

LCR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

At a meeting of the LCR Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in the Authority Chamber - No.1 Mann Island, Liverpool, L3 1BP on Thursday, 20th January, 2022 the following Members were

P r e s e n t:

Councillors

Steve Radford
Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
(in the Chair)

J Abbott, D Burgess-Joyce, E Dourley, E Finneran, J Hansen, C Howard, A Jones, T Long, J McManus, J Morgan, G Pearl, A Teeling, M Uddin and C Waterfield.

Also in attendance – Metro Mayor Steve Rotheram.

23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Pat Moloney, Kai Taylor and Sir Ron Watson CBE.

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

25. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 NOVEMBER 2021

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

26. COMBINED AUTHORITY BUDGET REPORT 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the Portfolio Holder for Policy, Reform and Resources and the Executive Director of Corporate Services, which provided the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with an opportunity to consider and make recommendations on the 2022/23 budget for the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority prior to its approval at the meeting of the Combined Authority on 21 January 2022.

The Metro Mayor, Steve Rotheram, introduced the proposed 2022/23 Combined Authority Budget and thanked John Fogarty and his team for the tremendous work that had been undertaken in the preparation of the budget proposals.

The Metro Mayor advised the Committee that this budget reflected where we were as a public body in the aftermath of Covid, the impact on Local Government Finances, uncertainty in levels of patronage on the public transport system, souring inflation, rises in supply chain costs, reductions in revenues and a growing gap between income and expenditure.

The Metro Mayor highlighted some of the key challenges and changes within the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority Budget 2022/23 to the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:-

- Ensuring the safe running of services to the public, given the economic challenges;
- Organisational efficiency and modernisation;
- Handling money was very inefficient as it generated transaction costs;
- A proposal to increase the tunnel tolls for the first time in five years in response to budget pressures and increasing maintenance costs;
- A proposal to increase the transport levy by 2%;
- A freeze in the Mayoral precept to avoid putting further financial pressure on residents; and
- A proposal to bring an amendment to the Combined Authority meeting to incentivise the rate of take up of Fast Tag to non-City Region residents.

The Metro Mayor concluded his statement and invited John Fogarty, Executive Director of Corporate Resources to make his budget statement.

John Fogarty advised the Committee that Covid continued to cast a big shadow over the financial situation and the Combined Authority's involvement in public transport meant it was very exposed to that financial impact of the pandemic. In setting a budget this year there had been four related, but quite distinct, challenges to consider:-

- How to return the Combined Authority to a position of financial sustainability where reserves were no longer needed to prop up the revenue budget which had been the case through Covid;
- How to maintain and grow the passenger transport network in an environment where passenger revenues had fallen off significantly;
- How did the Mersey Tunnels fit into this picture in balancing the financial benefits of tunnels with some of the negative aspects, particularly reliance of cars for cross river journeys; and
- How to deliver a package of investment (over £1bn) with limited revenue funding and the budget gap.

John Fogarty explained that the budget gap that currently existed had predated Covid, but the pandemic had made the situation worse. The transport levy had reduced over time and was now significantly less than it had been five years ago, but costs had not reduced correspondingly. A lot of costs had been fixed, particularly around concessionary travel, but the reality was that the costs and the demand for services had not reduced by the same degree. Whilst there was no intention that the transport levy should go back to its prior levels, the link between prices and the transport levy needed to be restored otherwise that gap would increase further. Therefore the budget proposed a 2% increase in the levy for the following year. The figure of 2% had been arrived at in consultation with Local Authority Finance Directors and Chief Executives. Setting the budget had been a consultative and collaborative process and it was considerably less than the likely inflation level next year. The intention was that the 2% would cover things which could not be avoided e.g. pay awards and that other inflationary pressures would need to be managed within existing budgets through business transformation, efficiency and value for money.

John Fogarty highlighted further key points from the budget proposals:-

- The freezing of the Mayoral precept as the Authority had continued to receive some external funding from Government which would assist in offsetting a Combined Authority running costs and together with the levy would set a positive direction of travel as the Authority emerged from the pandemic;
- The need for economic growth to be inclusive in the City Region and in order to benefit all communities an effective and affordable public transport network that linked communities with opportunities was required;
- Specific updates and challenges in relation to Bus, Rail and Ferries;
- Whilst Mersey Tunnels had remained resilient and journeys had increased towards the end of each lockdown period this had translated into additional costs of operation. Addressing this would mean that Tunnel tolls would need to rise by 20p. Increases had been deferred for a number of years due to Covid but maintaining those historic low levels of tolls in the current environment was not sustainable or possible.

