter.¹
 - (vi) That Councillor D'Agorne present the Draft Final Report to the Cabinet at their meeting on 7 May 2013.

REASON: To bring this Scrutiny Review to a close.

Action Required

1. To contact York Council for Voluntary Service to TW
arrange this.

**49. 2012/13 FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE MONITOR 3
REPORT**

Members considered a report which provided details of the 2012/13 finance and performance in City & Environmental Services (excluding Highways, Waste and Fleet), Economic Development and Housing Services.

Members questioned Officers on the following;

- Rent arrears and evictions-whether there were any knock on costs to other Council services?
- 'The Bedroom Tax'-what dimensions constitute an extra bedroom, what will be the impact and how much time will Officers spend implementing the new legislation?
- The Tour de France- how much will it cost the city to host Le Grand Départ and how much money will be brought into the city as a result of this?

In response to the question about rent arrears, Officers responded that they were currently investigating ways of making any possible financial effects on services cost neutral.

Regarding recent government legislation on welfare commonly known as the 'bedroom tax', Members requested that a potential briefing report be produced for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee on its effect on York residents and how Officers will carry out its implementation. This should include information on:

- What constitutes a bedroom in terms of size.
- Impacts of this and amount of time spent by Officers looking at it and costs incurred.
- Impact on residents' incomes.
- Report should encompass rent arrears and how we deal with this-do we have more rent arrears since this has been put into place?
- Consequences of this-will people end up just needing to be supported by the Council but in a different directorate.

Discussion regarding the financial costs and gain of hosting the Tour de France took place between Members. Officers informed the Committee that work was currently taking place with Welcome to Yorkshire and that they were awaiting further guidance from them on technical specifications and guidance.

The Committee requested an holistic overview report (including the financial costs and gain of hosting the Tour de France) to be presented to them at a future meeting.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the report be noted.
 - (ii) That the Scrutiny Officer arrange for a briefing note on the recent government welfare legislation relating to housing to come to a future meeting of this Committee and add this to the workplan.
 - (iii) That the Scrutiny Officer arrange for an overview report on the costs associated with the Tour de France to come to a future meeting and this be added to the workplan.

REASON: To update the scrutiny committee of the latest finance and performance position.

50. SIX MONTHLY UPDATE REPORT ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES IN YORK

Members received a report which provided them with an overview and update in relation to current major developments and planning proposals in the city. The following sites were mentioned in discussion;

Nestlé South

It was reported that Nestlé were currently examining how they could revise their schemes. Current pressures for the site meant that it was likely to have fewer industrial/commercial development and more housing.

Hungate

It was reported that the second phase of development had been agreed and that work was currently taking place with the developer on other uses for the site, besides residential usage.

Germany Beck

Officers were asked whether development was being held back due to waiting for a decision on government funding for infrastructure. Officers responded this was not the case.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

REASON: To ensure that the Committee is kept informed of major developments and planning applications in the city.

51. PROGRESS REPORT ON LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIPS

Members considered a report which provided an update on progress with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) that York belongs to: Leeds City Region and York/North Yorkshire/East Riding. The report also outlined policy developments which were emerging and might affect the future focus and operations of LEPs.

Officers informed the Committee that the Government had accepted 81 of the recommendations of the Heseltine report which made recommendations for LEPs. It was reported that LEPs were required to develop their own Growth Plans for each specific area (such as housing) in order to gain Government funding.

In relation to the Leeds City Region (LCR) LEP, and the proposal for a possible Combined Authority between West Yorkshire and York, Officers mentioned that the LCR LEP was continuing to review governance options. This was particularly influenced by the establishment of a Local Transport Body for West Yorkshire and York. Members were informed that they would regularly receive updates on the LEPs as and when further information was available.

Some Members asked when the Council would need to make a decision to choose which LEP to remain with. Officers reported that they were currently reviewing this and that the decision would need to be made in terms of single pots of available funding. They informed Members that the city's economy would remain as it currently was if York was in one LEP for a certain set of priorities and in another LEP for others. They added that York did not have to be a full member of a LEP in order to decide where to focus available funding.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the report be noted.
 - (ii) That a further update on LEPs be added to the workplan for a future meeting.

REASON: To keep the Committee up to date with the work of the LEPs.

52. INTERIM REPORT - EXTERNAL FUNDING SCRUTINY REVIEW

Members considered a report which summarised the work undertaken to date by the Task Group working on the External Funding Scrutiny Review.

Discussion took place on the Regional Econometric Model (REM), which would enable the Task Group (and it was also felt the wider Council) to gather evidence on the economic viability of projects and initiatives and to calculate the level of Gross Added Value (GVA) created by them.

Members felt that others were at an advantage having access to the REM, and that it would put the City at a disadvantage to not have access to the software. They agreed that the £1000 allocation of the scrutiny budget be used to part fund the purchase the REM.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That the report be noted.
 - (ii) That the Committee's allocation of the scrutiny budget be used to part fund purchase the REM be agreed.

REASON: To progress this scrutiny review.

53. WORKPLAN FOR 2012-13

Members considered the Committee's updated work plan for the municipal year 2012-13.

It was suggested that the Update on the recommendations arising from the Water End Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) be taken off the work plan. It was also proposed that that the Six Monthly Update on Major Transport Initiatives be considered by the Committee in the next municipal year.

As a result of the deletion of these items from the work plan. It was felt that the meeting of the 30th April be cancelled. The Scrutiny Officer informed the Committee about an upcoming scrutiny work planning event, and the Chair suggested that the 30th April could be used as a date for this event.

RESOLVED: (i) That the work plan be noted subject to the following changes¹;

- Briefing note on the recent government welfare legislation relating to housing to come to a future meeting of this Committee.
- Overview report on the costs associated with the Tour de France to come to a future meeting.
- That a further update on LEPs come to a future meeting of the Committee.
- That the Update report on the implementations of recommendations arising from the Water End Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) be removed from the work plan.
- That a report on the Six Monthly Update Report on Major Transport Initiatives be moved to be considered at a date in the next municipal year.

(ii) That the meeting of the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Tuesday 30 April 2013 be cancelled.

- (iii) That the date of the cancelled meeting of the Committee be suggested by the Committee as a possible date for an upcoming Scrutiny Work Planning Event.

REASON: To progress the work of the Committee.

Action Required

1. To update the work plan.

TW

Councillor Semlyen, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 7.15 pm].



Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Briefing from York CVS, June 18th 2013

Volunteering opportunities for under 16's and the York Charter for Volunteering

A summary of the key points to be presented to the scrutiny committee by Garry Jones, Support and Development Team manager at York CVS and by Liz Hamilton, Volunteering Manager at York CVS

Defining volunteering

Distinguishing between volunteering and work placements for young people and the differing responsibilities for organisations

Who benefits from involving young volunteers

Defining the benefits to – the organization, the volunteer and the service beneficiaries

The recent history of Youth volunteering in York

Funded initiatives such as the V project, current gaps in support – where next?

The current infrastructure to promote, support and develop Youth Volunteering

The role of schools, CYC, York Cares, YCVS (explaining brokerage), The Youth Award

The perceived barriers to Youth volunteering

By the volunteer involving organization (VIO), by the young volunteer

Overcoming the barriers

Partnership working (e.g. Children's Society); Role of the Volunteer centre - training to VIO's, advice and guidance, tool kits; local standards

The York Charter for volunteering

Locally devised standards, self assessment process, resources to support VIO's

This page is intentionally left blank



18 June 2013

Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Report of the Chief Executive

Progress Report – Local Enterprise Partnerships

Summary

1. This report provides an update on progress with the two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in which the city of York had been involved to date: Leeds City Region and York/ North Yorkshire/ East Riding. It also outlines policy developments which are emerging which might affect the future focus and operations of LEPs.

Background

2. As Committee will be aware from previous update, Lord Heseltine published a report in October 2012, *No Stone Unturned in Pursuit of Growth*, which made several recommendations for LEPs, which has since this time, focused the activities of the LEPs in both LCR and YNYER.
3. Since the previous Committee update, there has been considerable progress made in the city of York's position in the LEP agenda.

York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP

4. Following conversations with Government officials on the detail of proposals to devolve funding pots to LEPs, the City of York Council has given its notice to withdraw from formal membership of the YNYER LEP.
5. **(This decision is based on an assessment of the risks that the city will face in accessing funding via two LEPs – which from dialogue with Government officials is clear will be challenging, and from the Heseltine Review is not recommended for effective LEP engagement.)**

6. However, the Council is pursuing a proposal to develop a new working relationship and collaboration with YNYER LEP to ensure continued progress on the small business support, visitor economy and agri-food agendas. This proposal may lead to a joint bid to a post-2014 European funding programme, which would draw down external funding for this activity, depending on the outcome of negotiations with Government on the workings of European funding in future.
7. The aim is to ensure that the relationship with North Yorkshire and East Riding economies is maintained, whilst ensuring maximum value from the new single pot arrangements from Government to the city.

