





Brighton & Hove
City Council

Cabinet Member Meeting

Title:	Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects Cabinet Member Meeting
Date:	10 June 2008
Time:	5.00pm or at the conclusion of the Culture Recreation & Tourism CMM
Venue	Committee Room 3, Hove Town Hall
Members:	Councillors: Kemble (Cabinet Member)
Contact:	Caroline De Marco Democratic Services Officer 01273 291063 caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk

	The Town Hall has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets
	An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter and infra red hearing aids are available for use during the meeting. If you require any further information or assistance, please contact the receptionist on arrival.
	FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;• Do not stop to collect personal belongings;• Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions; and• Do not re-enter the building until told that it is safe to do so.

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

AGENDA

Part One

Page

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

- (a) Declarations of Interest by all Members present of any personal interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the Members regard the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct
- (b) Exclusion of Press and Public - To consider whether, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, or the nature of the proceedings, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting when any of the following items are under consideration.

NOTE: Any item appearing in Part 2 of the Agenda states in its heading the category under which the information disclosed in the report is exempt from disclosure and therefore not available to the public.

A list and description of the exempt categories is available for public inspection at Brighton and Hove Town Halls.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1 - 4

Report of Director of Strategy & Governance (copy attached).

Contact Officer: *Caroline De Marco,* Tel: 01273 291063
Democratic Services
Officer

Ward Affected: *All Wards*

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

5 - 12

Minutes of the meeting of the Major Projects Sub-Committee held on 14 March 2008 (copy attached for information).

4. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS

5. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION

- (a) Items reserved by the Cabinet Member
- (b) Items reserved by the Opposition Spokesperson
- (c) Items reserved by Members, with the agreement of the Cabinet

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Member.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS (THE CLOSING DATE FOR RECEIPT OF PUBLIC QUESTIONS IS 12.00 NOON ON TUESDAY 3 JUNE 2008)

No public questions have been received.

7. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

No written questions have been received.

8. PETITIONS

13 - 14

*Contact Officer: Caroline De Marco, Tel: 01273 291063
Democratic Services
Officer*

Ward Affected: All Wards

9. DEPUTATIONS

No deputations have been received.

10. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

No letters have been received.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

No Notices of Motion have been received.

12. MATTERS REFERRED FOR RECONSIDERATION

No matters have been referred.

13. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

No reports have been received.

**14. SHOREHAM HARBOUR REGENERATION PROPOSALS - UPDATE 15 - 22
AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MEMBER STEERING GROUP**

Report of Acting Director Cultural Services (copy attached).

Contact Officer: Sean Hambrook, Head of Strategic Projects Tel: 01273 290362

Ward Affected: All Wards

15. APPOINTMENT OF PROJECT BOARDS 23 - 28

Report of Acting Director of Cultural Services (copy attached).

Contact Officer: David Fleming Tel: 01273 292700

Ward Affected: All Wards

16. SUB-NATIONAL REVIEW OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 29 - 34

Report of Acting Director, Cultural Services (copy attached).

Contact Officer: Sean Hambrook, Head of Strategic Projects Tel: 01273 290362

Ward Affected: All Wards

The City Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public. Provision is also made on the agendas for public questions to committees and details of how questions can be raised can be found on the website and/or on agendas for the meetings.

The closing date for receipt of public questions and deputations for the next meeting is 12 noon on the 15 JULY 2008.

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Meeting papers can be provided, on request, in large print, in Braille, on audio tape or on disc, or translated into any other language as requested.

For further details and general enquiries about this meeting contact Caroline De Marco, (01273 291063, email caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk) or email democratic.services@brighton-hove.gov.uk

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 2

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Terms of Reference		
Date of Meeting:	10 June 2008		
Report of:	Director of Strategy & Governance		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Caroline De Marco	Tel: 29-1063
	E-mail:	caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	No		
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 This report is to inform the Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects Cabinet Member Meeting of the delegations to the Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects. An appendix sets out the Terms of Reference for the Culture, Enterprise and Tourism Overview and Scrutiny Committee (CETOSC).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) To note the Terms of Reference for the Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects.

(2) To note the appendix which sets out the Terms of Reference for the Culture, Enterprise and Tourism Overview and Scrutiny Committee (CETOSC).

H. Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects

Explanatory Note

The Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects will be responsible for promoting economic growth and enterprise in the city. The role includes political leadership of the Council's major infrastructure projects, to receive reports on and manage the progress of major projects and advise the Leader, the Cabinet and relevant Director/s as appropriate.

Delegated Functions

To exercise the functions of the Council in relation to:

1. Economic Regeneration

- (a) The Council's functions and partnerships regarding the promotion of economic growth and the establishment and development of business.
- (b) Promoting and developing the economic fundamentals of the City (on occasions with other Cabinet Members) in areas such as adult skills, productivity, development sites etc.

2. Major Projects

- (a) To oversee the progress of major projects undertaken by the Council, and advise the Leader or the Cabinet as appropriate;
- (b) To review major projects and any project Boards having regard to capacity to deliver, corporate priorities and resources, and advise the Leader or the Cabinet as appropriate.