Finally, John Fogarty referred to the challenge of how the vast capital programme would be managed. It would require a very strong pipeline of schemes and significant amounts of resources directed at delivering project management in particular and finding that capacity, with very limited revenue available for growth, would be a challenge. To address that it would be necessary to capitalise project management costs. The Combined Authority would work with Local Authorities as in some cases the project management resources would be better placed locally depending on delivery of the scheme. As more information was received from Government around the value and the timing of funding awards further reports would be brought to Members in order to address that capacity issue. He added that assumptions around price increases were a risk to the budget and cost escalation would also be a big challenge in the capital programme. Construction industry prices were increasing along with the cost of materials and that had already started to have an effect.

The Chair, Councillor Radford invited questions/comments from the Committee.

Councillor David Burgess-Joyce raised some concerns regarding the budget proposals. He asked what plans were being proposed to support those people on very poor incomes as a result of the loss of a cash payment system which would cause them some difficulties. He also asked whether it was proposed to revisit any of the big ticket spends that were not necessarily related to infrastructure. In particular, £3.6m on a training plan which seemed to be directed towards Merseyside, which did not seem to have any race equality issues against the potential loss of staff on the front line. He also asked why did we not just close the Queensway Tunnel?

The Metro Mayor confirmed that it was not proposed to do away with cash payments completely but rather to incentivise the move towards more electronic payments. Throughout the pandemic people had got used to using their debit card to pay for goods and services and it was necessary to modernise and to make savings. It was proposed to see whether people could be encouraged, even on low incomes, to preload electronically onto a card which would enable a faster transaction thereby causing less congestion and kinder to the environment. In respect of the second

point around the £3.6m that it was proposed to invest in trying to respond to what happened with Black Lives Matter, the Metro Mayor felt that was the appropriate way to level the playing field. The Combined Authority wanted to provide opportunities for all and the report had identified that there were communities who had much more difficulty in accessing some of our funding, therefore it was proposed to make it easier for people by specifically targeting some funding to black businesses and engaging people in those left behind communities. The Metro Mayor stated that Councillor Burgess-Joyce would be aware in respect of his own Local Authority there was a separate fund from Central Government which had been specifically earmarked for business support and could not be used for other capital projects.

Councillor Christine Howard stated that there were significant budget pressures across all Local Authorities, and asked what, if any, alternatives had been considered as opposed to increasing the transport levy?

The Metro Mayor stated that it was necessary to look at what was possible. Costs could be passed on to the passengers but that would mean that fares would need to be increased which would be counter-productive in the long term, particularly as low income families would be less likely to use public transport due to the fact that it would be more expensive. The Authority had looked at ways to improve contract costs, but many had been entered into prior to the Combined Authority being set up. The Metro Mayor indicated that some of those current contracts did not always provide value for money, but it had been necessary to abide by the legalities. The Authority would look to retender those contracts on renewal. Consideration had also been given to all alternatives. In addition, investment was proposed in the Bus Services Improvement Plan (BSIP). The Authority was doing what it could to secure funding from Central Government, but it wouldn't be enough to fill the gap. He noted that the Combined Authority had not increased charges for eight years. However, in that period Council taxes had risen in all Local Authorities and in a lot of cases by the maximum amount. He felt that it was fair and right to invest in a poor public transport system by looking at all of these different mechanisms. If there was a genuine desire for a 'London style' integrated transport system then it would be necessary to have significant funding to invest which would then achieve savings in the long term. The Metro Mayor stated that if he could find a different way of doing it without passing on costs he would certainly choose that route. He added that the Authority had already taken £4m out of the transport system in savings. The most unpalatable alternative would be cuts to services which no-one wanted to see.

Councillor John Abbott was hopeful about the future of the Combined Authority but felt that it was still a work in progress. However, he felt that more could be done by the Combined Authority to publicise what people were getting for their money.