Leeds City Region LEP

8. The LCR LEP continues to make progress against the delivery of the LCR City Deal.
9. The below provides a full update on the City Deal – what it promises and latest progress, including the development of a Revolving Investment Fund, West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund and the Combined Authority.

City Deal for Leeds City Region: Opportunity for York

10. The City Deal for Leeds City Region LEP offers participating authorities greater control over decisions and investment made in transport, skills, and other related agendas. The full detail of the deal is set out in the Appendix to this report, but roughly, the City Deal includes the following powers and devolution:
 - a £1 billion fund to improve public transport and the highways network, with the potential to create 20,000 jobs in the medium term
 - an additional £400m fund to strengthen infrastructure across the City Region
 - the creation of a 14-24 apprenticeship academy in Leeds, giving young people and local employers access to opportunities and training
 - the development of an 'Apprenticeship Hub' network, aiming to generate 15,000 new apprenticeships in the next four years
 - initiatives to increase overseas trade and inward investment activity, which could bring 7,400 jobs by 2018

- ultra-fast broadband for 88,000 homes, and over 16,000 businesses, with the intention to roll this out across the City Region by 2015

11. Of particular note are the first two of these which arguably produce the greatest added value to the city of York and other partners.

The City Deal: The Economic or Revolving Investment Fund (RIF)

12. At the heart of the Leeds City Region City Deal is the ambition to create a fund of critical mass that will enable investment in infrastructure to kick start growth in the city region economy. This fund, the Economic or Revolving Investment Fund (RIF) is, as the name suggests, a fund that is intended to generate an ongoing pot of money that will invest in commercially viable projects that produce a return that will be reinvested into the fund – creating further opportunity for the fund to be invested in further projects in the future.

13. The City Region's aspiration is to create a Fund of up to £500 million that could be invested in projects that support economic growth, with financial returns being reinvested on a revolving basis. Based on the impact of investments made by the Regional Development Agencies, such a Fund might be expected to support regional Gross Value Add growth, over time, of up to £3billion.¹

14. The Fund would enable the city region to kick-start investment in the city region's key infrastructure priorities, as well as help city region authorities lever in still more funds from private sources.

15. The Fund will only invest in projects that can offer a commercial return. The Revolving Investment Fund will therefore operate alongside a wider range of funding mechanisms (including the Transport Fund) that can support other investments needed to grow the economy which cannot be funded on a commercial basis

¹ Based on Pricewaterhouse Coopers analysis of £500m Fund, attracting leverage at a ratio of 1:3 from the private sector – creating £2bn initial investment capacity. Assumes Fund is “revolved” three times to deliver investment of £6bn. Estimated impact of £6bn investment, increase in GVA of up to £3bn.

- 16.** The RIF is being developed in respect of the wider context in which it will operate. That context has been built on a number of key principles, including:
- Strategic governance across the City Region will set, monitor and manage a common economic strategy and its supporting priorities;
 - Public sector funding, to deliver the City Region economic strategy, is pooled under the control of the overarching strategic governance arrangements;
 - Attracting additional private sector investment into the City Region to support growth; and
 - Recycling returns (whether directly from projects or indirectly via increases to pooled resources such as business rates) to be redirected via the strategic governance arrangements to support further projects.
- 17.** Private finance will be sought to co-invest at revolving Fund and/or project level. A consequence of drawing in private finance is that investment decisions will be made on an independent basis (in line with a Fund investment strategy that has been agreed via the strategic governance arrangements).
- 18.** The income generated from the LCR Pool (from levy savings) will be used to support the LCR Infrastructure Fund. Latest estimates suggest that the Pool could generate around an additional £1m for the Fund in 2013/14.
- 19.** City of York Council Cabinet agreed on 7th May to contribute £6.137mn to the fund subject to agreement of robust and transparent governance and appraisal framework, further details of which will be brought through a further Cabinet paper in due course. The York contribution is pro-rated based on its proportion of population of the total area covered by the RIF authorities.

The City Deal: The Transport Deal

- 20.** The Leeds City Region City Deal includes a commitment by Government to grant unprecedented freedoms to build, manage and sustain a local

£1bn WY Plus Transport Fund to drive economic growth, subject to establishing a Combined Authority (CA) governance arrangements to oversee the operation of the Fund. The freedoms and funding will include;

- a. a ten year £182.8m post 2014 major transport scheme funding allocation devolved to WY and York as part of the £1bn WYTF, and in return for dealing with DfT's compliance requirements (Local Transport Body - LTB);
- b. consideration by HMT in the next Spending Review of an additional programme of strategic local schemes;
- c. revenue funding as part of the ten year allocation, enabling a broader range of high profile sub regional social and economic issues to be tackled, including subsidising travel to help NEETs and disabled people into employment, education and training;
- d. devolved funding paid in advance of incurring costs locally, creating flexibility in sequencing delivery of WYTF schemes;
- e. working with HMT to increase the associated local share of public spending for re-investment to create a self-sustaining Fund; and
- f. locally determined prioritisation based on a 'Green Book' compliant Strategic Appraisal Framework.

- 21.** In addition, Ministers will also be considering the expressions of interest submitted by West Yorkshire, Greater Manchester and South Yorkshire to take on the Northern and Trans Pennine rail franchises in 2014. In addition to transforming local accountability, the devolved operation of these franchises would deliver a step change in the economic impact, service quality, and efficiency of rail operations in the North. However, putting in place sufficiently strong, stable and visible local governance such as a CA is considered a prerequisite to forming a credible and accountable pan Northern franchising counterparty.
- 22.** Further, a compact will be put in place, for example, with the Highways Agency and DfT Rail to ensure that the national strategic transport network, including the Motorways and rail network, support rather than stifle, local productivity growth.
- 23.** The above powers will be devolved on the condition of the creation of the West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund and the creation of suitable governance in the form of a Combined Authority, which the City of York Council and West Yorkshire Authorities are currently developing jointly.

The West Yorkshire Plus York Transport Fund

24. The fund is in the process of being created, and CYC has agreed at 7th May Cabinet to approve an initial contribution of £500K through the Economic Infrastructure Fund to kick-start the fund, alongside the contributions of the other participating authorities.

Development of a Combined Authority

25. The Combined Authority: In order to take on the new powers and responsibilities that are envisioned through the LCR City Deal, and as signaled in the last report update to Committee, CYC is engaging in the development of the new Combined Authority for West Yorkshire, following a decision to do so made by CYC Cabinet in May.
26. As York does not share a contiguous boundary with the other West Yorkshire authorities (due to a small strip of land between Leeds and York), the Council will be invited to join as a non-constituent member initially when the new CA is created in April 2014. As a non-constituent member, CYC will be delegated decision making powers as appropriate by the full members, which will include the five West Yorkshire authorities.
27. Working with Government departments, Council officers are exploring the options for moving to full membership as and when legislation can be made to allow for this move.
28. CYC Cabinet will be considering the draft scheme for the CA and formal review for the creation of the CA at its meeting in July, ahead of the submission of the scheme to Government.

An investment plan for the LCR LEP

29. An investment plan is being prepared by the LCR LEP which will see it making a case for investment through the new Single Local Growth Funds which Government plan to devolve to LEPs from 2014. In addition, there is a European Funding Prospectus in development in collaboration with the Leeds City Region LEP.

Consultation

30. No specific consultation has taken place on the contents of this report, which reflects the on-going involvement of the Leader, Members of the

Cabinet, Chief Executive and senior officers in LEP Board and other meetings.

31. Options

Options are not relevant to this report.

32. Analysis

Not relevant.

Council Plan

33. The work of the LEPs should prove valuable in supporting the Council Plan priorities of creating jobs and growing the economy and also get York moving priorities

Implications (Financial/ Human Resources/ Equalities/ Legal/ Crime and Disorder/ Information Technology)

The legal issues associated with a Combined Authority are highlighted above.

34. Risk Management

Not relevant.

35. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to note the content of this progress report.

Reason: To keep the Committee up to date with the work of the LEPS

Contact Details

Author and officer responsible for the report:

Katie Stewart
Head of Economic Development
(01904) 554418
katie.stewart@york.gov.uk

Specialist Implications Officer(s): Not relevant

Background Papers: None.

This page is intentionally left blank



Economic and City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee **18 June 2013**

Report of the External Funding Task Group

Interim Report - External Funding Scrutiny Review

Summary

1. This report presents an update on the work of the External Funding Scrutiny Review Task Group to date, and asks for agreement to revise the wording of the review objectives.