Appendix for noting only

Terms of Reference - Culture, Enterprise and Tourism Overview and Scrutiny Committee (CETOSC)

Following the adoption of the new Constitution on 15 May 2008, the Council has appointed an Overview and Scrutiny Commission and five further Overview and Scrutiny committees. The terms of reference for the Culture, Enterprise and Tourism Overview and Scrutiny Committee are as follows:

To perform the Overview and Scrutiny function in relation to all matters, Executive decisions and service provision connecting to the Enterprise and Employment and in particular:-

- Major Projects
- Economic Regeneration
- Culture, Arts and Heritage
- Tourism and Marketing
- Libraries and Museums
- Events
- Leisure, Sports and Recreation.

Specific responsibilities of Overview and Scrutiny Committees

All Overview and Scrutiny Committees have their responsibilities set out in Part 6 of the Constitution. They will have the following duties:

- To be aware of the forward plan and other anticipated decisions of the Cabinet/Cabinet Committees and council services;
- To develop focused programmes of work and identify the most appropriate means of progressing such work;
- To scrutinise and make recommendations to the Cabinet/Cabinet Committees/Cabinet Member and any relevant Council Committees in relation to issues arising from its work programme;
- To monitor the decisions taken by or on behalf of the Cabinet and the activities of service areas;

- To receive requests from Councillors and suggestions from officers of the council and co-optees for particular areas to be scrutinised;
- To propose to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission any Select Committee reviews (see para 3.3 below) including the terms of reference and membership of the Select Committee with a proposed scrutiny brief and resource requirement;
- To establish ad-hoc review Panels as necessary (see para 3.8 below);
- To exercise the right to 'call-in' and review decisions taken by or on behalf of the Executive (see para 3.10 and Appendix 1 below);
- To have an overview of the practice and policy of the relevant service areas;
- To identify areas of service practice and implementation of a policy that cause concern to members of the public and councillors and identify what action should be taken;
- To receive internal and external inspection reports on the services and challenge the action plans drawn up in response to problems that have been identified; monitor progress in implementing the action plans;

Agenda Item 3

Brighton & Hove City Council
MAJOR PROJECT SUB-COMMITTEE

4.00pm 14 March 2008

HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Peltzer Dunn (Chairman); Councillor Smith (Deputy Chairman), Councillors Hawkes (OS), Kennedy, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, Ann Norman, Rufus and Young.

PART ONE

ACTION

40. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

(A) Declarations of Substitutes

- 40.1 Councillors Kennedy and Ann Norman declared that they were attending the meeting as substitutes for Councillors Kitcat and Oxley respectively.

(B) Declarations of Interest

- 40.2 Councillor Mears declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item No.46, Open Market Update and Consideration of Project Options as she had a business at the Open Market.
- 40.3 Councillor Hawkes declared a personal interest in Item No.44 Falmer Community Stadium as she was a member of the City College Board.

(C) Exclusion of Press and Public

- 40.4 The sub-committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Section 100B(3) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

40.5 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Item No's 51 – 53 contained in Part 2 of the Agenda.

41. Minutes of the last meeting held on 4 February 2008.

41.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 4 February 2008 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the proceedings.

42. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

42.1 The Chairman noted that he had received a letter from an Interest Group in respect of the development at the Marina and that he had replied to say that the matter had been considered at the sub-committee's last meeting. He also stated that any further representations could be considered at future meetings.

42.2 The information was noted.

43. Public Questions

43.1 The Chairman noted that a public question had been received from Mr. Nigel Furness, which had been circulated and invited him to put his question to the meeting.

43.2 Mr. Furness thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to put his question:

"Could Councillor Peltzer-Dunn please tell us what plans the Council has for the King Alfred site if the current proposal does not proceed?"

43.3 The Chairman thanked Mr. Furness for his question and responded as follows:

"There are no such plans at the present time. The council has an agreement with the developer and until such time that the developer indicates otherwise, the assumption must be that the agreement will be complied with and the current scheme developed. If in fact the scheme does not proceed the council will need to consider the various options then available to it."

43.4 Mr. Furness then asked the following supplementary question:

"If there is a need for Plan B, will the comments of planning officers expressed before their departure be taken into consideration?"

43.5 The Chairman stated that should the current scheme not go ahead and a future scheme proposed requiring a planning application, it would need to be considered on its merits by the Planning Committee.

44. FALMER COMMUNITY STADIUM.

- 44.1 The Chairman welcomed Mr. Martin Perry from Brighton & Hove Albion to the meeting and invited him to give a presentation on the proposed stadium at Falmer.
- 44.2 Mr. Perry thanked the Chairman and gave a presentation to the Sub-Committee which outlined the vision for the stadium and how it would be brought to fruition.
- 44.3 Members of the sub-committee welcomed the presentation.
- 44.4 The Chairman thanked Mr. Perry for attending the meeting and noted that there was also a report from the Director of Environment, which detailed the progress to date on the Community Stadium project (for copy see minute book).
- 44.5 **RESOLVED** – That the presentation and report be noted.