The Metro Mayor agreed with the comments made by Councillor Abbott and he had made reference to that in his presentation. He said that Halton Council got more per capita than any other in the City Region but there were specific issues in Halton. Halton had never felt that it was part of the Liverpool City Region as it was part of Cheshire. The Concessionary Travel Scheme had not yet found its way into Halton as they were in a different scheme. The Metro Mayor agreed that there were issues which still needed to be resolved. He also referred to some of the major schemes and in particular the Halton Station Quarter. He added that it would take, from what was collected from the residents in the Halton area, about 40 years just to pay back the element that had been provided in funding support for the Halton Station Quarter. The Mersey Gateway Silver Jubilee Bridge had cost around £12m. If the Combined Authority had not provided funding for that, there would have been no

other sources of funding available. The Metro Mayor said that it was for all Councillors to better push devolution as a benefit to the City Region which London had benefitted from for over 20 years. He hoped the 'Levelling-up' White Paper would be published soon which might provide better powers and resources so that true devolution could be achieved. The Metro Mayor acknowledged that there was definitely a communications issue which needed to be addressed.

Councillor David Burgess-Joyce commented that in the last year, a large number of the workforce had been working from home and this had benefits for both sides. He asked had any work been done on home working and whether that had fed into a rationalisation of the estate. He also asked what the numbers were for releasing staff back into the workplace?

The Metro Mayor referred to the strategic picture and fortunately, funding had been secured from Government to undertake more projects in the City Region so more staff were needed, not less. He added that Katherine Fairclough, Chief Executive was undertaking a full appraisal of the structures within the Organisation and as the priorities changed so would some of the staffing requirements. There were efficiencies to be made in respect of the working practices, not just on numbers of staff. The Authority were fortunate that in winning that level of funding, some of it could be top sliced so any additional staffing requirements could be paid for as part of the programmes. One of the lessons which had been learnt was that working collectively through the Combined Authority, creates the best opportunity to get a fairer slice of national Government funding.

The Chair drew the item to a close and thanked the Metro Mayor and Officers for their contributions.

RESOLVED - That:

- (i) the contents of the report be noted; and
- (ii) the proposals contained within the appendices be noted and the comments raised by the Committee be considered by the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority as part of the formal approval of the Budget for 2022/23.

27. LCR COMBINED AUTHORITY CORPORATE PLAN 2021-24 - BIENNIAL/Q2 PERFORMANCE REPORT 2021/22

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director for Corporate Services which provided an overview of performance for the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority Corporate Plan 2021-24 as at the end of Quarter 2 (July to September) 2021. This was part of the bi-annual cycle of strategic performance reporting.

Stephen Littler, Corporate Performance Manager advised that the Quarterly Performance Monitoring Report included the following elements:

- (a) performance summary against the Corporate Plan Priorities up to the end of Quarter 2 2021/22 (30 September); and
- (b) performance data for the Corporate Performance Measures to the end of Quarter 2 2021/22.

The report outlined the 2021/22 half year delivery progress against the 5 priorities in Combined Authority's Corporate Plan 2021-24 which had been agreed in July 2021.

Stephen Littler confirmed that from his point of view all of the priorities were being delivered very well in accordance with the framework and commitments that had been set out in the Corporate Plan. There were no priorities or activities which were causing a huge concern at this point in what was a three year plan. The Combined Authority was six months into a 36 month programme and therefore it was still very early days.

He added that there was no doubt that Covid-19 had impacted on delivery in a lot of ways, not only in delivering the projects and the way officers worked in the Combined Authority, but also in the way we had performed. The way in which information had been managed had continued in a consistent and well governed format so that Members could have confidence in what was being reported as information was based on evidence and intelligence that was collected on a regular basis.

Looking forward into 2022/23 following the budget discussions the authority was already planning for next year's plan which would include new strategies, for example equalities, people and social value, as well as any other projects and levelling up funds etc. that came through. These would start to appear in the reporting throughout the year to reflect exactly what was being delivered.

Stephen Littler informed the Committee that a lot of the narratives were in a summary format but that he was open to answer any questions. One of the main aspects of the report was for Members to flag any areas they wished to know a little more about. At the previous meeting there had been quite a few questions around the Low Carbon Agenda and Priority 3 which was in the Corporate Plan and consequently a report was being brought to this meeting in relation to the launch of the Net Zero Strategy. He hoped that Members were supportive of this concept in terms of presentation of the report.