Background to Review

2. At a meeting of the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in September 2012 Members received information on a potential scrutiny review proposed by Councillor Semlyen on 'Unlocking the potential of external funding for economic development and regeneration projects' (see Annex A).
3. The Committee noted that at a time when Council budgets were being increasingly reduced, there was a real and growing need to attract new forms of investment – whether private or public. And, whilst there may be less public funding available than in previous years, there remained significant opportunities in the form of European Regional Development Funding, Growing Places Funding and other opportunities such as the Regional Growth Fund. The Committee agreed to proceed with the Review and delegated the work to this Task Group.
4. On 15 November 2012 the Task Group met for the first time to receive some initial information (shown at Annex B) detailing:
 - a) The 'Future of European Funding Programmes 2014-2020 Consultation Process' and the priorities for City of York Council. It also highlighted the key issues raised via the consultation process, by local authorities from across the Yorkshire and Humber region, including:

- Geographic Boundaries/Place Based Programmes
- Matched Funding
- Reduced Administrative Burden
- Integrated and Aligned Programmes

b) The suggested principles, priorities and ambitions for European Union (EU) funds 2014-2020, for the Leeds and Sheffield City Regions.

5. The Task Group learnt there was likely to be an allocation of funding for the Yorkshire and Humber area, some of which would be sub-devolved to the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPS) across the region. York was currently a member of two LEPS namely the Leeds City Region LEP and the York/North Yorkshire/East Riding LEP. As yet, however, it was not known what the funding options were, how much funding would be devolved to LEP level, or what the eligibility criteria would be.
6. The Head of Economic Development and the Funding and Investment Officer advised there were questions still to be asked about agreeing the key priorities for the Yorkshire and Humber region and how more local priorities for York would link in with any regional priorities set.
7. The Task Group agreed that any available funding should be accessed for York's top investment priorities, and that there was work to be done to promote York's key investment priorities within the Leeds City Region LEP in particular.
8. In January 2013, the Task Group reported back to the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee on their initial findings, and as a result the following remit for the review was agreed:

Aim

To be more effective and systematic in securing external funding and investment for York

Key Objectives

- (i). To assess how Leeds City Region are articulating investment priorities, specifically looking at the case of the LEP European Regional Development Funding Programme being developed and broader European Funding.

- (ii). To assess what resources are available to City of York Council (CYC) to effectively identify and successfully secure funding (resources in this instance including CYC staff, additional or temporary staff, partnership staff, ability to provide match funding, up-skilling and training).
- (iii). To develop a plan for presenting a strong case to Leeds City Region LEP for funding York's top investment priorities.

Information Gathered

9. **Objective (i) - To assess how Leeds City Region are articulating investment priorities**

In February 2013 the Task Group met to consider introductory information on a number of key investment priorities for the city. They have been articulated in the York Economic Vision which includes a range of long term development opportunities across the City. These include the strategically important regional economic development sites at York Central and Heslington East, and the city centre locations of Hungate and Castle Piccadilly, key to increasing York's vitality and economic performance.

- 10. Other suburban sites, at Terry's and Nestle South offer locations ideally suited for high-quality employment uses. Long-term residential growth can also be accommodated at Germany Beck, British Sugar and Derwenthorpe. Development at several of these sites will need to contain community facilities, which together will provide a range of investments to strengthen community cohesion and improve the quality of life locally.
- 11. These sites, representing the principal private sector investment opportunities in the City, are vital for its future economic prosperity and would ideally be able to respond to a range of market opportunities and need, providing important growth capacity for a variety of economic sectors. The Task Group also learnt of other flagship initiatives such as the wish to develop a Digital and Creative Hub within the city centre.
- 12. In March 2013 the Task Group met again to consider detailed information on the top two priorities that the authority would be putting forward to the Leeds City Region LEP:
- 13. **York Central: Phase 1, Queen Street Quarter** - York Central is a 37 hectare brownfield site adjacent to York City Centre and the City's rail station. The site is largely owned by Network Rail, who will rationalise current uses to allow for redevelopment.

The first phase is a 2.9 hectare mixed use development accommodating 40,000m² of new and converted floor space including improved transport interchange facilities.

14. It is estimated it will create in the region of 1663 gross jobs (plus 580 temporary construction jobs), by March 2016 – producing £69m GVA (Gross Value Added) per annum thereafter. In addition, the first phase of York Central will set in motion the potential for two further phases of development. In total the site offers the potential, on completion of the three phases, for an additional c. £247m GVA per annum and a net 4,750 jobs.
15. York Central is therefore clearly a major strategic project for the city and the wider region. However, there are considerable barriers and obstacles to development, largely associated with abnormal infrastructure costs. Key issues involve the reclamation and re-assembly of land that is partly used as an operational rail/freight site, and obtaining site road access. In phase one the ‘stacking’ of an existing car park into a multi storey facility is also a necessity to gain access to the site.
16. **Digital, Media and Creative Centre (DMCC)** –The DMCC will provide a new home for growing creative, digital and technology companies within York. Its creation has been a long-time ambition for the City of York. York is already a creative and digital hub for Yorkshire with inspiring architecture and a heritage that inspires creative talent.
17. Creative and digital companies in the City would greatly benefit from a central nucleus within this inspiring environment to grow their businesses and community. The intention is for the DMCC to provide around 20,000 sq. ft. of managed office accommodation for small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) within the creative, digital and technology sectors, and to encourage and support the growth and development of these sectors within York.
18. In particular the DMCC aims to increase the capacity of the city to provide flexible space and to increase opportunities for retaining and networking talent and enterprise across the city. The centre could provide high quality office space with offices ranging from around 58 sq. ft. suitable for sole traders, up to circa 1500 sq. ft. which will house companies of around 9-12 employees each.

19. The Task Group learnt that an outline feasibility study had been undertaken by Science City York investigating several possible sites and the challenges associated with each.
20. The Task Group considered some more specific information on the York Central site and a proposal for the DMCC to be sited on a specific site. However, that information was classed as exempt under paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as revised by The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006) and is therefore not included within this report.
21. **Funding the Above Priorities** – In regard to York Central Phase 1, the Task Group learnt that the timescales for the development of York Central are largely dependent on accessing a number of funding streams. Also that an outline bid for £9 million had been submitted to the Government's Regional Growth Fund to support site infrastructure and public realm works. The Fund is the Government's main financial instrument for investing in private sector and public/private projects, to stimulate growth and create additional employment.
22. An expression of interest for £6 million had also been submitted to the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Economic Partnership (YNYER LEP).
23. The Task Group noted that both the funding submissions made detailed the challenges around the York Central site, and that both were 'Stage 1' applications. If approval was received in principle, a far more detailed due diligence process would be undertaken, where the Government and YNYER LEP would ask detailed questions of the authority around job creation figures, timescales, spend profiles etc.
24. The Task Group were informed that the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Economic Partnership (YNYER LEP) had fewer access opportunities to resources than the Leeds City Region Local Economic Partnership (LCR LEP), but funding could be accessed via that partnership, in particular through the Growing Places Fund.
25. In regard to the DMCC, the Task Group learnt that an outline expression of interest for £2 million Growing Places funding had been submitted to the Leeds City Region Local Economic Partnership (LCR LEP). They recognised that funding channelled through the LCR LEP was critical to the future economic growth of York (see further details in Annex C).

26. Finally, in addition to the information above and the exempt papers, the Task Group learned that as well as approaching both LEPs, it was possible to approach the Government directly for funding. They were informed that the Council had already approached the Government for funding for site enabling, access and infrastructure unlocking. What was requested from the Leeds City Region LEP in terms of European funding would therefore be dependent on how much of the funding requested from the Government ultimately became available.
27. In late March 2013, the Task Group considered detailed information on the above mentioned funding streams – see Annex C.
28. **Objective (ii) - To assess what resources are available to City of York Council (CYC) to effectively identify and successfully secure funding**

The Task Group learnt of a Regional Econometric Model (REM) which enables the Council to easily calculate the Gross Value Added (GVA) to the city, by a wide range of proposed projects. The Task Group it would also enable them to gather evidence about the economic viability of a vast range of projects and initiatives.
29. The baseline data that is provided within the REM is forecast up to 2016. At the same time historic trend data is also available for the same data (some dating back 18 years). Some of the main datasets available through the model are Employment (Full Time Equivalent, Full Time, Part Time and Total Employment), GVA (£million), Population (000s), Qualifications and Occupations. These datasets can be cross referenced so it is possible to get a forecast of qualifications by occupation type for the region.
30. The REM is the key evidence gathering, economic modelling tool used across the Yorkshire and Humber region and nationally. It allows subscribers to run a huge variety of ‘scenarios of productivity’. In other words it will predict the amount of value generated by a development site were housing to be built on it or whether it be used for different industrial purposes – and in turn will tell us the best outcome for York and the wider region across a range of key sites in the City.
31. The REM licence costs £4000 + VAT per annum. The model is updated every 6 months and includes training and on-going support for the duration of the subscription

32. The Task Group discussed the benefits of the REM for both this scrutiny review and the Council as a whole. They noted that CYC had commissioned work externally from other authorities who had subscribed to the REM; however this cost the Council £700 a time so the cost was prohibitive. To continue commissioning externally was therefore not felt to be a viable or sustainable option.
33. The Task Group learnt that the Leeds City Region LEP also commissioned externally to gain access to the REM. The YNYER LEP did have access but CYC were only able to use this on an ad hoc basis. They noted that if CYC were to hold a licence (or licences) for the REM itself, then it could quite quickly make savings by not having to commission an external service. The Task Group queried whether the cost of the REM could be funded via a bid to the Economic Infrastructure Fund (EIF) but were informed it was not available for 'tools'.
34. It was reiterated that having constant access to the REM would deliver more effectiveness across the Council in general as well as financial savings. It was noted that the REM had already been used to enable CYC to get the best value for the city and wider regional economy from the Hungate site. There was also a case for using it to identify the different economic sectors that would bring the highest value back to the local and regional economy; potentially when looking at uses for the York Central site.
35. Having taking the above into consideration the Task Group then explored how the REM could help support their scrutiny review. They noted it would support the work on objective (ii) of the review, as it would help identify the resources required by CYC to effectively identify and successfully secure external funding. In regard to objective (iii), the Task was advised that it would be very difficult, both time wise and financially to achieve an outcome without accessing REM. The Task Group acknowledged they could commission some external work and spend £700 doing so; however they agreed it would not be cost effective. It would also rely on the Task Group only needing to access the REM on one occasion.
36. Having identified a gap in the resources the Council had for undertaking this type of work, they felt that there was a clear case of return on investment if the REM was purchased.

