

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD

10.00am

29 JULY 2014

ROPETACKLE CENTRE

MINUTES

Present: Councillor J Kitcat (Chair), Councillor Blackman, Councillor Parkin, Councillor G Theobald, Councillor Turner, Councillor Wall

Business Partners: Chris Baker, Phil Belden, Prof. Michael Davies, Dean Orgill, Ian Parkes, Andrew Swayne, Lynn Thackway, Caroline Wood

8 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

8a Declarations of substitutes

8.1 Councillor Turner was present as substitute for Councillor Yallop, Caroline Wood was present as substitute for Iain Shepherd and Phil Belden was present as substitute for Trevor Beattie.

8b Declarations of interests

8.2 Councillor Turner declared a general interest in Item 14 as a governor at Northbrook College.

8c Exclusion of the press and public

8.3 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.

8.4 **RESOLVED** - That the public not be excluded from the meeting.

9 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND ANY ACTIONS

- 9.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 May 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record subject to the following corrections as shown below in bold italics:
- 4.8 The Chairman of the Adur & Worthing ***District*** Strategic Partnership stated that strategic investment in the A27 for all methods of transport was key to the future of Newhaven and it was important for that investment to be planned and delivered coherently.
- 6.2 The ***Director*** of the CWS Partnership noted that the visitor economy was not listed in the working arrangements.
- 9.2 The Head of City Regeneration Brighton & Hove City Council updated on the subject of operating principles of the Board following discussion at the last meeting. He explained that officers had looked at the issue again and it was proposed that the schedule for Apportionment of Losses between Board Members would be proportionate to the contribution of each member.

10 COAST TO CAPITAL GROWTH DEAL - IMPLICATIONS FOR GREATER BRIGHTON

- 10.1 The Board considered a report that provided an update on the outcome of the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Growth Deal and set out the projects that fell within the Greater Brighton City Region which would be funded by the Local Growth Fund (LGF) as well as initial proposals in governance and delivery arrangements. The finalised governance arrangements would be presented to the October meeting of the Board. A review of those projects that did not receive funding would also need to be conducted.
- 10.2 The Strategic Director of Coast to Capital LEP explained that whilst there was an element of flexibility, it was very important for the funding allocated in 2015/16 to be spent delivering the projects. He added that whilst the Coast to Capital Growth Deal included a £31.7m funding package for sustainable transport that would be delegated to local transport bodies, an element of that would be assigned to the Board for employment and housing initiatives.
- 10.3 The Chair expressed his congratulations on a result that meant the Greater Brighton area was amongst the top 10 LEP's in the country. The Chair stated that more work and co-operation was now required in focus on the delivery of the projects.
- 10.4 Councillor Wall stated that Mid-Sussex District Council would welcome any support the Board could provide.
- 10.5 Councillor Theobald congratulated the result of the work undertaken and stated that he was pleased that the focus was not exclusively on the larger cities. Councillor Theobald requested clarity on the location of flood and sea defence work in Shoreham and asked if bonds might be an option for those projects that were not successful.

- 10.6 The Head of City Regeneration Brighton & Hove City Council stated that there was a description of the flood and sea defence work in Shoreham in the report of the Greater Brighton Investment Programme adding that a portfolio for all the Greater Brighton projects could be collated and circulated to members.
- 10.7 The Chief Executive for Worthing Borough Council & Adur District Council asked for further clarification on 3.22 of the report regarding misunderstanding of EUSIF funding.
- 10.8 The Strategic Director, Coast to Capital LEP clarified that this referred to a reluctance encountered to cede delegation to local level and some misunderstanding on the issue from the LGA.
- 10.9 Councillor Blackman asked if funding could be brought forward if projects were ahead of schedule.
- 10.10 The Strategic Director, Coast to Capital LEP stated that it was unlikely funding could be brought forward if projects were ahead of schedule however, there may be some flexibility for projects that might be struggling- although there was no guarantee the LEP would agree to any request.
- 10.11 The Chair stated that Members should take the matter of EU funding up with the LGA for clarification and consensus.
- 10.12 Councillor Turner stated that his colleagues in the EU often stated their surprise to him that local authorities did not pursue funding more regularly.
- 10.13 The Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing Brighton & Hove City Council stated that EU funding was often subject to very strict audit and increased liability for the managing authority. There was a significant distinction in terms of reward for large and small projects and funding. The Executive Director suggested that officers could return with a report on the matter sometime in the future for clarification.
- 10.14 **RESOLVED-** That the Greater Brighton Economic Board-
- 1) Notes the success in securing Local Growth Funding for projects that fall within the Greater Brighton city region
 - 2) Endorses the approach taken regarding the planning for the delivery of LGF funded projects
 - 3) Requests that the Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board focus their work on urgently developing final business cases and delivery plans for all first year LGF funded projects that fell within the city region so that they are ready to start delivery from April 2015.
 - 4) Asks for a revised list of city region pipeline projects agreed with partners which will be developed into full business cases for future LGF funding rounds.