The Chair indicated that he had found it quite difficult to read the report as the print was very small on some pages particularly when using a screen and he asked if a larger font could be used in future reporting.

Councillor Christine Howard stated that she had got a bit confused with the RAG status because the individual workstreams were also coloured. She noticed in the 'Cleaner' workstream that there was mention of the green bus routes and in particular the 86 and 53. The 53 ran through her ward and she would be interested to understand to what extent there had been co-operational conversations with the Local Authorities about the bus routes that were going to be considered to be a green bus route and what plans there were for the future as it was something she would really like to support and work with the Combined Authority on.

Stephen Littler confirmed that he would address the presentational issues within the report which had been raised. In terms of the bus services he would take that back to Matt Goggins, Assistant Director for Bus, and would get back to Councillor Howard with a response on engagement on the green routes project.

John Fogarty, Executive Director of Corporate Services explained that there had been high levels of collaboration and joint work with all of the Local Authorities in respect of the green bus corridor routes. It was quite a formal process because it was

part of the package of CRSTS funding which had been agreed as a Combined Authority, including representatives from each of the Local Authorities. The bus corridors that would be taken forward were following collaboration with the relevant Local Authorities and Officers.

Councillor David Burgess-Jones referred to page 91 of the agenda and the 'myriad' of colours. He noticed that there was a 'red' in Priority 1 as well as a 'red' in Developing our Organisation. He asked what the 'reds' referred to?

Stephen Littler, again took on board feedback in relation to the format and presentation of the data.

Jason Roberts, Transformation Manager, advised that the Priority 1 'red' was to do with the 'Community Renewal Fund' which was in line with Government requirements and there had been a delay in Central Government releasing the paperwork so feedback was awaited on that. In respect of the 'red' in Developing Our Organisation Jason Roberts confirmed that he would look into it and provide the information to the Committee separately.

RESOLVED - That:

- (i) the contents of this report be noted; and
- (ii) any requests for further information be made as required.

**28. APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE SCRUTINY MEMBER TO THE LCR
AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE 2021/22**

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Legal and Monitoring Officer which sought a nomination from the Committee for a Liberal Democrat Councillor to sit as a substitute Member on the Combined Authority's Audit and Governance Committee for the remainder of 2021/22.

Louise Outram, Deputy Chief Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that the Committee required the appointment of two Labour Councillors, one Liberal Democrat Councillor and one Conservative Councillor and to appoint substitute members on the same basis. Following a change in the Membership of the Committee approved by the Combined Authority in November 2021, a replacement substitute Member needed to be appointed.

RESOLVED – That Councillor Geoff Pearl be appointed as the substitute Liberal Democrat Member on the Audit and Governance Committee for 2021/22.

**29. LIVERPOOL CITY REGION PATHWAY TO NET ZERO - OVERVIEW AND
PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Policy, Strategy and Government Relations which updated on progress to address the Climate Emergency declared by the Combined Authority in 2019. The report highlighted that the production of a net zero carbon pathway and action plan was one of the key objectives of the Corporate Plan (Priority 3: A Cleaner City Region) and outlined progress on meeting this objective and the proposed next steps.

Rachel Waggett, Principal Environment Officer advised that since the last meeting in November 2021, an update had been made to Corporate Plan priorities. A number of questions had been raised around Priority 3, the Cleaner priority stream

and in particular around the plan for achieving Net Zero Carbon and what this meant for Liverpool City residents. So on that basis the Performance Team had been asked to present progress on this particular plan activity in more detail.

Rachel Waggett explained that the report set out a summary of progress together with two additional appendices. The first appendix was a Pathway to Net Zero document which was scheduled for approval at the Combined Authority meeting the following day. The second appendix provided an overview of the key stakeholders consulted whilst preparing the document.

The Committee were informed that section 4 of the report highlighted some of the great progress that had already been made in a number of areas, fundamental in achieving the Net Zero goal. Examples of initiatives included the Community Environment Fund which supported grass roots environmental projects, the energy efficient retrofit of homes, steps to encourage people out of private cars.

