Decision No: CMM - 1

Forward Plan No: EEM2075

This record relates to Agenda Item 14 on the agenda for the

Decision-Making

RECORD OF CABINET MEMBER DECISION

DECISION-MAKER: COUNCILLOR TED KEMBLE

PORTFOLIO AREA: ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR

PROJECTS

SUBJECT: SHOREHAM HARBOUR

REGENERATION PROPOSALS -

UPDATE AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MEMBER STEERING GROUP

AUTHOR: SEAN HAMBROOK

THE DECISION

1. That progress of the project be noted.

2. That It be agreed that the Council appoints three City Council Members as representatives to sit on the Shoreham Harbour Member Steering Group, namely: the Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment and Major Projects, one Labour ward councillor (Councillor Hamilton) and one Conservative ward councillor (Councillor Harmer-Strange).

REASON FOR THE DECISION

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

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

 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.

OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS CONCERNING THE DECISION None

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The decision-maker(s) did not declare a personal or prejudicial interest in the matters set out in the report

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD:

We certify that the decision this document records was made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and is a true and accurate record of that decision

Date: Decision Maker:

10 June 2008 Councillor Ted Kemble

Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects

EH. Kelle.

Signed:

Proper Officer:

10 June 2008 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come in to force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication subject to any review under the Council's Scrutiny 'Call-In' provisions.

Call-In Period 17 June 2008

Date of Call-in (if applicable) (this suspends implementation)

Call-in Procedure completed (if applicable)

Call-in heard by (if applicable)

Results of Call-in (if applicable)

Decision No: CMM – 2

Forward Plan No: EEM 2076

This record relates to Agenda Item 15 on the agenda for the

Decision-Making

RECORD OF CABINET MEMBER DECISION

DECISION-MAKER: COUNCILLOR TED KEMBLE

PORTFOLIO AREA: ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR

PROJECTS

SUBJECT: APPOINTMENT OF PROJECT BOARDS

AUTHOR: DAVID FLEMING

THE DECISION

1. That the role performed by Project Boards and the part they play in the delivery and decision making process of major projects be noted.

- 2. That the Project Boards for the Brighton Centre, City College (including Wilson Avenue), the Open Market, Preston Barracks and The Keep be retained and that new Project Boards be created in accordance with the criteria set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report as appropriate.
- 3. That it be agreed that each of the four main political groups be requested to nominate representatives to join the identified Project Boards.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

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

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

 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.

OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS CONCERNING THE DECISION None

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The decision-maker(s) did not declare a personal or prejudicial interest in the matters set out in the report.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD:

We certify that the decision this document records was made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and is a true and accurate record of that decision

Date: Decision Maker:

10 June 2008 Councillor Ted Kemble

Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects

EH. Kelle.

Signed:

Proper Officer:

10 June 2008 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come in to force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication subject to any review under the Council's Scrutiny 'Call-In' provisions.

Call-In Period 17 June 2008

Date of Call-in (if applicable) (this suspends implementation)

Call-in Procedure completed (if applicable)

Brighton	&	Hove	City	Council

Call-in heard by (if applicable)	
Results of Call-in (if applicable)	

Decision No: CMM – 3

Forward Plan No: N/A

This record relates to Agenda Item 16 on the agenda for the

Decision-Making

RECORD OF CABINET MEMBER DECISION

DECISION-MAKER: COUNCILLOR TED KEMBLE

PORTFOLIO AREA: ENTERPRISE, EMPLOYMENT & MAJOR

PROJECTS

SUBJECT: SUB-NATIONAL REVIEW OF

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

AUTHOR: SEAN HAMBROOK

THE DECISION

1. That the main points of the consultation response, as set out in Section 7 of the report, be approved.

2. That the Acting Director, Cultural Services be authorised to discuss and if possible agree a similar joint response with East and West Sussex County Councils.

REASON FOR THE DECISION

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. 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.
- 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/ governmentled 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.
- 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

DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

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

OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS CONCERNING THE DECISION

None

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD:

We certify that the decision this document records was made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and is a true and accurate record of that decision

Date: Decision Maker:

10 June 2008 Councillor Ted Kemble

Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Employment & Major Projects

EH. Kelle.

Signed:

Proper Officer:

10 June 2008 Mark Wall, Head of Democratic Services

Signed:

SCRUTINY

Note: This decision will come in to force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication subject to any review under the Council's Scrutiny 'Call-In' provisions.

Call-In Period 17 June 2008

Date of Call-in (if applicable) (this suspends implementation)

Call-in Procedure completed (if applicable)

Call-in heard by (if applicable)

Results of Call-in (if applicable)

Brighton & Hove City Council