45. INVESTIGATIONS INTO OPPORTUNITIES FOR SURPLUS LAND AT FALMER.

- 45.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services, which sought approval for the investigation of an option for the surplus land at Falmer following the receipt of a proposal from Brighton & Hove Albion Football Club (for copy see minute book).
- 45.2 The Acting Director of Cultural Services noted that the matter had been the subject of a report to the Policy & Resources Committee on the 6 March, which had approved the proposal and that an extract from the meeting had been circulated.
- 45.3 Members noted that the Policy & Resources Committee had approved the investigation and therefore that a report would be brought back in due course.
- 45.4 **RESOLVED** – That the extract and the report be noted.

46. OPEN MARKET UP-DATE AND CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT OPTIONS.

- 46.1 The sub-committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services, which outlined the current status of the Open Market proposal and options for the future direction of the Project (for copy see minute book).
- 46.2 **RESOLVED** –

(1) That the report be noted and that Policy & Resources Committee be recommended to approve the following:-

- (2) That the project continues to make progress and that Option 1 is approved as described in section 8 of this report where the lock out period ending on 19 April 2008 is extended by eight months to 19 December 2008 and officers continue to support the Open Market Traders Association and Hyde Housing Association to prepare a development proposal with draft Heads of Terms and draft Development Agreement to be reported back to the Project Board;
- (3) That if the Open Market Traders Association and Hyde Housing Association have not brought forward draft Heads of Terms and draft Development Agreement for the redevelopment proposal that are acceptable to the council as landowner by the new deadline of 19 December 2008, then officers should move to Option 5, as described in section 8 of this report, and work with the stallholders and Hyde to develop a procurement package where the council would then seek a developer prepared to deliver the vision and work in partnership with the stallholders and Hyde; and
- (4) That an agreement in principle and subject to further information from the Open Market Traders Association, that the Board of the proposed Community Interest Company to be established by the Open Market Traders Association as a company limited by guarantee includes minority representation of the council and that no one interest should have majority representation.

Note: Councillor Mears having declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting and took no part in the debate or decision on the item.

47. THE BRIGHTON CENTRE.

47.1 The Sub-Committee noted that the special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 19, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B of the 1972 Local Government Act as amended (items not to be considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that as a result of ongoing negotiations and discussions with Standard Life Investments which had not been concluded at the time of the despatch of the agenda.

47.2 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance, which detailed the progress on the Brighton Centre Redevelopment Project (for copy see minute book).

47.3 **RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

48. UPDATE ON OTHER MAJOR PROJECTS.

48.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services which provided an update of the position of the

various major projects which were not the subject of separate reports on the agenda (for copy see minute book).

48.2 **RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

49. NEW CONSTITUTION – FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS.

49.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance, concerning the arrangements for the work of the sub-committee under the proposed new executive arrangements for the council (for copy see minute book).

49.2 **RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

50. ITEMS TO GO FORWARD TO COUNCIL

50.1 The sub-committee considered whether any items should be submitted to the 24th April Council meeting for information in accordance with Procedure Rule 20.3a.

50.2 **RESOLVED** –

That no items be referred to council for information.

PART TWO SUMMARY

51. OPEN MARKET – UP-DATE AND CONSIDERATION OF PROJECT OPTIONS – EXEMPT CATEGORY 3.

51.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services, concerning the Open Market and project options with regard to the lease of 3, 4, 5, & 6 Francis Street, Brighton.

51.2 **RESOLVED** – That the recommendations contained in the report be agreed.

Note: Councillor Mears having declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting and took no part in the debate or decision on the item.

Councillors Hawkes, Kennedy, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, Rufus and Young wished their names recorded as having abstained from voting on the above resolution.

52. THE BRIGHTON CENTRE – EXEMPT CATEGORY 3.

- 52.1 The Sub-Committee noted that the special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 19, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B(4) of the 1972 Local Government Act as amended (items not to be considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that officers were keen to present the most up to date position on the status of SEEDA's application for grant funding to the Central Projects Review Group following the submission of the investment case, which was still in preparation at the time of the despatch of the Agenda.
- 52.2 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance, which detailed the current status of the SEEDA application for grant funding to the Central Projects Review Group and progress on the Procurement Strategy with Standard Life.
- 52.3 **RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

53. BLACK ROCK REDEVELOPMENT – EXEMPT CATEGORY 3.

- 53.1 The Sub-Committee noted that the special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 19, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B(4) of the 1972 Local Government Act as amended (items not to be considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were as a result of Brighton Arena Limited's (BAL) ongoing negotiations and discussions with prospective lead investors and the Council, which had not been concluded at the time of the despatch of the agenda.
- 53.2 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment, which set out and reviewed the progress to date in relation to activities undertaken by Brighton International Arena (BIA), a revised programme for taking the project forward and future funding arrangements.
- 53.3 **RESOLVED** – That the recommendations contained in the report be agreed.

54. PART 2 ITEMS

- 54.1 The committee considered whether or not items 51 - 53 should remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.
- 54.2 **RESOLVED** – That items 51 – 53 contained in Part 2 of the agenda and decisions thereon remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 6.05p.m

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2008

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBERS MEETING

Agenda Item 8
Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Petitions
Date of Meeting:	10 June 2008
REPORT OF:	Director of Strategy & Governance
Contact Officer:	Name: Caroline De Marco Tel: 29-1063
	E-mail: caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision:	No
Wards Affected:	All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

To receive the following petition presented at Council on the 13 March 2008 and any petitions presented directly to the Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects Cabinet Members Meeting.