- 5) Notes that the resource requirements to ensure capacity to both deliver funded projects and secure further funding for the City Region from future rounds are outlined in a report that also appears on the agenda for the Board meeting.

11 GREATER BRIGHTON AND COASTAL WEST SUSSEX STRATEGIC STATEMENT - COMMISSIONING PROPOSAL

- 11.1 The Board considered a report that sought agreement to commission the development of a Greater Brighton and Coastal West Sussex Strategic Statement and a further three background papers that would be specific to the economic geography of the Greater Brighton region including city region economy, the city region housing market and the city region transport system.
- 11.2 Councillor Blackman asked if the universities could contribute and help with some of the work of the Board as a means of training and experience.
- 11.3 The University of Brighton Director of Economic & Social Engagement clarified that it was an issue that could be examined for the long term but he could give no assurances as there were many competing priorities.
- 11.4 The Chairman of the Adur & Worthing District Business Partnership stated that the Board had to move very quickly to deliver the outlined projects.
- 11.5 Councillor Parkin stated that he felt the biggest issue in the region was the need for housing and a clear transport strategy and felt the report was a good start on those issues.
- 11.6 Councillor Theobald noted that he had recently submitted a Notice of Motion in support of the A27 Action Campaign and agreed that the Board should make efforts to link up the work already being conducted by transport bodies.
- 11.7 The Chair stated that it was important for West Sussex to be involved with the work of the Board in some capacity as a transport authority.
- 11.8 The Director of the Economy Adur & Worthing District Council stated that he hoped the interim findings could be shared ahead of the timescale for sign off in order for the data and intelligence gathered to be used quickly.
- 11.9 The Director of the CWS Partnership stated they were engaged on similar work with county councils.
- 11.10 The Chief Executive of Worthing Borough Council & Adur District Council stated that it was important for the Board to hold that data together as it could eventually drive strategy effectively.
- 11.11 Councillor Wall stated that whilst Mid Sussex District Council was not a part of the previous Local Strategic Statement, he welcomed the opportunity to look at economic development and growth in the region. Councillor Wall added that he believed it was very important for all partners to be involved, particularly West Sussex County Council in some capacity.

11.12 The Chair recognised the importance of the document and that it should aim for collective value and not upset individual strategies.

11.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Greater Brighton Economic Board-

- 1) Agree the proposed scope of the Greater Brighton and Coastal West Sussex Strategic Statement and City Region background documents focusing upon city region economy, housing market, and transport system
- 2) Agree that the Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board should jointly commission the Strategic Statement as part of a joint commission with the Coast West Sussex & Greater Brighton Strategic Planning Board.

12 GREATER BRIGHTON BUSINESS SURVEY

12.1 The Board considered a report that presented the findings of the Greater Brighton Business Survey 2014 and presented recommendations arising from the survey.

12.2 The Chairman of the Adur & Worthing District Business Partnership stated that he felt there was some overlap with priorities 3, 4, 10.

12.3 In reference to recommendation 8, the Chairman of the Brighton & Hove Business Partnership asked if the role was as exemplar employer or facilitator.

12.4 The Economic Development Manager, Brighton & Hove City Council stated that local authorities would act as a conduit to facilitate school networks with the business community.

12.5 Councillor Blackman observed priority 3 should be more precise in its wording as profit did not necessarily lead to growth. Councillor Blackman noted that the needs of businesses changed within its lifecycle and businesses was not a homogenous group and included start-ups, those in transition, small businesses and large businesses.

12.6 Councillor Turner stated that business growth was also about productivity. With reference to recommendation 5, Councillor Turner stated that he had never come across a business using UKTI.

12.7 The Chair stated that the issue of UKTI had also arisen at the LEP Board and it was clear there were strong views for and against its use. The Chair supplemented that recommendations 1, 3 and 9 appeared to cover the same issues but were phrased slightly differently.