37. For all the above reasons, the Task Group suggested the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee gave their £1000 allocation from the scrutiny budget towards the cost of purchasing the REM.
38. At their meeting on 26 March 2013, the Economic and City Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee acknowledged it would not be appropriate to use their £1000 budget on a consultant, insomuch as this would buy a very limited amount of time; whereas the REM would allow the Council to undertake the work of a specialist consultant itself, in house. They therefore agreed to allocate their budget to the purchase of the REM.
39. **Objective (iii) - To develop a plan for presenting a strong case to Leeds City Region LEP for funding York's top investment priorities**
The Task Group believed that a greater impact would be gained by scrutinising officers' efforts to secure LCR investment for one specific flagship initiative and asked which of the two options put forward (a DMCC or the York Central site) would be preferable. In response they were informed:
- **DMCC** - The creation of a DMCC site within the city centre would be an easier option for this Task Group to manage however work was already ongoing with this.
 - **York Central** – This was a more complicated site but needed the most work and development of the two options under discussion.
40. The Task Group acknowledged that whichever 'priority' was chosen, it was about 'pitching' the project and making sure that the barriers and problems faced (or the perceived problems) were understood in order that either of the options could be pitched to interested developers in a positive way.
41. Some Task Group members felt that the DMCC was a project that the public would expect to happen with minimum cost to the Council therefore the attraction of external funding to move this forward would be imperative. The Bonding Warehouse had initially been considered as a potential site for this but the cost of the building had been prohibitive and the rental costs too commercial for the kinds of businesses that would be attracted to such a centre. The Task Group learnt there were three other site options currently been considered but to date specific information on those remained commercially sensitive.

42. The Task Group felt that the York Central site was such a large site that it would probably be unlocked bit by bit. York Central was a longer term project whilst the DMCC was more of a stand alone project.
43. Having considered the above the Task Group initially agreed they would like to concentrate on the DMCC, particularly given the immediacy and the shorter timescales involved. However, it subsequently came to light that the Council had agreed to appoint a Project Manager to oversee the development of a Digital Media and Creative Centre. The appointment was thought to be critical to any future funding decisions affecting the DMCC. Whilst the appointment has been welcomed for the longer term development of the scheme, the Task Group have recognised that in the short term it will create a delay in the submission of funding applications for the DMCC.

Consultation

44. The Task Group used the GeniUS website to gather the public's views on a number of issues. The questions posed and associated responses are shown at Annex E to this report.
45. Finally, the Task Group recently met with a number of key players in relation to both the York Central site and attracting external funding for key investment priorities for the city. Feedback on that meeting will be included in the draft final report arising from this review.

Suggested Amendments to Review Remit

46. In light of the above, it has been recommended that the Task Group consider a shift in the emphasis of their scrutiny review, to concentrate their future efforts on the York Central initiative. It has also been recommended that the scope of the review be widened, to allow for analysis of officers attempts to secure investment in York Central from a variety of funding sources including European funding devolved to the Leeds City Region LEP, alongside a range of other public and private sector funding applications.
47. The suggested change in the scope will also allow members to scrutinise:
 - a) The way in which detailed business cases and broader marketing and communication campaigns have been prepared to promote key development sites.

b) Methods of stakeholder engagement with business and the wider community around major infrastructure sites.

48. With this in mind, the Task Group is proposing the following changes to objectives (i) & (iii) of the review:

- In regard to Objective (i) - *'To assess how Leeds City Region are articulating investment priorities, specifically including looking at the case of the LEP European Regional Development Funding Programme and broader European Funding.'*
- In regard to Objective (iii) - *'To develop a plan for presenting a strong case to ~~Leeds City Region LEP~~ for attract funding for York's top investment priorities'*

Options

49. Having considered the work undertaken by the Task Group to date, Members may choose to either:

- i. Agree to the changes to the review objectives as shown in paragraph 36 above.
- ii. Agree that the review objectives remain as originally set (see paragraph 10 above).
- iii. Identify some alternative amendments to the review objectives.

Council Plan

50. The work on this review supports the 'create jobs and grow the economy' priority within the Council Plan 2011-15.

Risk Management & Implications

51. Any risks and/or implications associated with the recommendations arising from this review will be identified within the Task Group's draft final report, and will be presented for this Committee's consideration at a future meeting.

Recommendation

52. Having considered the information contained within this report and its annexes, Members are asked to

- a) Note the work on this review to date
- b) Agree the amendments to the review objectives as shown at paragraph 36 of this report.

Reason: To allow the External Funding Scrutiny Task Group to progress their work on this scrutiny review in line with scrutiny procedures and protocols

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Tel No.01904 552054
e: melanie.carr@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty
A.D. Governance & I.C.T.

Report Approved **Date** 3 June 2013

Specialist Implications Officer(s) Not Applicable at this stage

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Annexes:

Annex A – Scrutiny Topic Details (submitted by Cllr Semlyen)

Annex B – Information on the ‘Future of European Funding Programmes 2014-2020 Consultation Process’, etc

Annex C – Information on Potential Funding Sources for York’s Key Investment Priorities

Annex D – Information on top 2/3 CYC Priorities put forward to Leeds City Region (LCR)

Annex E – GeniUS Questions & Responses Received

This page is intentionally left blank

Topic: Unlocking the potential of external funding for economic development and regeneration projects

Date: 25 September 2012

Proposed by Cllr Anna Semlyen

Background

At a time when Council budgets are being increasingly reduced, there is a real and growing need to attract new forms of investment – whether private or public. Whilst there may be less public funding available than in previous years, there remain significant opportunities in the form of European Regional Development Funding (ERDF), Growing Places Funding and other opportunities – such as Regional Growth Fund should further opportunities such as this be made available. Further, funding bodies like Arts Council and Heritage Lottery Fund all offer opportunities for some of our city centre regeneration and support for creative industries.

Scope

This topic would enable the Committee to input a view on both the need and potential for systematically monitoring, reviewing, and effectively responding to funding opportunities as and when available and relevant.

The Committee would particularly be asked to look at the ERDF programme for 2014-2020 to be released shortly, and a review of Growing Places funding and other opportunities as are currently emerging.

The group could review models of how other Councils support this type of activity, and review best practice for learning lessons for CYC.

The scope of the project would need to be limited to the remit of the committee – so economic and city development funding if possible – although some reference to wider coordination of funding would be beneficial.

Partners

This topic could and should involve partners including Science City York, which has a particular expertise in funding and has successfully attracted funding already. Other partners may be sought such as the business networks in the city and other bodies involved in the economic development agenda.

Timescales

The project would sensibly be timed to coincide with the availability of staff resource coming into EDU to review funding potential for the city in October/November 2012 if possible. This will enable sufficient officer support for the Committee in exploring this topic.

A) Future of European Funding Programmes 2014-2020 Consultation Process - priorities for the City of York

Introduction

- The European Commission has recently published outline proposals for Structural and Cohesion Funds 2014-2020. Each EU Member State will have a partnership agreement which will set out its strategy and rationale for how the Funds are to be deployed to complement the EU 2020 strategy and domestic initiatives for sustainable jobs and growth.
- Approximately one third of the EU's budget - €376 billion - will focus on high-impact growth and jobs programmes such as developing the skills of local workforces, encouraging entrepreneurship, improving infrastructure and protecting the environment. The UK is likely to receive £12 billion through a **Partnership Agreement** which will set out overarching spending plans / priorities nationally, regionally and locally.
- Success in meeting these goals will greatly depend on decisions taken at local and regional level, therefore local authorities and partners have an essential role to play in influencing the UK Partnership Agreement. Local Authorities understand the opportunities for growth in their areas, and are perfectly placed to work with and support third and private sector organisations to make it happen.