To receive the following petition presented at Council on the 13 March 2008 by Councillor Older and signed by 551 people:

The Connaught Centre has been a centre of excellence in teaching for adults and as a vital community resource for the past 30 years. City College Brighton and Hove's plans for the future of the centre and adult education are unclear in their redevelopment proposals.

We the undersigned believe that the loss of the facility would be detrimental to both the community and learners in the west of the city and that City College will be failing in its remit to provide city wide learning by concentrating all of its facilities in the east and centre of Brighton and ignoring the needs of Hove. We request a positive response on the future of the Connaught.

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 14

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	<i>Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Proposals – Update and Terms of Reference for Member Steering Group</i>		
Date of Meeting:	10 June 2008		
Report of:	<i>Acting Director Cultural Services</i>		
Contact Officer:	Name: Sean Hambrook	Tel: 29-0362	
	E-mail: sean.hambrook@brighton-hove.gov.uk		
Key Decision:	Yes	Forward Plan No. 7 Digit Ref: EEN0001	
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the Shoreham Harbour regeneration proposals and to present the terms of reference for a proposed Member Steering Group established to oversee the development of a joint Area Action Plan.
- 1.2 The Terms of reference (included at Appendix 1) detail the role for elected Members in the process.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 The Cabinet Member is asked to note the progress of the project and agree that the Council appoints appropriate representatives to sit on the Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group as detailed in paragraph 3.11. Draft Terms of Reference for this Member Steering Group are provided at Appendix 1

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The background to regeneration plans for Shoreham Harbour was detailed in a report to the Policy and Resources Committee 27th September 2007. Despite the major complexities and challenges involved, the Council has supported the aims to regenerate Shoreham Harbour to provide new jobs, homes, community facilities and infrastructure. The commitment to secure regeneration will be reflected in the policy on Shoreham Harbour in the South East Plan when approved.

3.2 The proposed new Planning Regulations on the preparation of Local Development Frameworks will allow for Government agencies to prepare planning guidance where this would provide economies in production and avoid duplication (e.g. where the information in the guidance would apply to areas greater than single districts). It would therefore be appropriate for the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) to progress the interim planning guidance for Shoreham Harbour taking account of any work already undertaken on this by the Council, undertaking a sustainability appraisal and also further consultation. The Council will need to endorse the final guidance document for it to be afforded weight in decision making.

3.3 SEEDA is working on developing a new and expanded mixed use regeneration vision for Shoreham Harbour and surrounding areas. The current project presents a very different development proposition than that conceived in the 1990s through the Shoreham Maritime Vision. SEEDA will be able to provide funding and other resources to progress the project matched by funding from English Partnerships. SEEDA has also submitted a bid to the Government for Shoreham Harbour to be designated a Growth Point which will help to lever significant funding for new infrastructure. It is useful to outline the main features of the new vision for the Harbour, as reported to Members last year:

- The current project for the Harbour is very different from the original Shoreham Maritime Project for a number of reasons. A broader geographical area is being considered that encompasses the existing adjacent residential and business communities of Shoreham town centre, Southwick, Fishersgate and Portslade. The level of development is larger enabling consideration of an urban extension and providing a greater mix of uses. The density of development is higher and sustainability is a core consideration.
- The emerging project represents a step change that could create a large scale, sustainable urban extension – with a balanced community that has the capacity to deliver the following key outputs and outcomes:
- A major urban development, following the latest standards for sustainable development set out by the Government and incorporating best practice drawn from across the world.
- Up to 7,750 Full Time Equivalent new and higher quality jobs.
- Up to 10,000 new homes (6,000 within the Harbour area) including a mixture of tenure and housing types.
- New retail and leisure facilities and a high quality network of public open space including a significantly improved public beach and other supporting community facilities.
- A package of high quality public transport improvements including contributions to the proposed Rapid Transit System (RTS) link with Brighton & Hove and upgrades to the existing railway stations.

- Improvements to the north/south road links from the new urban extension to the wider main road network to relieve traffic congestion from existing thoroughfares around the area.
- An agreed policy framework in order to guide the successful delivery of the project.
- SEEDA's Board endorsed the project in the Autumn of 2007.

3.4 The principal means of progressing the regeneration of the harbour is through a joint Area Action Plan with Adur District Council and with West Sussex County Council. The joint Area Action Plan will put forward a number of development options (based on robust evidence) for the Harbour for extensive consultation with the local community, partners and key stakeholders at each stage of its production. As a development plan document, this Area Action Plan will be subject to a public examination following its submission to the Secretary of State.