12.8 Councillor Blackman agreed that recommendations 1 and 3 were very similar but that recommendation 9 was more strategic in nature.

- 12.9 The Chairman of the Adur & Worthing District Business Partnership stated that the key issue was working more smartly for value maximisation adding that he felt this was something the officer board needed to look at.
- 12.10 The University of Brighton Director of Economic & Social Engagement stated that more and more universities saw London as a focus for recruitment and the Board similarly should consider actively campaigning for the region in London be that virtually or physically.
- 12.11 The Chair agreed adding that the key cities had considered collaborating to establish an embassy type building as a base in London.
- 12.12 The Chief Executive of Worthing Borough Council & Adur District stated that he supported the report and that he believed London would be the biggest economic driver in the course of the next twenty years and the Board should seek to maximise any opportunities connected with the city.
- 12.13 The Chair stated the Greater Brighton region had a unique opportunity in being located so close to London.
- 12.14 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor of University of Sussex stated that the Board also had to focus on providing the right skills and training to retain people in the area.
- 12.15 The Chair agreed adding that the region benefited from a sense of place and would benefit by a more collective identity in promotion and marketing strategy.
- 12.16 The Director of Operations, SDNPA stated the attraction of the region was unique and there needed to be a more joined up approach to maximise that benefit.
- 12.17 **RESOLVED-** That Greater Brighton Economic Board
- (1) Notes the findings of the Business Survey as found in Appendix 1 and in the Greater Brighton Area summary (Appendix 2)
 - (2) Request three areas that the Officer Programme Board give specific consideration to when developing an action plan to respond to the business survey recommendations
 - (3) Request that the Officer Programme Board bring an action plan to the next meeting of the Board which responds to the business survey recommendations

13 GREATER BRIGHTON INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - PROGRAMME UPDATE REPORT

- 13.1 The Board considered a report that provided an update on progress and issues on the Greater Brighton Investment Programme. The report would be a standing agenda item and feedback on presentation and format was requested.

- 13.2 The Chairman of the Adur & Worthing District Business Partnership stated that he would prefer a more visual display of the information including maps.
- 13.3 The Chair stated that it was helpful for the report to be a standing item as it provided accountability and as a source of information for learning of achievements in other areas of the region.
- 13.4 **RESOLVED-** That the Board notes the update.

14 GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD - WORK PLAN AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

- 14.1 The Board considered a report that outlined the success of the Greater Brighton City Region initiative to date in terms of securing funding through the Greater Brighton City Deal and Coast to Capital Growth Deal process and proposed the future work plan for the Economic Board and Officer Programme Board. Specifically, the report outlined future opportunities for securing further funding to deliver the City Region Investment Programme and projects and proposed the resource requirements to ensure there was capacity to both deliver the 2015/16 funded projects whilst also developing a robust pipeline of projects that can secure further funding from future funding rounds.
- 14.2 The Head of City Regeneration, Brighton & Hove City Council added that a recruitment process took place for a Business Manager post in June 2014 but following an interview round, it had not been possible to attract the right candidate. It was felt that the possible cause may have been that the post was offered for a one year period so it was proposed to re-advertise the post for a three year period in the hope that it might attract a more suitable candidate. The funding to do so would be met within existing budgets.
- 14.3 Councillor Wall stated that he believed the Board had missed an opportunity in not including West Sussex as a partner and he would be happy to assist in engaging in discussions to see if this could be taken forward. Councillor Blackman said that he felt the Board would benefit from East Sussex County Council's involvement.
- 14.4 The Board agreed to approach West Sussex County Council and East Sussex County Council regarding involvement with the Board in some capacity.
- 14.5 **RESOLVED-** That the Greater Brighton Board:
- (1) Agree the draft work plan for the Greater Brighton Economic Board
 - (2) Notes that the Greater Brighton Investment Programme is now moving into a new phase. There is an immediate need to develop final business cases for the 2015/16 funded projects whilst also developing a robust pipeline of projects that can secure further funding from future funding rounds.
 - (3) Agrees to establishing a virtual Programme Management Office
 - (4) Request that the Officer Programme Board bring a report for agreement at the next meeting of the Economic Board which outlines the final resources requirements to

ensure that there is capacity to deliver projects, provide streamlined programme management, performance monitoring, audit and risk management arrangements

The meeting concluded at 11.20am

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of