Background / Consultation

- The Government will use evidence from the forthcoming round of Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) consultation events to inform the UK's draft Partnership Agreement. The draft agreement will be published in Spring 2013, with 3 months further formal consultation taking place thereafter.
- The UK Government will need to ensure that it concentrates and aligns investment flexibly where it will make the greatest economic impact. A sensible dialogue and a proactive approach to lobbying Government will need to be taken **before** the publication of the draft Partnership Agreement in Spring 2013.

- In an era of austerity and declining funds it is essential that City of York Council positions itself to respond appropriately (both individually, and collectively through the European Officers Network), to ensure that the resources which will come into our area are used in the most efficient manner for maximum impact and growth.
- The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills will also hold two formal consultations with Yorkshire and Humber local authorities and partners on 4 & 5 December 2012. Input into this consultation is essential.

Key Issues Raised to date by Local Authorities

Preliminary consultation events were held in spring 2012. Typical responses from partners in Yorkshire and the Humber included the following:

- **Geographic Boundaries / Place Based Programmes:** It is essential that the UK Programme's geographic boundaries are tailored to provide the most efficient and effective economic and environmental impact. There is a general desire to operate EU funds at the geography of the 'local area' – **if this is deemed as the City Region level or at potential combined authority levels needs to be given some serious consideration.**
- In Yorkshire and the Humber there is a strong call for funds to be deployed / contracted at a City Region Level - with Leeds City Region Economic Development Plan as the key driver of spend. There is strong support towards a devolved sub-programme for the City Region, combining all key EU funds, within an Operational Programme at a wider level.
- If any City Region approach on the future of the European programme is to be progressed then a lead should be identified, and methods of reporting, influencing and updating need to be made clear. The Yorkshire and Humber European Officers Group is a key vehicle for CYC and York based partners to influence.

- As far as possible within the constraints of EU law, many other local authorities feel that programmes should operate through commissioning rather than bidding allowing for a more **Place based Programming approach** – allowing funds to be deployed through an investment fund for an area, where it can be combined with other national and local funds, thus hugely simplifying match funding problems. This also aligns with the issue raised above to ensure it is strategically driven against a set of local priorities rather than approving bids. If this approach is adopted it is imperative that flagship schemes and initiatives from York are considered.
- **Matched Funding:** Funds from European programmes must be match-funded in order to be accessed by projects. Sufficient availability of match-funding is crucial for the successful implementation of programmes; and there are a range of potential sources. In the past a large proportion of match-funding had been awarded by Government to managing agencies, for example ERDF was often matched by Regional Development Agency single pots, and ESF through the co-financing organisations. In addition a good deal of matched-funding has been sourced locally; from local authorities, universities, and the third and private sectors.
- Privately sourced match-funding is likely to be more sought after given that public sector sources can be expected to be lower in the future, and local partners may be in a good position to help access private sector sources locally. It is believed that leverage of very significant increased level of private sector match could be found, were the rules on “profit” to be firstly clarified, secondly eased.
- It is also important that City Regions and LEPs start to consider how they might realistically identify, encourage and use local public and private sources of match-funding, while also helping maximise the value of sources from central Government (Regional Growth Fund, Growing Places Fund). City Deals need to be broadened and preparation needs to start now to put an infrastructure in place which align better the pooling and matching of resources.

- The default position should be that Government departmental expenditure is available for match. Better central government planning to align their priorities with local programmes would help, as would more creative use of alternative local sources of funding, such as the introduction of tax increment financing, retention of business rates, recognition of volunteer time as valid match and further exploitation of private sector funding.
- Given the interest by the Commission in Financial Engineering Instruments like Jessica, Jeremie (such as venture capital funds, guarantee funds, loan funds and urban development funds) will be an opportunity lost if we do not start to plan for these types of funding vehicles. However they are complicated and resource intensive in their implementation.
- **Reduced Administrative Burden:** One of the biggest frustrations with EU funding is the bureaucracy and poor administration of the funds. A standardised approach to application, timescales and selection procedures is essential; including simplified management and audit procedures; integrated systems for aligned projects and shorter time frames for decisions, authorisation and disbursement of payments.
- **Integrated and aligned programmes:** A degree of integrated programming, in particular in relation to ERDF and ESF, to enable more aligned support for business development alongside skills development, is vitally important.

Recommendations

- Ultimately the Government's intention is that 'spending decisions for any funds provided to England for this period should be taken at a more local level, with a strong role potentially for LEPs/City Region where they are established. This means that authorities in the Leeds City Region have an opportunity to play a role in shaping the next EU programme to ensure that funding is aligned and local priorities are met.
- After December 2012 this will be followed up by a direct response from Leeds City Region authorities to BIS, echoing similar sentiments, before the draft Partnership Agreement is released for comment in Spring 2013.

- A list of key responses compiled from local authorities and key partners in Yorkshire and Humber to the EU funding consultation process is shown below. The intention of the Yorkshire and Humber European Officer's Group is to submit these responses to the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) prior to their formal regional consultation meetings in December 2012.

B) Suggested Principles Priorities and Ambitions for EU Funds 2014 – 2020 for the Leeds and Sheffield City Regions

1. Decision making should be in the hands of local decision makers
2. Funds should be deployed / contracted at city region level.
3. Operational programme geography likely to be a number of adjoining LEP areas.
 - All funding streams with an economic purpose should at the least be aligned and ideally conjoined – the Heseltine Review makes this suggestion as well, in combination with other national and local funds should deliver the LEP.
 - Funding should be deployed strategically against key priorities – in Leeds CR the Economic Development Plan should be the key driver for identifying this although the support to Cities should not be at the expense of others areas in the CRs
 - Funding focused on outcomes rather than outputs
 - Funding streams with an economic purpose should be deployed at the level of functional economic spaces
 - Both the CRs are eligible to receive funding from each of the key funds - ERDF, ESF and EAFRD (although EAFRD is only eligible in certain smaller areas). Whilst each CR has been developing a City Region Investment Fund this could also be used as a key vehicle to access funds to deliver the economic growth agenda.
4. Overarching priorities:
 - Growth (increased GVA),
 - Jobs (numbers and quality),

- Physical and environmental regeneration.
 - Inclusion.
 - Reduced worklessness and poverty.
5. Priority Sectors - each CR will need to clearly articulate what its key priority sectors are based on its economic strategy. Suggestions would include ;
- Advanced manufacturing;
 - Healthcare technologies;
 - Low carbon;
 - Construction;
 - Creative and digital.

Also, aviation; tourism; culture, leisure & sport; retail and logistics maybe considered – although traditionally sectors like leisure and sport , retail and tourism traditionally have not been key sectors supported through eg. ERDF. Recognition of the key role that professional and business services play in fostering growth in all sectors, as well as being a potential growth sector in itself also needs to be acknowledged.

6. Particular priorities for ESF - Promotion of greater inclusion, reduction of worklessness and reduction of poverty.
- a. Continuing investment in skills development for unemployed people, particularly for vulnerable groups.
 - b. Workforce development support for SME's
 - c. Minimising numbers of young people who are NEET
7. Preparing for and implementing changes to support the raising of the participation age in education.
- a. Supporting vocational education outside schools.
 - b. Supporting schools engagement with and understanding of the labour market.
 - c. Supporting young people's transition at 18 to adult support and other services.
 - d. Pre-apprenticeship programme and a programme to help the young unemployed become more work ready

Principal work-streams for EU funds to support:

Economic Growth Plans for the Leeds CR and Sheffield CR (currently under development) must frame the use of EU funds. Whilst Sheffield CR have already started to lobby Government with regard to Transition areas they have also started to articulate what their priorities would be for the Sheffield CR to fund using EU funds.

Growth (increased GVA), jobs (numbers and quality) and physical and environmental regeneration are all important to the city region, and we must seek to deliver them all in combination, and to the benefit of the whole of the city region.

- Thematic focus. We believe that most of what we would want to do can be contained within the European Commission's eleven themes, provided that interpretation is sufficiently flexible and that the MA does not adopt an unreasonably risk averse approach.

As for the required minimum spend on four of them, we do not believe that such high level prescription is helpful, although we do not think that it will unduly constrain or distort delivery against our ambitions.

- Work stream focus. As a LEP we have identified a number of principal work streams, and insofar as they meet eligibility requirements, we would deploy EU funds to support these.
- Complementarily with City Deal plans and priorities:
- Where Enterprise Zone plans are in place ensure the maximum leverage of both.
- Knowledge Transfer – DoDs are in need of a discussion with the city region's universities to how best benefits can be shared of their often world class work to the benefit of the city region's businesses and wider economy
- SME competitiveness which would include amongst others.
 - a range of programmes to support start-up
 - social enterprise support
 - export programmes
 - supply chain development
 - facilitating access to public sector procurement

- Marketing and inward investment programme for the city region (where eligible and not displacement).
- Skills- in line with City Deal Skills Plan, emphasise the importance of higher level skills, linked to business need and key sectors.
- Entrepreneurship – with low levels of aspiration in many of the CRs more deprived post-industrial communities, target pro-entrepreneurship actions in those communities.
- Inclusion, worklessness, poverty – with all the evidence, as well as through experience, shows that this is best tackled at a very local level. Suggest enhancing ATA type models to support the unemployed as well as more intensive programmes to help the young unemployed become more work ready, as well as continuing, deepening and broadening the many successful programmes already underway in different parts of the city region.
- Economic infrastructure – whilst in the current Y & H ERDF Programme this has been limited only to the Objective 1 area (ie South Yorkshire) lobby for this to be more flexibly available across both CR areas – making the area attractive to knowledge and advanced industries.
- Transport schemes that are essential to unlock growth or create jobs should be funded. Also schemes which connect excluded communities/ individuals to jobs.
- A programme of urban transport low carbon actions.
- Broadband connectivity – building on work undertaken in the current programme to make sure the use of new technologies eg. 4G, multi device options, are made accessible to all areas.
- Rural - ensuring that rural communities are fully connected to the urban economy.