The pathway document also provided a brief summary of the excellent work being undertaken by each of the six local authorities. The aim was to show the breadth and the scope of actions that were already being undertaken so the excellent progress being made in moving towards our goal could be seen. However, in order to meet the ambitious target and the challenges set at COP26 it would be necessary to move even more quickly in the future. It was clear that in order to do that the participation of all the communities and businesses in the City Region was required.

Appendix two of the report detailed the wide public engagement exercise undertaken to understand the thoughts and opinions of people in the Liverpool City Region on this matter. Rachel Waggett advised that a fuller report was available if anyone wished to see it.

In conclusion, the Pathway to Net Zero document set out a clear direction of travel for the Liverpool City Region. It tried to set out where we were now, where we needed to be in the future and the broad actions needed to achieve Zero Net Carbon in each of the five areas. The document had been designed by a community supplier with the aim of delivering this very complex information in a simple accessible format and was an attractive document to read. For those people who did want to drill into the detail there were hyperlinks throughout the document which would be available on the website in an electronic format.

The Chair welcomed the report and agreed that it had been a visually attractive report and easy to read. He commended the team who had provided support in writing it as people would be able to navigate the report effectively.

Councillor John Abbott referred to page 178 of the agenda and in particular paragraph 3.3. He was pleased to see that socio-economic status would be included. He stated that socio-economic status in his mind meant social 'class' but it normally meant 'income', The deprivation and exclusion that many working class people suffer from was not just a lack of money it was education, housing, health, life chances etc and he asked if there was any way of indicating that we meant 'class'.

Rachel Waggett responded that it had been very strongly felt by the Climate Partnership that we should tell it as it was. Poverty was an area that was considered within all of the Authority's Policies and Strategies and underpinned everything it did. The affordability of some of the aims was going to dictate how achievable they were, and it was something that we had been very aware of throughout this process. The Equality and Diversity appraisal undertaken meant that as we started to bring forward

projects it would be possible to see how affordable those particular interventions were and what support needed to be put in place for the people who could least afford them.

Councillor David Burgess-Joyce referred to page 168 of the agenda where it specifically talked about some people still needing to drive a car either privately or via car hire clubs. He asked if a date had been set for when a congestion charge was being introduced.

Rachel Waggett reported that there had been no determination as to whether a congestion charge or clean air zone would be necessary at this stage. It was hoped that people would voluntarily choose to use their own cars less. Included in the document was the realisation that for some people owning their own car, either throughout their lives or for a portion of their lives, was necessary. In the future those cars would likely be electric vehicles and it was hoped that the majority of people, for some or part of their lives, would not need to own a car at all and would move around using public transport, active travel or shared models of car ownership.

Councillor David Burgess-Joyce felt that there would need to be a congestion charge as people would not give up their cars voluntarily. He had recently ordered an electric car but some people may not be able to afford it due to the high cost. He felt that a congestion charge in Liverpool would be inevitable and he just wanted to know when.

The Chair clarified that the Metro Mayor did provide an answer that it was an open option to be looked at but no decision had been made.

Councillor John Morgan said that the only way to meet the aspiration of this report in terms of transport into the city was to have a fully integrated affordable transport system which was deregulated to the Combined Authority. In respect of the issue around a congestion charge it was way beyond what needed to be discussed today.

The Chair clarified that the subject of a congestion charge was an issue which would not go away, but it was not an immediate issue which needed to be discussed at this point.

Councillor John Abbott commented that he was under the impression that any question that was thought to be relevant by Members could be raised. A congestion charge would impact on the poor, but the answer to the question was that a decision had not yet been made but it would have an impact on equality.

RESOLVED That:

- (i) the progress made to achieve the climate commitments of the Combined Authority be noted, with particular reference to the Corporate Plan objective to create a net zero carbon pathway and action plan;
- (ii) the need for collective action referenced throughout the report on reducing net carbon emissions by all partners and communities across the Liverpool City Region, be recognised and supported; and
- (iii) the Combined Authority's proposal to develop a Year 2-5 Climate Action Plan that recognises the contribution of all stakeholders be supported.

30. EQUALITY STRATEGY DRAFT VISION AND OBJECTIVES

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director for Corporate Development and Delivery and the Portfolio Holder for Policy, Reform and Resources which provided an update on work to develop a four-year Equality Strategy for the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority. The strategy would set out the vision and objectives for equality, diversity and inclusion and would include a delivery plan to demonstrate how the ambition set out within the corporate plan in relation to equalities would be achieved.

