ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT AND MAJOR PROJECTS CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 36

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Project

Date of Meeting: 7th December 2010

Report of: Strategic Director Place

Contact Officer: Name: Mike Holford Tel: 29-2501

E-mail: mike.holford@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Key Decision: No

Wards Affected: South Portslade/Wish

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 This report seeks to update the cabinet member on progress on the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Project and seek agreement to progress changes to the project management and governance arrangements.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Cabinet Member requests officers to prepare a report seeking to adopt a Scheme of Delegation for the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Project at Cabinet on 20 January 2011.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

Governance

3.1 A review of the project management and governance arrangements for the Project was undertaken in August/September 2010. This review was undertaken with the participation of all partner organisations. The recommendations were approved by the Leaders of the City Council and Adur District Council and Deputy Leader of West Sussex County Council and endorsed by an Officer Working Group. A further review of arrangements will be made in February 2011.

A summary of the main recommendations are:

- To put in place a Shoreham Harbour Project Scheme of Delegation to ensure that the project is operating within the Standing Orders of all three Councils involved in the project (Brighton & Hove, Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council), backed up by clear financial decision-making protocols and processes.
- A Memorandum of Understanding to be created.
- The identification of a central, dedicated Project Manager role supported by a Project Support Officer to provided administrative support.
- The identification of a Development Manager role for two years.
- A re-structuring of the project to focus on delivery, with less meetings/subgroups and a review of partner input at all levels to prevent duplication.

FUNDING

For the financial year 2010/2011, £129,000 was received in revenue funds and £1,043,000 in capital funds from the Department of Communities and Local Government Growth Point Programme. In addition £314,000 revenue and £645,000 capital was carried forward from the 2009/2010 Growth Point allocation. This funding is being used to undertake essential technical studies including flood risk modelling, transport studies and a capacity and viability assessment. It will also be used for background evidence studies to underpin the Shoreham Harbour Planning Document if required.

Eco-Town funding of £260,000 revenue and £490,000 capital has been received which has been earmarked for investigative studies and an eco-demonstration project (PortZED). The local authorities together contributed £95,000 to cover staffing resources in addition to direct staff input. In total £983,000 revenue and £1,993,000 capital is available for the project in 2010/2011. It is intended that a significant amount of this will be carried forward to 2011/2012

At this stage it is unclear whether further funding under either the Growth Point programme or Eco-Town funding will be made available for 2011/2012 and thereafter.

A bid has been submitted on 24 September 2010 for up to £500,000 'PortTown' funding from the European Union. The outcome is expected in December 2010. The money would be used to improve links between the successful ports and their surrounding communities and with the other successful bidders.

Studies

A re-appraisal of the development capacity including financial viability is nearing completion. The final report is expected before Christmas. If available an update will be provided at CMM. It is anticipated that there will be a reduction in the potential number of dwellings due to substantial land reclamation from the sea not being viable and the need for the Port to retain

land to provide for a predicted growth in trade. Completion of a flood risk study is expected at around the same time. The transport impact of the capacity work will also need to be re-considered.

Shoreham Port Authority

The Shoreham Port Authority heard on the 2 August 2010 that it would remain as a Trust Port and would not be privatised. The Port Authority has produced a Masterplan for the operational port area which has been submitted to the Department for Transport.

Planning

Work on relevant Planning Policy documents is deferred currently awaiting publication of the Coalition Government's proposals for the Planning System. In conjunction with the outcomes of the technical studies this may require a re-appraisal of planning work which initially was aimed at producing a Joint Area Action Plan by the three local authorities.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Consultation is not required with regard to putting in a Scheme of Delegation as this is a technical issue of legal compliance. However, there will be a full programme of community consultation in the development of the plans to regenerate the Harbour.

6. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

6.1 Brighton and Hove City Council has contributed £65,000 in capital funding towards the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Project in 2010-11. There are no further financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report.

Finance Officer Consulted: Name: Karen Brookshaw Date: 18 November 2010

Legal Implications:

6.2 There are no legal implications arising directly from this report. Any legal implications arising from the proposed report on the Scheme of Delegation referred to in paragraph 2. above will be included in that report.

Lawyer Consulted: Name: Hilary Woodward Date: November 2010

Equalities Implications:

6.3 The Council's priority for regeneration of the Port is to provide employment for local people.

Sustainability Implications:

6.4 The Port has the potential to become an important location for renewable energy generation and an exemplar for sustainable housing and mixed use developments.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

6.5 None identified.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

6.6 There are risks arising especially with respect to finance, if correct governance arrangements are not identified and in place to meet the standing orders and procedures of the participating authorities. This would raise other issues such as a lack of strategic direction to the project, an inability to acquire strategic sites and duplication of scarce resources.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

6.7 The future growth, development and regeneration of the Port area is important to the future economic prosperity of the wider Brighton and Hove area.

7. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

7.1 An alternative would have been to continue with the existing project management and governance arrangements. The risks associated with this approach are identified at Paragraph 6.6 above.

8. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 The recommendations allow the City Council to implement the proposed changes to the project management and governance arrangements.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Background Documents

There are none.