External Funding Scrutiny Review

Potential Funding Sources for York's Key Investment Priorities

Leeds City Region Local Economic Partnership (LCR LEP)

1. Funding channelled through Leeds City Region LEP will be critical to the future economic growth of York.
2. The driving force behind all funding accessed via the Leeds City Region will be the **City Region Strategy and Investment Plan**, through which there is a proposal to create a single front door **Investment Fund** - combining or aligning different monies (e.g. the Regional Growth Fund, Growing Places Funding, European monies, Green Investment Bank etc.) which will be 'matched together at source' by the LEP.
3. Local authorities are being encouraged in the first instance to identify flagship initiatives for inclusion within the **Leeds City Region Investment Plan**. Leeds LEP then intends to support these initiatives through the proposed single **Investment Fund** (In reality piecing together elements of European, Region Growth fund, Growing Places monies in support of an individual scheme 'behind the scenes').
4. Ensuring as many York initiatives as possible feature prominently within the City Region Investment Plan and are eligible to receive support from the **LCR Investment Fund** is a natural priority for CYC.
5. Some funders (particularly Europe) may not be keen for their funding to be merged at source with other grant / loan schemes by the LEP. As a result CYC is also preparing a list of flagship projects which are particularly suited to attracting European funding, which will form part of a Leeds LEP European prospectus.
6. **Leeds LEP - European Funding: 2014-2020**
7. The proposed delivery mechanism for European funding 2014-2020 is the European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund and European Agricultural Funding for Rural Development. These will be brought together into an EU Growth Programme with a Single Governance Structure.

The Growth Programme's top priorities will be innovation, research and development, support for SMEs, skills, low carbon, employment and social inclusion.

8. The funds available in the EU Growth Programme will be notionally allocated to LEP areas. Each LEP will lead the development of an EU Investment Strategy which will complement the Local Enterprise Partnership's wider economic / strategic plan.
9. Leeds LEP will therefore receive a tranche of European monies in the next round of Structural Funding 2014-2020. The amount of funding Leeds LEP will receive has yet to be determined, although the funding priorities for European monies have already been made clear and further detail will be released in the final week of March 2013.
10. Leeds LEP will then be compelled to produce a high level 'European brochure' by September 2013, giving an outline of the type of flagship schemes that European monies might be spent on in their region. Again, both York Central and the Digital creative centre are expected to feature prominently in these brochures - but due to the nature of European funding regulations, it may be that very specific elements of both schemes are highlighted e.g., greenspace/low carbon elements of the York Central development or specific training schemes/apprenticeships associated with the Digital Media Centre.
11. It remains to be seen whether Leeds LEP will be able to merge their European monies into the planned Single Investment Fund or not. What is certain, however, is that the European monies allocated to Leeds LEP could be used for a broad range of projects and initiatives in York, (not just the York Central and Digital Media Centre schemes).
12. The Task Group may wish to consider looking at the detail of the European funding regulations when they emerge, to see if any other flagship schemes from York could be identified as being eligible for Leeds LEP European monies.

York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Economic Partnership (YNYER LEP)

13. YNYER LEP has access to fewer resources than Leeds LEP but it is still important to acknowledge that funding opportunities may still be accessed via this partnership, in particular through the **Growing Places Fund**.
14. £730 million Growing Places funding has been allocated to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to generate economic activity in the short term by addressing immediate infrastructure and site constraints and promoting the delivery of jobs and housing.
15. Both Leeds City Region and YNYER LEP have Growing Places Funding still available (despite the deadline having officially passed) which both are predominantly administering on a loan basis. Both LEPs (particularly YNYER LEP) have found it difficult to identify viable projects and would be keen to hear from potential York schemes that could generate employment predominantly through loan funding.
16. There is also the potential that YNYER LEP will decide to back York Central as their main infrastructure priority and ask to Government in their Growth Strategy. This again would take the form of a loan - but a low interest loan, with a 0.5% discount off the PWLB loan rate (our prudential rate) for a proportion of the overall infrastructure funding required for the site.

Central Government - Regional Growth Fund

17. The **Regional Growth Fund** is the government's main financial instrument for investing in private sector and public/private projects that will stimulate growth and create additional employment, and is another key funding avenue that is being actively explored at present.
18. The intention is to give companies the confidence to invest, hire and grow. The fund predominantly supports SMEs to expand, through investment in premises, technology and equipment which will in turn lead to long term job creation, and typically supports 20% of the costs of investment. The threshold for bids is £1 million.

19. Bids for funding from private bodies and public-private partnerships across England on a challenge basis are accepted - the majority of bidding partnerships will include a combination of large private sector players, SMEs and social enterprises working together with public partners. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) play a role (alongside councils) in coordinating across areas and communities, and in bidding for the Fund.
20. Round 4 of the Regional Growth Fund will close to applications on 20th March 2013, with successful bidders announced within 6 months. Successful bids must demonstrate the potential for creating long-term, private-sector led economic growth and employment, and also evidence a significant private sector matched funding contribution - circa 80%.
21. CYC have already submitted an expression of interest for our flagship development site, York Central, and are also working to support individual York based firms with the calibre to bid to the fund directly.
22. It should also be noted that Leeds City Region LEP successfully secured a tranche of funding through Round 3 of the Regional Growth Fund which it has used to create a sub fund for SMEs in the Leeds City Region area. York firms are eligible to apply. In this case the maximum amount of funding available is £1 million per project (although most grants are likely to be in the region of £100,000 or less). Again CYC is actively supporting a number of York firms in key growth sectors to submit bids to this fund.

Work of the Economic Development Team

23. Having identified major investment priorities and ambitions for the City, and the primary sources of funding through which to bring them to fruition, the Economic Development Team will be actively pursuing the above funding opportunities over forthcoming months.
24. The Economic Development Team also intends to explore ad hoc funding opportunities as and when they arise. This includes new and sometimes radical funding models to unlock key development sites and kick-start other growth initiatives in the City via municipal bonds, crowd funding and social impact bonds.

25. To support this, it is important for the City to harness the energy, ideas and expertise of its residents, businesses and academics, working with the Local Authority to lever in investment, develop new ideas for the future and become more proactive in seizing opportunities as they arise.
26. Other key events to report in recent weeks include a successful Funding and Finance Business Breakfast hosted by the Economic Development Team in the Mansion House and attended by 60 people. The funding pages of the York Means Business website are also in the process of being overhauled.

This page is intentionally left blank

Information on top two/three priorities that City of York Council will be putting forward to Leeds City Region (LCR)

York Central: Phase 1, Queen Street Quarter

York Central is a 37 hectare brownfield site adjacent to York City Centre and the City's rail station. The site is largely owned by Network Rail, who will rationalise current uses to allow for redevelopment. The first phase is a 2.9 hectare mixed use development accommodating 40,000m² of new and converted floorspace including improved transport interchange facilities.

It is estimated it will create in the region of 1663 gross jobs (plus 580 temporary construction jobs), by March 2016 – producing £69m GVA (Gross Value Added) per annum thereafter. In addition, the first phase of York Central will set in motion the potential for two further phases of development. In total the site offers the potential, on completion of the three phases, for an additional c. £247m GVA per annum and a net 4,750 jobs.

York Central is therefore clearly a major strategic project for the city and the wider region. However, there are considerable barriers and obstacles to development, largely associated with abnormal infrastructure costs. Key issues involve the reclamation and re-assembly of land that is partly used as an operational rail/freight site, and obtaining site road access. In phase one the 'stacking' of an existing car park into a multi storey facility is also a necessity to gain access to the site.

The timescales for the development of York Central are largely dependent on accessing a number of funding streams. An outline bid for £9 million has been submitted to the Government's Regional Growth Fund to support site infrastructure and public realm works. An expression of interest for £6 million has also been submitted to the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Economic Partnership (YNYER LEP).

Both are 'Stage 1' applications and if approval is received in principle, a far more detailed due diligence process would be undertaken, where the Government and YNYER LEP will ask detailed questions of the authority around job creation figures, timescales, spend profiles etc.

The Regional Growth Fund and Growing Places Fund submissions detail the challenges around the York Central site.

