

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

MAJOR PROJECTS SUB-COMMITTEE

4.00pm 4 FEBRUARY 2008

HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Smith (Deputy Chairman, in the Chair); Councillors Hawkes (OS), Kitcat, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, Older, Oxley, Rufus and Young.

PART ONE

ACTION

32. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

(A) Declarations of Substitutes

- 32.1 Councillor Older declared that she was substituting for Councillor Peltzer Dunn.

(B) Declarations of Interest

- 32.2 Councillor Hawkes declared a personal but non prejudicial interest in Item No. 35 on the agenda, as she was a Member of the City College Board of Governors.
- 32.3 Councillor Rufus declared a personal but non prejudicial interest in Item 37 on the agenda, in that he was a member of the Sussex Area Committee for the Co-op.
- 32.4 Councillor Mears declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item No. 38 on the agenda; as she had a business interest in respect of the Open Market and would therefore not take part in the discussion or any decision in relation to the Open Market should the matter arise.

(C) Exclusion of Press and Public

- 32.5 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).

- 32.6 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting during consideration of the items listed on the agenda.

33. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 6 NOVEMBER 2007

- 33.1 **RESOLVED** – That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 6 November 2007 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the proceedings.

34. Public Questions

- 34.1 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.

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

"In light of pending Scrutiny into the increasingly controversial process by which the King Alfred development went through Planning procedures, could you please tell us whether any such development will be put on hold until that panel has reached its conclusions? "

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

"Thank you for the question. As far as I am aware there are no proposals for the planning committee's decision relating to King Alfred to be the subject of scrutiny. In any event the Development Agreement has a tightly constrained timetable and in the absence of a third party challenge there is no scope for the council to unilaterally delay the proposed development."

- 34.4 Mr. Furness then asked the following supplementary question:

"In light of this can Councillor Smith please tell me if he welcomes the development going ahead?"

- 34.5 The Chairman stated that he welcomed the sporting complex but on a personal level felt that it was an over-development of

the site.

35. CITY COLLEGE BRIGHTON AND HOVE FOUR SITE STRATEGY.

35.1 The Chairman welcomed the representatives from City College to the meeting and invited Mr. Fryer to give his presentation.

35.2 Mr. Fryer thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to attend the meeting and to outline City College's proposals for the four sites (see minute book for copy of the presentation). Mr. Fryer stated that the college intended to take a different approach in offering education to 14-19 year-olds and he believed there was a tremendous opportunity for the council and the college to work together to provide excellent educational provision in the city. The project amounted to an investment of around £100m with the Learning and Skills Council having agreed to provide £80m towards that cost. City College would invest the remaining £20m but would need to work with the council to achieve the development aspirations on the four sites.

35.3 The Chairman thanked Mr. Fryer for his presentation and opened the debate for questions.

35.4 Members of the sub-committee welcomed the proposals and asked for information in respect of:

- The projected breakdown of students at each site;
- Consultation with students;
- Links with local educational schemes;
- Access facilities;
- The formation of the Development Brief;
- The proposed Academy and City College's aspirations;
- The disposal of buildings; and
- The consultation process.

35.5 Mr. Fryer stated that the expectation was to have 45% of students in the city centre, 25% at Falmer and 30% at Wilson Avenue and Hove. He confirmed that students had been and would continue to be consulted on the proposals and their views taken into account. He was well aware of local schemes that were operating successfully and envisaged building close links with such schemes so as to widen the opportunities for students. In respect of the Connaught Centre in Hove, again he was aware of concerns over access and gave his assurance that access issues would be included in all four developments. With regard to the Development Brief, he noted that the four sites would be at

- different stages and would go forward at a different pace and there would be a need to work with officers to address matters as they arose. The disposal of buildings was necessary to help fund the development and full consultation on the proposals for each site would be undertaken.
- 35.6 The Sub-Committee then considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services, which outlined the latest aspirations from City College in respect of its capital strategy and four site development (for copy see minute book).
- 35.7 Councillor Kitcat asked for clarification with regard to the agreement in principle given by the Environment Committee to the demolition of buildings as part of the four site strategy.
- 35.8 The Planning Projects Manager stated that the Environment Committee had considered issues in relation to the demolition and retention of buildings and stated that he would provide a briefing paper for Councillor Kitcat.
- 35.9 Councillor Mitchell asked for clarification in respect of recommendation 2.2 and the approval of the budget.
- 35.10 The Acting Director of Cultural Services stated that funding had been identified within the SIF to enable a feasibility study to be undertaken for the Wilson Avenue site, bearing in mind City College's new proposals for that site. The funding would be allocated for the feasibility study should the sub-committee recommend that and this would then be subject to the approval of the SIF budget allocation by the Policy & Resources Committee.
- 35.11 Councillor Rufus queried whether any consideration had been given to the potential change in use of the Wilson Avenue site and possible need for a change in planning use from D1 to C3.
- 35.12 The Planning Projects Manager stated that this was something that would be discussed with the developer in due course and was dependant on the outcome of the feasibility study and the need to take account of the Local Planning Policy.
- 35.13 **RESOLVED –**
- (1) That the presentation from City College introducing their aspirations for a four site strategy, as outlined in the College's Project Brief at Appendix 1 to the report be noted;