Growth Point Status

3.5 On 31 October 2007 SEEDA submitted to the Dept for Communities and Local Government (CLG) an expression of interest for Shoreham Harbour to become a Growth Point. A Growth Point is defined by CLG as an area which can help to deliver new homes to meet growing demand. Such homes are to be well designed and green, linked to good schools, transport and health care. Growth Points must offer significant strategic growth, additional to that in previous plans. Funding support for this growth will be made available by the Government and it has promised that it will work with local partners to ensure that infrastructure and services keep pace with the new homes. Government resources will be targeted for providing the necessary infrastructure. There are currently 29 Growth Points designated across the country (but none on the Sussex coast) and the Government has invited bids for additional areas. In making the bid (the outcome of which will be made known in late Spring this year), SEEDA has stated that the regeneration of the harbour will create a large scale sustainable urban extension with a balanced community.

3.6 Members should note that a Growth Point award does not necessarily mean that the levels of development proposed by SEEDA are viable and can be achieved at Shoreham Harbour. These are to be fully tested through the Area Action Plan process.

3.7 A Stakeholder Steering Group and some specialist sub groups (looking at flood, transport, employment and communication issues) have been set up to help produce the joint Area Action Plan. Consultants have been appointed by SEEDA to undertake initial technical work for the Area Action Plan.

- 3.8 Draft terms of reference for a Member Steering Group have been devised (see Appendix 1) which set out the objectives, membership and responsibilities of the group. The group is to have an overview function to ensure that a deliverable Area Action Plan is produced, and to oversee the activity of the Stakeholder Steering Group.
- 3.9 Membership of the Stakeholder Steering Group includes senior officers from GOSE, SEEDA, English Partnerships, West Sussex County Council, Brighton and Hove City Council and Adur District Council, Shoreham Port Authority, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency and Sussex Enterprise (as observer).
- 3.10 The following actions are to be progressed and addressed by the Area Action Plan:
- Develop the rationale/strategic case for the project
 - Secure a policy framework for housing numbers and tenures; economic development, community and social development, transportation and environmental sustainability
 - Co-ordinate a development framework for the area
 - Co-ordinate the feasibility and design of all strategic infrastructure, flood defences, reclamation and remediation works
 - Co-ordinate an economic development strategy
 - Co-ordinate the identification of mainstream and other public funding sources
 - Develop/agree a workable and viable scheme
 - Ensure that a comprehensive public consultation strategy is undertaken
 - Consider proposals for delivery mechanisms/partnership structures
 - Risk analysis and contingencies
 - Identify a comprehensive work programme to achieve the above.
- 3.11 The proposed representation on the Members Steering Group is three City Council Members, namely: the Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment and Major Projects, one Labour ward Councillor (Les Hamilton) and one Conservative ward Councillor (Steve Harmer-Strange).

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Consultation processes will be developed and implemented as this project progresses and throughout the development of the joint Area Action Plan.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications related to this report. Other than member and officer involvement there are no other financial commitments relating to the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration at this stage.

Accountant consulted: Anne Silley 22 May 2008

Legal Implications:

There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report. Specific implications relating to future actions will be dealt with in subsequent reports.

Lawyer consulted: Bob Bruce 22 May 2008

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 Equalities Impact Assessments will be carried out throughout the development of the joint Area Action Plan.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 A key priority for this project is that the development proposed shall be sustainable and wherever possible, housing and commercial buildings shall be zero carbon. This will be a key aspiration for all aspects of the project including transport, buildings and infrastructure. The project will also address key considerations arising from the impact of climate change including the potential risks from flooding and the opportunities arising for sustainable energy generation.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 Crime and Disorder implications will be considered throughout the development of the joint Area Action Plan.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 These are included in the main body of the report above, and will be fully considered in the development of the joint Area Action Plan.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 Any Corporate / Citywide implications will be reported back to the appropriate forum as the joint Area Action Plan is developed.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 The current proposals will deliver the governance structure required to drive the project forward for its current development phase. However this structure will be kept under review and alternative arrangements may well be necessary in future. Reports detailing any required and proposed changes will be brought back to the appropriate forum for decision.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The establishment of a Member Steering Group for this project is necessary to ensure that there is involvement in and oversight of the development of the project by democratically elected Members.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group DRAFT Terms of Reference

Documents In Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None

Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group DRAFT Terms of Reference

1 Remit

- 1.1 The Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group will work with officers of the three authorities, SEEDA, English Partnerships, the Port Authority, the other statutory agencies, and the project's consultant teams to consider proposals for the regeneration of Shoreham Harbour and provide feedback to the project partners.
- 1.2 The Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group is an advisory and consultative body and will not make any executive or planning decisions. The group may comment on emerging proposals but will not be a formal consultee. Decisions relating to planning policy and planning applications will remain the responsibility of the three authorities.

2 Membership

- 2.1 West Sussex County Council – 3 members
- 2.2 Adur District Council – 3 members
- 2.3 Brighton & Hove City Council – 3 members
- 2.4 Nominations to be confirmed by each authority on an annual basis.

3 Chairmanship

- 3.1 The group shall elect a Chair on an annual basis. The Chair will rotate around the three authorities on an annual basis.

4 Meetings

- 4.1 No less than four times a year, with meetings to be held in closed session.
- 4.2 The group will hold a wider member meeting, to which all Members of all authorities shall be invited, no less than once every six months.

5 Roles & Activities

- 5.1 Receive and consider reports/presentations on the full range of project issues, providing feedback and soundings to the project partners on emerging

proposals and policies.