Digital, Media and Creative Centre (DMCC)

The Digital, Media and Creative Centre (DMCC) will provide a new home for growing creative, digital and technology companies within York. Its creation has been a long-time ambition for the City of York. York is already a creative and digital hub for Yorkshire with inspiring architecture and a heritage that inspires creative talent.

Creative and digital companies in the City would greatly benefit from a central nucleus within this inspiring environment to grow their businesses and community. The intention is for the DMCC to provide around 20,000 sq. ft. of managed office accommodation for small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) within the creative, digital and technology sectors, and to encourage and support the growth and development of these sectors within York.

In particular the DMCC aims to increase the capacity of the city to provide flexible space and to increase opportunities for retaining and networking talent and enterprise across the city. The centre could provide high quality office space with offices ranging from around 58 sq. ft. suitable for sole traders, up to circa 1500 sq. ft. which will house companies of around 9-12 employees each.

Current Progress / Timescales - An outline feasibility study has been undertaken by Science City York investigating several possible sites and the challenges associated with each. In addition, an outline expression of interest for £2 million Growing Places funding has been submitted to YNYER LEP.

3. Leeds Local Economic Partnership (Leeds LEP) Funding

Leeds LEP's intention is to compile a Single Investment Plan identifying key investment priorities for the LEP area.

Sitting alongside this strategic plan the LEP also aims to develop an Investment Fund – the intention of which is to combine the present 'funding cocktail' (Regional Growth Fund, Growing Places Fund, Green Investment Bank monies etc.) into one funding stream.

This will naturally be a complex process to manage and will take time to come to fruition. However, City of York Council has already held discussions with Leeds LEP in order to ensure that both York Central and the Digital Creative Centre feature prominently within the proposed

Investment Plan, and that both schemes are therefore in a strong position to receive LEP funding when it becomes available.

The amount of funding that CYC would like to secure from Leeds LEP (and the purpose of that funding) will vary considerably depending on the success of the funding submissions to Government and York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP referred to above.

4. Leeds LEP - European Funding: 2014-2020

To briefly recap on the proposed delivery mechanism for European funding 2014-2020 the European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund and European Agricultural Funding for Rural Development will be brought together into an EU Growth Programme with a Single Governance Structure. The Growth Programme's top priorities will be innovation, research and development, support for SMEs, skills, low carbon, employment and social inclusion.

The funds available in the EU Growth Programme will be notionally allocated to LEP areas. Each LEP will lead the development of an EU Investment Strategy which will complement the Local Enterprise Partnership's wider economic / strategic plan.

Leeds LEP will therefore receive a tranche of European monies in the next round of Structural Funding 2014-2020. The amount of funding Leeds LEP will receive has yet to be determined, although the funding priorities for European monies have already been made clear and further detail will be released in the final week of March 2013.

Leeds LEP will then be compelled to produce a high level 'European brochure' by September 2013, giving an outline of the type of flagship schemes that European monies might be spent on in their region. Again, both York Central and the Digital creative centre are expected to feature prominently in these brochures - but due to the nature of European funding regulations, it may be that very specific elements of both schemes are highlighted e.g., greenspace/low carbon elements of the York Central development or specific training schemes/apprenticeships associated with the Digital Media Centre.

It remains to be seen whether Leeds LEP will be able to merge their European monies into the planned Single Investment Fund or not. What is certain, however, is that the European monies allocated to Leeds LEP could be used for a broad range of projects and initiatives in York, (not just the York Central and Digital Media Centre schemes).

The Task Group may wish to consider looking at the detail of the European funding regulations when they emerge, to see if any other flagship schemes from York could be identified as being eligible for Leeds LEP European monies.

Responses to question posted on GeniUS website

External Funding into the City of York

The aspiration for the City of York is to place itself in the a **top five UK and top ten European city economies by 2015**, and in the process become a more international, innovative and enterprising city.

In order to achieve this vision, it is important for the city to harness the energy, ideas and expertise of its residents, businesses and academics, working with the Local Authority to lever in investment, develop ideas for the future and become more proactive in seizing opportunities as they arise.

To make this happen we need ideas from you on:

- **how best to identify and progress opportunities for citywide funding or investment;**
- **what additional mechanisms could we put in place to best communicate opportunities;**
- **who we can work with to create groups or consortia within the city that can come together to support this;**
- **what would make is easier for you to get involved if you are interested?**

If you have thoughts or ideas on any of these areas then please post them here: <http://geniusyork.com/forum/topics/external-funding-scrutiny-review> on the forum, to let us know what you think and to discuss and shape them with others.

The discussion on GeniUS! will run until the end of March and your ideas, suggestions and recommendations will feed into a review of external city funding by the council's Economic and City Development overview and scrutiny committee, comprised of Councillors from all parties looking at this issue. The results of this review will go to the council's cabinet, and will inform future council policy and practice in this area.

If York is going to reach and exceed these aspirations, new thinking and joined up working with city partners from all areas is crucial. To set York up for a robust and bright future we need to ensure we secure the best opportunities now.

Replies to This Discussion

Reply by Michelle White on February 23, 2013 at 17:31

I think it is foolish to focus on winning competitions and becoming famous. To change how the city is run to focus on winning competitions is to spend a lot of money creating systems that squeeze everything bone dry. A huge wealth sucking device where we suck more funds, get people to invest- get more funding. Is our goal to become a leech? The main systems that run our city need to be orientated towards beneficial goals for its residents. What if you destroy many beneficial things claiming they are inefficient? How can happiness be inefficient. If every city is like a leech its no wonder we have reached our current situation where everything is bone dry and like tightrope walk. Penny pinching has crippled everything. Why do we need such a massive amount of blood. Because we spend too much thats why. York has its many "Millenium Domes" these were past attempts to compete with other cities. We dont need a new fad or project. What we want is a focus on caring for our own city. Turning it into a competition machine is not what the city needs. The city needs to not be like other cities. York is a tourist attraction BECAUSE it is not like other cities. Cloned shopping centres are everywhere. Nowhere has any character anymore or personality. Everything has become about National businesses and money making. Why cant we show the way. Our city is historical. Why not follow historical ideas instead of this modern self destruction. Increase the historical developments. That will make York shine. You have a city that attracts intelligent educated people and international interest. Those eyes looking and ears watching are waiting for us to do something worthwhile..and its not something that is about spending money on building massive tin shacks or talking a lot of administrative drivel. I already came up with the idea that pensioners might want to decorate the city with flowers "York in Bloom". And having been living in the city for 60 odd years they might want to discuss with you what they have seen in the last 60 years and their wealth of knowledge. These are ideas for developing love and sense of community. What city does this? Why not make York special? A leader showing the other cities new ways

Reply by Heather Niven on March 1, 2013 at 18:42

Not sure anyone is focussing on winning competitions and becoming famous here, more on better ways to fund new initiatives in the city to help new businesses, social enterprises and community groups start and grow.

Your idea of capturing the experiences people have who have lived in York for decades is a great one! One idea could be a Wikipedia for York - a citywide resource for all residents to share their stories. What do you think?

Reply by Michelle White on March 4, 2013 at 13:53

Sounds awesome. I'm in very anti Millennium dome mindset! Born a Capricorn so I'm always focusing on not wasting money. I had an idea that would be a good initiative. It would be a national business set up by the government where anyone with a disability can go and find paid employment. No forcing people off benefits on this one but the disabled person applies IF THEY WISH. Work and payment is not set up to be by the hour but by the job. In this way people with disabilities can work at their own pace. With an hourly payment people will feel pressurised to work fast and may destroy their health if put under pressure. I, for example would like to try 1 hour per week working on a computer but this hours work I would spread over 3 hours so I do it at a 3rd of the speed of a healthy person. Then I would like to experiment with increasing very slowly at my own pace with no pressure or threat of financial loss. Currently there is no employment for someone in that situation. I use a wheelchair & have been to daycentres where other people in wheelchairs sit for hours on end playing windows solitaire. I believe those people would also like to try. It's very depressing and gives rise to lots of fear if there is no prospect of being able to move towards any kind of paid work. no one will employ someone who cannot work fast if the pay is by the hour. Many disabled people are very low mentally because of these obstacles

Reply by Heather Niven on March 4, 2013 at 14:17

Hi Michelle, I really like this idea - what if it was a social enterprise (rather than a national enterprise set up by government) which provided assistance with computer work for charities, voluntary groups or other non for profits and as part of the deal the people doing the work got paid per job either with money or with other perks, i.e. tea at Betty's or tickets to go to nice places in the city? This would get folk out and about as well as providing a way to give time and expertise for a good cause. Everyone benefits - the non for profits get assistance with admin, research, social networking and graphic design and the helpers get out and about or some other reward for taking the time and effort to assist, as well as experience and insight.

Another idea would be to ask the same group of people to spend some time looking online for opportunities that would be useful and relevant to York and its people, and feeding the information back to the council and other groups to then develop and take advantage of? Maybe rewards could be on commission basis depending on which initiatives are taken forwards? Just a thought.