- (2) That the proposed funding to support the city council's work in partnership with City College to undertake a feasibility study into the options for the future use of the Wilson Avenue site be recommended, subject to the Major Projects/Capital Projects SIF funding allocation being approved by Policy & Resources Committee for 2008/2009; and
- (3) That the contents of the Development Brief, as detailed in Appendix 2 to the report on the redevelopment of the college's Pelham Street campus, as presented to Environment Committee for approval in principle at its meeting on 24th January 2008 be noted.

36. BRIGHTON MARINA MASTERPLAN - PLANNING ADVISORY NOTE.

- 36.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment, which provided an update on the latest progress on the production of a draft Brighton Marina Masterplan Planning Advisory Note (PAN), (for copy see minute book).
- 36.2 The Planning Projects Manager introduced the report and stated that the PAN aimed to co-ordinate future development thorough the production of a masterplan to guide the comprehensive regeneration of the Marina. The document would act as a supplement to the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Marina and in the long term form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 36.3 Members of the Sub-Committee expressed their concern over the PAN and the need to ensure ward councillors were informed of the proposals. Members indicated that they would submit their views as part of the consultation process.
- 36.4 **RESOLVED** – That the progress report and the emerging draft Planning Advisory Note (Appendix 1 to the report circulated separately) be noted.

37. ST JAMES INVESTMENTS, NEW ENGLAND STREET AND LONDON ROAD.

- 37.1 The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Cultural Services, concerning the work being carried out by St. James Investments in preparing a comprehensive mixed-use regeneration proposal for an area of their land holdings within the New England Street and London Road area (for copy see minute book).

37.2 The Head of Strategic Projects introduced the report and stated that the developer was seeking views at an early stage and would be undertaking a consultation exercise in due course.

37.3 Councillor Rufus welcomed the report and the proposed development of the area, however he felt that there was a need give consideration to how matters were taken forward and therefore moved the following amendment so that recommendation 2.3 would read as follows:

"That officers be requested to organise a briefing relative to the various proposals affecting London Road and its immediate surroundings to which various parties involved in land holdings (St. James Investments, Co-op) and associated projects (Open Market and City College) be invited to present their proposals, and to use this presentation to launch the development of an officer and Member lead masterplan for the area."

37.4 Councillor Kitcat formerly seconded the amendment.

37.5 Councillor Mitchell referred to page 75 of the report and suggested that the proposed consultation exercise met the requirements of the amendment and therefore queried the need for such an amendment.

37.6 Councillor Oxley welcomed the report and suggested that recognition of the need for consultation was evident in the report and therefore the aims of the amendment were already met. He did not see the need to amend the report.

37.7 The Planning Projects Manager stated that the scheme arose out of the LR2 study and that the council was in an excellent position to be able to make the most out of what the developer could deliver.

37.8 The Chairman noted the comments and put the proposed amendment to the vote which was lost. He therefore moved the recommendations contained in the report.

37.9 **RESOLVED –**

(1) That the project's progress detailed in section 4 of the report be noted;

(2) That the interest being shown in extending the area to include the council owned premises at New England House

be noted; and

- (3) That St James Investments be invited to deliver a presentation on their regeneration proposals to Members of the Committee, Ward Councillors and Lead Officers together with a question and answer session.

38. UPDATE ON OTHER MAJOR PROJECTS.

- 38.1 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).
- 38.2 Councillor Morgan noted that the proposed move to a Leader and Cabinet system was likely to come into effect in May, and queried whether Project Boards would continue and how Members would be involved in overseeing projects with the dissolution of the sub-committee itself.
- 38.3 The Acting Director of Cultural Services stated that he could not answer the question at this point in time but would endeavour to get some clarity in this respect and report back in due course.
- 38.4 **RESOLVED** – That the updates given in the table at section 4 of the report be noted.

39. ITEMS TO GO FORWARD TO COUNCIL

- 39.1 The sub-committee considered whether any items should be submitted to the 13th March Council meeting for information in accordance with Procedure Rule 20.3a.
- 39.2 **RESOLVED** –
- That no items be referred to council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.25pm.

Signed

Chairman

Dated this

day of

2008