- 5.2 Take an overview of, and comment on, the work of the Area Action Plan Steering Group and the production of the Area Action Plan without prejudice to the formal consideration of this Plan by the Planning Authorities.
- 5.3 Take an overview of, and comment on, the work of the various sub-groups of the Area Action Plan Steering Group; these include planning policy, transportation, communications, and economic development.
- 5.4 Contribute to proposals for stakeholder and community consultation, communications activities, and press releases relating to the project.
- 5.6 Channel and communicate the views of Members, including issues raised through the authority's scrutiny committees.
- 5.7 Communicate to and advise the three respective Councils on progress and issues through Cabinet, Council, Planning Committee, and other appropriate channels.
- 5.8 Publish minutes of meetings for public information.

6 Support to the group

- 6.1 The group will be supported by the Area Action Plan Steering Group, an officer group that brings together all the key project partners.
- 6.2 A nominated officer from the Area Action Plan Steering Group will provide administrative support to produce agendas and minutes, and facilitate venue hire for meetings and events.
- 6.3 The Area Action Plan Steering Group will produce reports, summaries, and presentations for the Member Steering Group.
- 6.4 Feedback from the Member Steering Group will be a standing agenda item at Area Action Plan Steering Group meetings.
- 6.5 Each authority shall nominate a lead officer to act as a first point of contact for Members in relation to Shoreham Harbour and Member Steering Group issues.

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 15

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Appointment of Project Boards		
Date of Meeting:	10 June 2008		
Report of:	Acting Director of Cultural Services		
Contact Officer:	Name:	David Fleming	Tel: 29-2700
	E-mail:	david.fleming@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	Yes	Forward Plan No. EEM0002	
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Under the Terms of Reference for the Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects, the previous remit of the Major Projects Sub-Committee in respect of Major Projects now form part of the delegated functions of the Cabinet Member. One of those functions is “to review major projects and any Project Boards having regard to capacity to deliver, corporate priorities and resources and advise the Leader or the Cabinet as appropriate”.
- 1.2 This report reviews the role performed by Project Boards and the part they play in the delivery and decision making process of major projects. It seeks agreement to the retention and continuation of a number of existing Project Boards, requests nominations from the main political groups for their representatives to join these Boards and sets out the criteria by which Project Boards are considered appropriate and may be established.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (1) To note the role performed by Project Boards and the part they play in the delivery and decision making process of major projects.
- (2) To approve retention of the Project Boards for the Brighton Centre, City College (including Wilson Avenue), the Open Market, Preston Barracks and The Keep and agree to the creation of new Project Boards in accordance with the criteria set out in paragraph 3.3 as appropriate.
- (3) To agree that each of the four main political groups be requested to nominate representatives to join the identified Project Boards.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 Following a review of the constitution in May 2007 the Major Projects Sub-Committee was established to oversee the progress of major projects undertaken by the Council and advise the Policy & Resources Committee. By taking a more co-ordinated approach to the management and delivery of major projects, the intention was to enable a more effective strategic overview across the full range of major projects and at the same time provide a mechanism for focussed and systematic Member input to ensure maximum efficiency and accountability. The review also considered each of the projects, their stage of development and the decision making structure in place at the time. This resulted in a number of changes, both to project structures and decision making arrangements, with recommendations agreed at the Sub-Committee's inaugural meeting on 10 July 2007. Among the main recommendations was the recognition that a Project Board can have an important role to play in the development and progression of major infrastructure projects, particularly in the early stages. A number of cross-party Project Boards were therefore established on a task and finish basis.

3.2 Definition of Major Projects

3.2.1 The Council has been involved and will continue to be involved in major commercial, regeneration and infrastructure projects across the city; projects that are key to the city's future success and prosperity. For the purposes of the Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects Cabinet Member Meeting, major projects fall into one of two categories.

- Those that involve the council either as a direct procurer or a facilitator of the provision of a major capital asset and / or regeneration of a site or area; or
- Those not directly involving the council as landowner but which are of strategic significance to the city, such as the regeneration of the Brighton Station site or the provision of major infrastructure works.

3.2.2 Such projects also:

- Have major public and private sector resource implications
- Have significant land use and spatial implications
- Require planning permission before implementation
- Have particular resource implications for some or all officers in city planning, project planning, transport planning and policy, sustainability, economic development, legal, property services and strategic finance.

3.2.3 There are currently 14 major projects considered to fit into the above categories.

Table 1 - Project Name (alphabetical)	
Black Rock (Brighton Int'l Arena)	King Alfred
Brighton Centre	London Road
Circus Street	Marina inner (Explore Living)
City College (inc. Wilson Avenue)	Marina outer (Brunswick)
Community Stadium	Open Market
i360 / West Pier	Preston Barracks
Jubilee Street Redevelopment	'The Keep' New Records Office & Resource Centre

3.3 Criteria for establishing Project Boards

3.3.1 Many of the projects listed in Table 1 above have benefitted from the involvement of cross-party Project Boards. Project Boards continue to perform a valuable function, particularly in the early stages of a project's life. It is, however, recognised that their role becomes less important as the project advances and it was therefore agreed that Project Boards should continue until one or more of the following stages is reached:

- The point at which a Development Agreement is signed
- Issue of Planning Permission
- The Developer taking vacant possession just prior to a start on site.

