

# GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD

10.00am 19 APRIL 2016

CONFERENCE SUITE, TRIANGLE LEISURE CENTRE, BURGESS HILL

## MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor Parkin (Chair), Councillor Humphreys, Councillor Morgan and G Theobald and Councillor Wall

**Business Partners:** Trevor Beattie, Prof. Michael Davies, Peter Davies, Prof. Humphris, Nick Juba, John A. Peel, Andrew Swayne

### PART ONE

#### **30 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

##### **30a Declarations of Substitutes**

30.1 There were none.

##### **30b Declarations of Interests**

30.2 There were none.

##### **30c Exclusion of press and public**

30.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Board considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

30.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the items contained in Part Two of the agenda.

#### **31 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

31.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26 January 2016 be approved and signed as the correct record.

#### **32 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

32.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*"I would like to record our thanks to Jenny Rowlands for her input and contribution to the Board and we wish her well for the future.*

*In terms of the proceedings of today's meeting, I would like to note that the presentations from Nick Juba at Item 35 and 36 will be taken together as a single presentation as they are inextricably linked and are therefore best described together"*

### **33 UPDATE ON GREATER BRIGHTON INVESTMENT PROGRAMME**

33.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that provided a progress update on the Greater Brighton Investment Programme for the period 17 December 2015 to 17 March 2016. Furthermore, the report requested approval of the submission of two additional City Region projects- Eastside North, Newhaven and South Site, Brighton Marina.

33.2 Max Woodford provided a verbal update to the Board on the proposal for Eastside North, Newhaven. The project sought £2.8m of LGF funding to match against £12.2m of private investment. The proposal was for the development of a major logistics and distribution centre and would create substantial employment and training opportunities in the newly designated Enterprise Zone.

33.3 Nick Hibberd provided a verbal update to the Board on the proposal for South Site, Brighton Marina. The project would be a mixed-use redevelopment that would include a minimum of 1,000 residential units, replacement leisure facilities, a podium structure with car parking underneath to replace the existing multi-storey car park and public realm improvements. The contribution would be to facilitate approximately £300m of private investment.

33.4 Councillor Theobald asked if there would be improvements in access to Brighton Marina as part of the project.

33.5 Nick Hibberd stated that improvement to access was a key consideration and was also part of the new conference centre proposals. Discussions were planned with the various parties concerned on improvements between Black Rock and Madeira Drive.

33.6 With regard to the Digital Catapult Centre, John A. Peel stated that of the three proposed in the country, this was widely considered the best. The LEP were not currently minded to release capital funding due to ongoing issues with the accountable body but due diligence was almost complete. It was hoped the project could be underway imminently.

33.7 Councillor Wall stated that he welcomed the update that represented achievements and challenges for partners. Councillor Wall noted the Call for Growth Projects and expressed caution to manage expectations as there was not a limitless amount of funds available. Councillor Wall added that not all twelve projects were likely to be approved and robust businesses cases were required. With regard to the submissions relating to the Burgess Hill area, these were 'shovel ready' and the business cases mature and robust.

- 33.8 John A. Peel stated that Councillor Wall was correct that this round of funding would be very tough and competitive. The better prepared the Greater Brighton Region could be, the better the case it could make to central government to grant funding.
- 33.9 Caroline Wood noted that an economic impact assessment model was being put into place that would mean the Board could look at data in a clear and consistent way. The model would be established too late for this round of funding but would be available and be a benefit going forward.
- 33.10 Phillip Carr elaborated that there was a set amount of funding available and there was no certainty that every LEP would be successful. The Secretary of State was keen to have 'challenge sessions' focussed on deliverability of schemes and projects that shared central governments emphasis on housing, jobs, employment floor space and transport infrastructure.
- 33.11 Prof. Davies asked if there was an estimated timescale to that process.
- 33.12 Phillip Carr stated that there would be 39 challenge sessions that he expected to be scheduled before the parliamentary summer recess.

33.13 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Board note the report.
- 2) That the Board endorse the submission of two additional City Region projects – Eastside North, Newhaven and South Site, Brighton Marina – for this round of C2C Growth Deal funding. Further details are outlined in section 3.41 – 3.44 of this report.

**34 UPDATE ON GREATER BRIGHTON DEVOLUTION BID**

- 34.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that provided an update on progress with the Greater Brighton Devolution Deal since the previous meeting held on 26 January 2016.
- 34.2 The Chair congratulated officers for the significant amount of work undertaken on the matter in a limited timeframe.
- 34.3 Nick Juba asked when a clearer picture of timescales may be known.
- 34.4 Nick Hibberd stated that the emphasis to meet for further discussion was on the Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board and that would be done following further discussion with Board partners.
- 34.5 Phillip Carr stated that he was in regular communication with Nick Hibberd and the wider Officer Programme Board regarding the devolution bid process. Those meetings and discussions would narrow the focus on what the requests of any devolution deal would be and also provide clarity on the offer that may arise from central government. A devolution deal would be drafted in the near future and the focus would then be on ensuring that all parties were satisfied with the content and proposals.