Olly Martins, Fairness and Social Inclusion Policy Lead advised the Committee that performance would be reviewed regularly against the delivery plan and considered by this committee in addition to the Combined Authority. The draft vision and objectives were set out within the and the finalised version of the Strategy and delivery plan was due to be considered by the Combined Authority at its meeting on 4 March 2022.

Olly Martins explained that the report provided an update on the work to develop a strategy to ensure that this was encased across all activity of the Combined Authority. Since consideration of the Strategy by the Committee at its meeting on 3rd November 2022, it was at the point where the equality vision had been set and an objective had been developed in relation to each one of the three defined roles. Beneath each objective sat a descriptor and then some of the initial priorities that would be pursued. The next stage would be to develop a detailed delivery plan which would be presented to the Combined Authority for consideration at its meeting on 4 March 2022.

Olly Martins explained that the Committee now had an opportunity to undertake some activity via a Task and Finish Group to look at the Strategy in more detail. A proposal had been put forward to look into disability and this was detailed in section 3.7 of the report.

Councillor John Abbott asked for clarification on the make-up of the Task and Finish Group

Trudy Bedford, Statutory Scrutiny Officer advised that Task and Finish Groups were open to all Members of the Committee. There were no upper or lower limits and the group and it was not bound by any of the usual quorum issues. The process would start with an introductory session where a scoping document would be presented to Members and then three or four sessions would take place where evidence would be gathered from various witnesses and then formal report would be brought to Members for consideration together with a set of recommendations. If the recommendations were agreed by this Committee then they would go to the Combined Authority for final approval.

Councillor John Abbott explained that he was the Chief Executive of a disability Charity and would very much like to be involved.

The Chair asked if the Committee were in agreement with the focus being on disability or whether there were any other areas that Members would like to consider.

Councillor Christine Howard commented that she was not opposed to looking at disability as a topic but it would need to be narrowed down. It needed to be well defined rather than an overarching topic.

Olly Martins responded and suggested that one of the roles he had described e.g. the Combined Authority's role as an employer would be an obvious way of trying to break down the subject.

The Chair wondered if it would be worthwhile doing all three roles as part of the process. He asked if Councillor John Abbott would be interested in chairing the Task and Finish group given his interest on the subject of disability. Councillor John Abbott confirmed that he would be willing to Chair the group provided that there was more than one Member on it. The Chair asked if any other Members would like to support Councillor Abbott on the Task and Finish group and names were taken of all those expressing an interest. Any Members not in attendance at the meeting would also have the opportunity to participate.

Councillor David Burgess-Joyce said that it was not clear in the report what would be undertaken in the future that was not happening now.

Olly Martins explained that the Combined Authority would be doing a better job as an organisation of looking like the communities that it served. As an employer there were distortions which meant that the organisation did not look like the communities it served in relation to disabilities, ethnic minorities and gender. He added that it was difficult to measure as specific data wasn't collected in that area. The process was changing to ensure that we were maximising the contribution made to building a fair and socially representative region.

Councillor Eddie Dourley commented that 20 years ago he had worked on a Supported Employment Team which had consisted of 20 people. The work had been aimed solely at people with disabilities and health issues and supported roughly 375 people in Halton, but that team did not exist anymore. He felt that there was a massive gap in terms of support as a result of austerity and lack of financial support.

RESOLVED - That:

- (i) the draft Equality Vision and Objectives provided at Appendix 1 and the further detail provided on the approach to developing the Equality Strategy be noted;
- (ii) that the proposal to include socio-economic status as part of the equality strategy as described at paragraph 3.2 of the report, be noted;
- (iii) it be noted that the Combined Authority Equality Strategy Delivery Plan would be presented to the Combined Authority on 4 March 2022;
- (iv) the proposal to conduct a task and finish scrutiny review on disability in support of developing the Equality Strategy delivery plan as described at 3.7 below be agreed; and
- (v) further consideration be given as to how the Equality Strategy and Delivery plan could inform the Committee's Work Programme and future scrutiny reviews.

Minutes 23 to 30 received as a correct record on the 12 day of April 2022.

Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

(The meeting closed at 3.40 pm)