3.3.2 Based on the above criteria it is proposed that five Project Boards should be retained. The projects being:

Table 2 – Existing Project Boards	
Project	Proposed Membership
Brighton Centre	1 Cons, 1 Labour, 1 Green, 1 Lib Dem
City College (inc. Wilson Avenue)	1 Cons, 1 Labour, 1 Green, 1 Lib Dem
Open Market	1 Cons, 1 Labour, 1 Green, 1 Lib Dem
Preston Barracks	1 Cons, 1 Labour, 1 Green, 1 Lib Dem
'The Keep'	Joint Board with ESCC BHCC represented by Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation & Tourism and Acting Director of Cultural Services

- 3.3.3 The Project Boards shown in Table 2 above have continued to operate throughout the past year and their involvement has again confirmed their value. It is therefore recommended that these Project Boards are retained under the new arrangements. With the introduction of the new constitution and decision making arrangements it is likely that each political party will want to review its representation on Project Boards. It is therefore recommended that each of the four main political groups be requested to nominate its representative on each of the retained Project Boards.
- 3.3.4 Whilst the criteria shown in 3.3.1 provide a helpful guide to when a Project Board is considered appropriate, it should be recognised that each project may require a slightly different approach and, in certain circumstances, it may be appropriate / beneficial to retain a Project Board, e.g. until planning permission is secured, or even possibly, until the Developer has served the Vacant Possession Notice.
- 3.3.5 In the case of the Open Market Project Board, this could be expanded in due course to take on a wider brief to include London Road proposals as they emerge. In addition to the above Project Boards, Members may find it helpful to have the occasional one off cross-party briefing on strategic sites where a number of individual projects may overlap. For example, at Falmer there is the Community Stadium, the retained land, the City College proposals and Falmer Academy.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 This report covers an internal procedural matter that simply seeks continuation of existing arrangements. No external consultation has been undertaken.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Project Boards are advisory only. Any recommendations on major projects will be the subject of further reports accompanied by a financial risk assessment.

Finance officer consulted: Anne Silley *Date:* 28/05/08

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. As with the previous constitutional arrangements Project Boards are advisory only and have no delegated powers.

Legal officer consulted: Bob Bruce *Date:* 28/05/08

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Sustainability Implications:

5.4 There are no direct sustainability implications arising from this report.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 There are no direct crime & disorder implications arising from this report.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6 The Major and Capital Projects Teams work with the Council's Risk Manager to identify all risks relating to the individual projects. These risk registers are presented to Officer Steering Groups and escalated to Project Boards as priorities require. The purpose of a continuous risk assessment is to meet the corporate requirements of protecting and securing the Council's assets and physical resources. It also helps project teams identify and manage changes which affect the City and operating environment and influences decision making, business planning, managing change and innovation. The key risks to major projects are the availability of funding, securing development partners and the viability of individual projects.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.7 Project Boards have proved an effective means of developing projects and their continued engagement will assist both in terms of co-ordination of Council input to the schemes themselves and in the achievement of the Council's priorities.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

6.1 Last year's review of project decision making structures involved consideration of the most effective arrangements to support project management and delivery, the results of which were reported to the Major Projects Sub-Committee in July 2007. It was through that review that criteria for the involvement of Project Boards were agreed and Boards retained where appropriate. The criteria remain valid under the new constitutional arrangements and Project Boards are still regarded as necessary.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The retention of Project Boards, where appropriate, is an effective means of providing cross-party engagement and support.

- 7.2 A number of projects are reliant on the full involvement of partners whose engagement is therefore reflected in membership of the relevant Project Board. With those Boards arriving at decision by consensus, this has provided an effective means of allowing key partners to have a voice in the decision making process. It is considered important that the new arrangements continue to accommodate this collaborative approach and maintain the close working relationships.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

None.

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Report to Major Projects Sub-Committee – 10 July 2007 – “Terms of Reference and Proposed Decision Making Structures”.
2. Report to Major Projects Sub-Committee -10 July 2007 – “Appointment of Project Boards”.

ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 16

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	<i>Sub-national review of economic development and regeneration</i>		
Date of Meeting:	<i>10 June 2008</i>		
Report of:	<i>Acting Director, Cultural Services</i>		
Contact Officer:	Name:	<i>Sean Hambrook</i>	Tel: 290362
	E-mail:	<i>sean.hambrook@brighton-hove.gov.uk</i>	
Key Decision:	No		
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 This report proposes a response to the consultation on the Sub-National Review of Economic Development and Regeneration, and seeks authority to negotiate a joint response with East and West Sussex County Councils.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (1) Approve the main points of the consultation response, as set out in section 7 of the report.
- (2) Authorise the Acting Director, Cultural Services, to discuss and if possible agree a similar joint response with East and West Sussex County Councils.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The Sub-National Review of Economic Development was published on 16th July 2007. Its main recommendations were that the Government should refocus powers and responsibilities below the national level to support its objectives to encourage economic growth and tackle deprivation at every level, by:
- empowering all local authorities to promote economic development and neighbourhood renewal, including a new statutory duty to assess local economic conditions;
 - supporting local authorities to work together at the sub-regional level, including working with interested sub-regions to explore the potential to

allow groups of local authorities to establish statutory sub-regional arrangements;

- strengthening and streamlining the regional level, introducing integrated strategies and giving the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) lead responsibility for regional planning;
- reforming central government's relations with regions and localities, with the aim of sharpening the focus of central government departments through clearer objectives and responsibilities.