- 34.6 Andrew Swayne noted paragraph 3.6 detailed an announcement of a further £3.8 million Local Growth Funding split into £1.8 million of Growth Deals with LEP's and £2 billion allocated through the Home Building Fund. Andrew Swayne asked for further detail on that and if that would mean that several schemes would have separate funding streams.
- 34.7 Paul Castle clarified that a different process would apply to the £2 billion allocation that would be allocated through the Homes & Communities Agency and paid to developers. The role of the LEP was currently being explored in that process.
- 34.8 John A. Peel noted that the document explored the idea for a regional transport board and asked if there was any indication what sub-region that would cover.
- 34.9 Nick Hibberd stated that discussions were continuing on the most logical and beneficial geography and work was underway with the 3SC's to influence that debate.
- 34.10 John A. Peel stated that in his view, the involvement of Croydon area and 'Gatwick triangle' would help the proposal enormously.
- 34.11 Councillor Theobald noted the Chancellor of the Exchequer had recently assigned £100,000 to explore options for Brighton Mainline 2 (BML2). Councillor Theobald noted that visitor numbers to the city had increased and were continuing in that upward trend and represented a very challenging situation that needed resolution.
- 34.12 Geoff Raw stated that the need for BML2 was clear and Jonathan Sharrock would play an important role in supporting conversations with Network Rail on the matter.
- 34.13 John A. Peel stated his agreement with that observation and he was aware that Jonathan Sharrock saw BML2 as a key issue for the LEP.
- 34.14 Andrew Swayne stated that BML2 was part of a wider discussion on the GBEB and 3SC bids relating to how there would be a joined up approach from the two in working together on key strategies and not duplicating the work of respective officers.
- 34.15 Councillor Wall stated that whilst he was assured in reading the report update, it was clear that there was still a lot of work to do and the Board would need to consider the fuller detail and when that was complete. Councillor Wall stated that the four local authority Board Members were considering 12 projects and that demonstrated the scale of ambition across the region. Councillor Wall noted that the Board needed to be very cautious amongst that ambition as there was potential for overlap and duplication in officer time and use of public money. Preventing that required ensuring that the GBEB and 3SC's were sharing information as much as possible and planning together.
- 34.16 Councillor Morgan stated that he welcomed the comments made by Councillor Wall and it was essential to avoid any duplication. Councillor Morgan added key aspect of the partnership would be increased transparency from the 3SC's.

- 34.17 Nick Hibberd noted that there was a Memorandum of Understanding between the GBEB and 3SC's that demonstrated shared understanding. In terms of partnership working, there were regular catch-ups between the respective officers that included weekly meetings and a number of joint meetings on issues such as transport. Complications were sometimes caused by the two groups working at a different pace and existing efforts would be re-doubled to limit duplication in work.
- 34.18 Councillor Wall stated that there were synergies between the work of the GBEB and 3SC's but also separate pursuits as the scale of the 3SC's was completely different. Councillor Wall added that whilst the GBEB was good at delivering schemes, the 3SC's had potential to a bigger level that was a clear reason to work better together and in a more cohesive fashion to avoid duplication. Councillor Wall moved the following motion to add a recommendation as shown in bold italics as follows:
- The Board requests that as the devolution work progresses every effort is made to further reduce the amount of duplication and overlap with the 3SC proposals in order to ensure best use of resources for the tax payer and that the results of this work is referenced in future reports.***
- 34.19 Andrew Swayne stated that he agreed with the comments made regarding duplication but cautioned that the 3SC's was a wide-ranging and complex partnership and it the flexibility and agility of the GBEB could not be compromised.
- 34.20 Councillor Theobald asked if a similar request to that in the motion tabled would be made of the 3SC's.
- 34.21 Councillor Wall stated that the date of their next meeting had not yet be confirmed but he would raise with his colleagues on the 3SC's at the meeting.
- 34.22 The Chair stated that he could write to the Chair of the 3SC's and ask them to consider the same resolution.
- 34.23 Councillor Humphreys stated that he supported the issue of effectiveness and delivery and believed that both the GBEB and 3SC's should agree the resolution. Councillor Humphreys added that there would be a need for an indicator of that efficiency.
- 34.24 Councillor Wall felt that the demonstration of efficiency would be clear in the reports submitted to the GBEB.
- 34.25 Prof. Davies queried the need for a further resolution as he understood that the terms of co-operative working were enshrined on the MoU between the GBEB and 3SC's.
- 34.26 Councillor Wall stated that he did not feel the issue was as simple and a line in the sand was needed as the GBEB and 3SC's progressed as entities. Councillor Wall added that such as resolution would also demonstrate political buy-in.