Reply by Michelle White on March 4, 2013 at 18:01

It needs to be paid work. Its all about feeling there is hope to self support or that one can achieve this even on a small scale would lift a lot of depression etc. There is plenty of voluntary work where you can go as slow as you like but as soon as it comes to trying to support oneself financially a bit more there's just a massive brick wall

Reply by Adam Gray on February 26, 2013 at 14:48

As Senior Funding and Investment Officer at City of York Council I would like to kick start the debate by putting forward a few ideas for comment / consideration.

I'm particularly interested in the idea of developing an Ethical Investment Bond for York - i.e. an FSA regulated bond, which raises money from various ethical investors and local benefactors to support start-up businesses retaining young graduates in the City, the development of social enterprises, firms which pay a living wage etc.

The bond would offer low interest loan finance to these firms - the investors would be paid back, but not at a significant rate of return, say 2% per annum max.

Does anyone have any additional thoughts / ideas around this theme? Would this be an attractive proposition for citizens of York to invest in, particularly if the bond were to be FSA regulated?

Reply by Heather Niven on March 1, 2013 at 18:37

Sounds like a really interesting idea Adam, and also the idea of local investors and benefactors helping new businesses the city to develop further sounds laudable. As Carole Dove says, adding in matched funding perhaps through crowd funding would also demonstrate market demand, or support for new proposals which could reduce any risk to investors. An understanding of social impact in addition to return on investment and the added value of this way of funding may also

encourage more people to support new initiatives. Definitely worth exploring further!

Reply by Anna Semlyen on March 4, 2013 at 13:18

As well as cash, an input to a funding bid could be in the form of promises - e.g. of expertise, voluntary work, shared resources, commitment to rent space in a building or guarantee a mortgage or loan.

Reply by Eddy Adams on April 9, 2013 at 11:20

Some brief thoughts on this.

Our forthcoming work on social innovation in Europe's cities suggests that although funding is important, in most places the issue is more about total resource mobilisation - maxing what we have. In particular, this means tackling public sector funding silos, addressing poor performance and encouraging new behaviours. Cities at the leading edge of social innovation and public sector reform are those which are supporting new space for service design and prototyping which allows all actors - particularly customers - to assume a key role. GeniUS itself is a good - although early stage - example of this.

So I would argue that it is a mistake to chase the money, and that good ideas will usually find backing, even at times like this.

However, I do agree that we need to look at new creative ways to support activities - although I'm rather sceptical about SIB¹s etc; I do think we need to fully explore sustainable forms of public sector finance. OECD² is about to publish a review of social innovation finding sources that might be relevant here.

I feel as though I'd be ducking the issue if I didn't say something about money! As we know, one of York's difficulties is that it is relatively wealthy, so hasn't had access to much in the way of EU Structural Funds. These are of course diminishing anyway, but there are new opportunities in the 2014-2020 programmes which are of interest. For example, there will be a much stronger focus on Social Innovation both within the Cohesion Funds but also in the new research programme, Horizon 2020. This means that the type of model York is pioneering is potentially well-placed to attract resources.

¹ Strategic Investment Bonds

² Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

One of the challenges overall is to address fragmented activity within the city. Lots of organisations are very good at attracting funding for their own work and that is likely to continue. Perhaps one of the tricks is to use high profile events/occasions like the Tour de France to mobilise partners behind a range of related activities - which can help break down traditional rivalries and compartmentalised behaviour.

Much of this is already under way in the city I think (hope!). So I'd come back to the importance of creating an ecosystem that encourages coproduction, fresh thinking and the design and prototyping of new ideas. And I'd emphasise that some of the city's ongoing initiatives - such as the Dementia Friendly City concept - offer a strong platform for additional thinking about resources, which is much easier to manage than a general call to arms re external funding.

Keep up the good work :-)

Reply by Adam Gray on April 10, 2013 at 10:53

Hi Eddy

Some carefully considered comments here which make a great deal of sense. Despite my job title (i.e. Funding and Investment Officer) I fully agree that initial emphasis should be placed on co-ordinating partners' activities and generally encouraging co-production and new ideas - which, if robust enough, will still attract funding despite the difficult climate. To an extent this happens already but there is always room for improvement / new ideas.

Your comments around European funding are timely and accurate. CYC is carefully tracking the plans for the 2014-2020 programme, and I think that whilst overall monies will diminish there is potential to support a broader range of eligible projects through the new Structural Programme, particularly around social inclusion, SME innovation, low carbon, environmental activities etc. Horizon 2020 is another one I'm following closely.

As regards creative ways to support activities - again I find myself agreeing that Social Investment Bonds are only one, rather narrow, option and that there are many other forms of potentially flexible new funding to be considered. I will look out for the OECD report and read with interest.

Other interesting reading includes the recent Centre for Cities report around the future of urban development funds in the UK. The move

towards establishing a pan-authority Municipal Bond is gathering pace nationally, although with various complexities. I'd be interested in yours, and other contributors' comments, around that. Although cautious in some respects, I'm also interested in various Crowd funding models which strikes a chord with some of Heather's earlier comments.

Regards, Adam

Reply by Eddy Adams on April 10, 2013 at 11:15

Yes - the CfC One Fund to Rule them all work is interesting - interesting that although UK lags well behind the Nordics and Germany in terms of innovation and urban development, we are still ahead of the curve on creative thinking around processes and financial models. Let's keep in touch - happy to share our (URBACT's³) forthcoming work on social innovation which is out 3rd May.

Reply by Adam Gray on April 10, 2013 at 12:08

Hi Eddy

Thanks for that, it would be great to keep in touch and very interested in the URBACT work around social innovation too.

best regards

Adam

Reply by Heather Niven on April 10, 2013 at 17:36

Some great input here Eddy and Adam, and I am keen to read up on some of the info you mentioned here i.e. Horizon 2020, OECD and cohesion funds as well as your latest report from URBACT.

I agree wholeheartedly that better relationships and more people working together to respond to opportunities is going to give you the most effective solutions. I also agree that this site, GeniUS! York is a definite step in the right direction but still in early stages and is not enough in isolation to achieve the levels of integration we need.

The new 'Innovate York' programme developed between City of York Council and Science City York aims to build on these beginnings to further connect everyone with the shared purpose of making York robust and ready for the future. Residents, businesses, academics, social enterprises and voluntary groups working together to support York in collectively responding to any opportunities which might benefit the city

³ URBACT is a European exchange and learning programme promoting sustainable urban development.

(from both within and out-with the city). Part of this will be to develop specialist 'think tanks', provide lots of networking opportunities to bring people together, bring new ideas to York to pilot, fast-track new ideas in both the council and the city, providing training and expertise in how to be more innovative, and generally helping to make things happen, for the better. I will be posting more on this over the next few weeks and hope you can be involved!

York is full of creative, passionate and innovative people and we need everyone's collective brainpower and support to mobilise the city, become more responsive and therefore seize more opportunities.

Economic & City Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee Work Plan 2013/2014

Meeting Date	Work Programme
18 June 2013 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance of the Leader (to include information on the City Team) 2. CVS Presentation on Volunteering Opportunities for under 16s & York Charter for Volunteering 3. Verbal Update on Implementation of Recommendations Arising from the Scrutiny Task Group E-Planning Facilities – Reasons for Being Behind Schedule 4. Update report – Local Enterprise Partnerships 5. External Funding Scrutiny Review Interim Report 6. Workplan 2013/14
23 July 2013 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Year End CYC Finance & Performance Monitoring Report 2. Green Travel Plans (Businesses) Overview/Progress Report 3. Biannual Update Report - Major Transport Initiatives 4. Bi-annual Update Report - Major Developments within the City of York Council 5. Briefing notes on Potential Review Topics for the municipal year 2013/14 6. Workplan 2013/14
24 September 2013 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance of the Cabinet Member for Transport, Planning & Sustainability 2. First Quarter CYC Finance & Performance Monitoring Report 3. Update on Implementation of Recommendations from Out of Hours Childcare Scrutiny Review 4. External Funding Scrutiny Review Draft Final Report 5. Impact of the 'The Spare Room Subsidy' – often called the 'Bedroom Tax' 6. Grand Depart Briefing/Update 7. Workplan 2013/14
19 November 2013 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance of the Cabinet Member for Health, Housing & Adult Social Services 2. Second Quarter CYC Finance & Performance Monitoring Report 3. Update on Newgate Market - success of improvements, EIF bid & information on footfall 4. Update on Implementation of Recommendations from the E-Planning Facilities Scrutiny Review 5. Update on Implementation of Recommendations from Youth Unemployment Scrutiny Review 6. Workplan 2013/14

28 January 2014 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Six Monthly Update Report on Major Transport Initiatives2. Six Monthly Update Report on Major Developments within the City of York Council3. Workplan 2013/14
25 th March 2014 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Third Quarter CYC Finance & Performance Monitoring Report2. Workplan 2013/14
29 th April 2014 @ 5pm	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Workplan 2013/14