3.2 The Government's proposals for implementation were published on 31st March 2008. It is this consultation the city council would be responding to. The main implementation proposals were:

- Legislation will be brought forward that will give Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) responsibility for regional planning. RDAs will lead the development of the new integrated regional strategies which will replace regional economic strategies and regional spatial strategies.
- RDAs will continue to be business-led and will be informed by a forum of local authority leaders, representing all local authorities in the region, who will agree the draft strategy.
- It is expected that RDAs will delegate funding, where appropriate, to those best placed to deliver economic improvements, including local authorities and sub-regional partnerships.
- Regional Assemblies will not continue in their current form and effective stakeholder engagement and management will be required of and led by RDAs.
- In the transitional period the current round of regional spatial strategies will be completed and regional assemblies and RDAs will be expected to work together to begin preparations for the regional strategy.
- A focused statutory economic assessment duty will be created for upper tier and unitary local authorities that will contribute to the analytical underpinning of key local and regional documents and improve the shared economic evidence base.
- Multi-Area Agreements (MAAs) will be introduced to enable authorities to improve economic prosperity by working across administrative boundaries.
- The Government will legislate to allow development of formal legal status for collaborative arrangements. The focus for these new sub-regional arrangements should be economic development. However the Government will consider a wider range of functions and will not be prescriptive about the functions or the functional economic areas that might be covered.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 Officers will be consulting with colleagues in East and West Sussex County Councils prior to submitting the council's formal response.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

There are no direct financial implications relating to the development of the consultation response.

Accountant consulted: Anne Silley 27 May 2008

5.2 *Legal Implications:*

It remains to be seen as to what form the legislation will take and there are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

Lawyer consulted: Bob Bruce 27 May 2008

5.3 *Equalities Implications:*

None in terms of the response but in future work the RDA will take account of any equality implications.

5.3 *Sustainability Implications:*

None in terms of the response but future work of the RDA, local authorities and other regional partners including the new regional strategies will need to be underpinned by the principles of sustainable development.

5.4 *Crime & Disorder Implications:*

None in terms of the response but in future work the RDA will take account of any crime & disorder implications.

5.5 *Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:*

Responding to the consultation gives the Council the opportunity to influence government policy in this area.

5.6 *Corporate / Citywide Implications:*

The recommendations of this report are that we seek agreement with East and West Sussex County Councils to submit a joint response to the consultation which will strengthen our response.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

No alternative options were considered as we are responding to a national consultation exercise.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1** Sustainable and appropriate economic development will form a key part of the Council's Local Area Agreement. The consultation on the Sub-National

Review gives an opportunity for the Council to influence government policy in this area.

- 7.2 The proposals for implementation of the sub-national review fall short, in the view of officers, in several ways. Most importantly, the local authority voice is weakened with the abolition of SEERA and arrangements proposed do not provide an adequate replacement.
- 7.3 There are many items in the proposals with which we can agree. In particular, the general devolutionary thrust of the paper is welcome, and gives the city a chance to exercise a greater degree of control over the funding it receives for economic development. It should also encourage closer working with neighbouring authorities, which is a sensible and logical approach.
- 7.4 Some important elements of economic development and planning remain at regional level, however, and it is in this area that the LGA and many local authorities have expressed strong concern. The abolition of SEERA removes a strong local authority voice in regional planning, and leaves SEEDA as the principal regional player on both planning and economic development.
- 7.5 Given the central importance of planning and economic development to local authority work, it is disappointing that the government's proposals do not give local authorities more leverage over SEEDA. The local authority forum that government propose is a consultative body with no veto power, and final authority will rest with the Secretary of State.
- 7.6 Officers would support a response that backs the position of the LGA, and suggests that SEEDA become a central/local shared agency. This is also the proposal of Cllr Keith Mitchell, current Chairman of SEERA.
- 7.7 Officers anticipate that the government will not support the LGA's approach, so the proposed response also seeks to ensure that any local authority representation (whether a forum or some other mechanism) is properly representative of the economic profile of the local government community in the region.
- 7.8 The proposed consultation response would therefore:
- support those elements of the implementation proposals that are devolutionary
 - disagree with the proposal that RDAs should remain business/government-led quangos
 - propose instead that RDAs should become central/local shared bodies, with 50:50 representation of central and local interests on the board

- say that any form of local government representation should be properly representative of the economic and planning interests of local government in the region, rather than on a strictly numerical basis.

7.9 From informal conversations, officers understand that East and West Sussex County Councils broadly share our position. To strengthen our consultation response, officers would like to seek agreement from both authorities to submit a joint response along the lines proposed above. If officers are unable to secure agreement, an individual response from the City Council will be issued.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

None

Documents In Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Review of sub-national economic development and regeneration
2. Prosperous Places: Taking forward the Review of Sub National Economic Development and Regeneration