34.27 Kathryn Hall stated that some of the proposals of the report such as a Transport Body and BML2 had not been discussed with partners on the 3SC's and the resolution would be a tightening up of issues and procedures.

34.28 Councillor Theobald stated that whilst he supported the motion, it should certainly be agreed by both the GBEB and 3SC's.

34.29 Trevor Beattie stated that he agreed with the observation made in the motion but there needed to be flexibility between the GBEB and 3SC's as both sides would move at a different pace.

34.30 Councillor Smith seconded the motion.

34.31 The Chair put the motion to the vote which passed.

34.32 The Chair put the recommendation as amended to the vote which were agreed.

34.33 **RESOLVED-** That the Greater Brighton Economic Board:

- 1) Note the overall progress of the Greater Brighton Devolution Proposals since the 14 January 2016 Ministerial challenge session and the updates from the five work stream.
- 2) Note the draft proposals for:
  - The outline of the Strategic Transport Partnership which is subject to further discussion with 3SC
  - The Brighton Mainline (BML) Task Force
  - The Greater Brighton City Region (GBCR) Digital Strategy
  - The approach to creating a new digital infrastructure
  - The drive to implement university led, innovation driven growth
- 3) Agree the approach and timetable for consideration of governance issues
- 4) Note the timetable for the next six months
- 5) Note that further resources will be needed to complete and implement the Devolution Deal – to be proposed for decision in the separate overall GBEB budget paper.
- 6) The Board requests that as the devolution work progresses every effort is made to further reduce the amount of duplication and overlap with the 3SC proposals in order to ensure best use of resources for the tax payer and that the results of this work is referenced in future reports.

## **35 UPDATE ON SUSSEX COAST AREA REVIEW**

35.1 The Board received a verbal on the Sussex Coast Area Review and an update on the redevelopment of City College, Brighton and Hove presented by Nick Juba.

- 35.2 Prof. Humphris enquired as to how there could be a much more joined up approach to skills training.
- 35.3 Nick Juba stated that the Youth Employment Trust could be important to this end and noted that Northbrook College already delivered 150 apprentices every year. Nick Juba added that all partners were welcome to ideas on how to progress the issue.
- 35.4 Councillor Wall stated that he was pleased to hear the ambition of Further Education providers. Councillor Wall noted the recent financial difficulties of Central Sussex College with the likely impact that there would be no provision in Mid Sussex. This would in all probability mean an increase in demand in Lewes and Brighton as students looked elsewhere for educational opportunities.
- 35.5 Nick Juba clarified that he was not yet involved in discussions on a possible course of action so was unable to provide any update.
- 35.6 Andrew Swayne stated that this was a collective concern and he hoped the Board could receive an update to a future meeting.
- 35.7 **RESOLVED-** That the presentation and verbal update be noted.

**36 PRESENTATION ON CITY COLLEGE BRIGHTON AND HOVE CITY CENTRE CAMPUS REDEVELOPMENT**

As detailed at Item 35.

**37 PRESENTATION ON BIO-INNOVATION CENTRE**

- 37.1 The Board received a presentation from Prof. Davies and Mike Herd on the development of the Sussex Bio-Innovation Centre, a state-of-the-art teaching and research facility based at the University of Sussex.
- 37.2 **RESOLVED-** That the presentation be noted.

**38 PRESENTATION ON STEM FEST AND BIG BANG**

- 38.1 Due to time constraints, the item was deferred to a future meeting.

**39 OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2016/17**

- 39.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that outlined the preparatory steps needed to support the operational aspects of the Greater Brighton Economic Board in 2016/17.
- 39.2 The Board extended their thanks to Councillor Parkin for his diligent leadership as Chair of the Board in the 2015/16 municipal year.
- 39.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Greater Brighton Economic Board:

- (1) Agree and secure the budgetary contributions sought to fund the cost of running the Board and its workplan in 2016/17;
- (2) Agree that Brighton & Hove City Council shall continue to act as Lead Authority for the Board in 2016/17;
- (3) Agree the process by which the Chair of the Board shall be nominated for 2016/17;
- (4) Note the date by which the Lead Authority must be notified of all named substitutes and instruct any necessary actions within their respective organisations;
- (5) Note the date by which the lead authority must be notified of all nominations to the Greater Brighton Call-In Panel and instruct any necessary actions within their respective organisations, and;
- (6) Note that the Annual Report will be drafted for presentation to the Board at its first meeting in the new municipal year.

**40 PART TWO MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 40.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Part Two minutes of the previous meeting held on 26 January 2016 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**41 PART TWO ITEMS**

- 41.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Part Two minute item remain exempt from disclosure from the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 12.20pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of