

**GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD**

**10.00am 13 OCTOBER 2015**

**SHOREHAM CENTRE, POND ROAD, SHOREHAM-BY-SEA, WEST SUSSEX BN43 5WU**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Parkin (Chair) Morgan, G Theobald, Turner and Wall

**Business Partners:** Prof. Crampton, Prof. Davies, John A. Peel, Dean Orgill, Peter Davies, Andrew Swayne, Nick Juba, Trevor Beattie

**PART ONE**

**11 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**11a Declarations of substitutes**

11.1 Councillor Turner was present as substitute for Councillor Humphries

**11b Declarations of interests**

11.3 There were none.

**11c Exclusion of the press and public**

11.4 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.

11.5 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the items contained in part two of the agenda.

**12 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

12.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 July 2015 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**13 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

13.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*"I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome a new Member of the Board: Nick Juba from City College.*

*I'd also like to record our thanks to Councillor Rob Blackman for his work as Member of the Board.*

*Unfortunately this will be the last meeting for Prof. Crampton and I'd like to also extend thanks for his work as a Member of the Board*

*"We have a number of observers at today's meeting that I would like to welcome: Councillor Gillian Brown, Leader of Arun District Council and Robert Cottrill, Chief Executive at Eastbourne Borough Council*

*"I'd also like to inform the Board that I recently received a letter from Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP in which he stated that he was looking forward to meeting representatives from the Board to discuss the Greater Brighton devolution bid and that he had found it an exciting proposal"*

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

- 14.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that provided a progress update on the Greater Brighton Investment Programme that included projects that have already been allocated City Deal and Coast to Capital Growth Deal funding and covered the period 15 July to 15 September 2015.
- 14.2 The Chair asked officers if there were any issues that needed attention from the Board.
- 14.3 Max Woodford clarified that whilst the Programme workload was high; there was no specific cause for concern or issue.
- 14.4 Andrew Swayne asked if there were any improvements that could be made and applied to processes for future bids.
- 14.5 Nick Hibberd stated that whilst the programme was progressing well, there had been key elements of learning. Specifically, this was to plan further ahead and to escalate any issues quickly. Nick Hibberd added that the key next step was drawing down the funding from the accountable body.
- 14.6 Nick Hibberd relayed to the Board that the Broadband Voucher Scheme had now completed and the additional funding had been spent in its entirety. Overall, 600 businesses had used the Scheme which was a very successful.
- 14.7 Councillor Theobald noted that Councillor Blackman had requested that the Scheme be extended to parts of Lewes and asked if this had been implemented.
- 14.8 Max Woodford confirmed that the Scheme had been extended to the entire LEP area, including Lewes.
- 14.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Board note the report.

#### **15 UPDATE ON GREATER BRIGHTON DEVOLUTION BID**

- 15.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that sought formal approval of the Greater Brighton Devolution Prospectus and for agreement on the next steps.
- 15.2 Councillor Theobald congratulated officers for producing a comprehensive and detailed report in a short amount of time.
- 15.3 Geoff Raw relayed to the Board that the process of devolution would be a long-term as demonstrated by the process undertaken by Greater Manchester.
- 15.4 Andrew Swayne stated his agreement that the process of devolution would be long-term.
- 15.5 The Chair expressed his congratulations to officers who had put together a proposal very quickly and at short notice.
- 15.6 Councillor Wall reiterated the congratulatory comments made adding that the process could lead to benefit for the local authorities involved in sharing information and achieving best value in the delivery of public services.
- 15.7 John A. Peel noted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made clear that any transfer of powers under devolution would be to a directly-elected mayor. This would be difficult to negotiate and asked how it was intended to challenge that requirement in the context of the region not sharing that view.
- 15.8 The Chair stated that he had attended a meeting at Whitehall the previous week and understood there was no set policy on the requirement for a directly-elected mayor.
- 15.9 John A. Peel thanked the Chair for his assurance and noted that of the 38 devolution bids from various authorities; only 4 had included a proposal for a directly-elected mayor.
- 15.10 Councillor Theobald stated that he was sure Department for Communities & Local Government (DCLG) ministers would assess each bid on its merits, subject to the scale of the devolution.
- 15.11 **RESOLVED-** That the Board:
- (1) Formally approve the Prospectus;
  - (2) Agree the continued development of the proposals contained within the Prospectus, delegating authority to the Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board ('the Officer Board') working in partnership with the Board, the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP), the Three Southern Counties and other neighbouring authorities, wider partners and stakeholders and in line with feedback and guidance from Government, and;
  - (3) Agree the funding of additional consultancy support for the continued development of the proposals and the associated business cases. The Officer Board will ensure

the best use of these resources, drawing these down as required against clear outputs. Any additional costs will be capped at £50,000.

**16 HCA UPDATE AND LAND PROGRAMME**

- 16.1 The Board considered a presentation from Ken Glendinning, Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) that provided an update on the role, objectives and work of the HCA in housing delivery and supporting local economic growth.
- 16.2 Councillor Morgan asked on the definition of affordable housing by the HCA. Councillor Morgan noted that affordable housing was a significant problem in the South East region and the Right to Buy Scheme had led to difficulty in local authorities providing housing. Furthermore, Councillor Morgan stated that Starter Homes Scheme was often outside of the reach of key workers and iterated his belief that public land should be used for housing development for public workers.
- 16.3 Ken Glendinning stated that affordable housing and shared ownership was a focus for the HCA. Local authorities could still make decisions about how land was brought forward and the HCA was engaging at local level on land contribution.
- 16.4 Dean Orgill asked if there was an indication on the number of houses that could be built.
- 16.5 Ken Glendinning clarified that the bulk of housing would be built in Crawley with smaller assets used across the rest of the region. He added that central government was keen to divest itself of public land and that message was being cascaded to all government departments. Transparency would be provided through the Housing Board and significant work had been undertaken with the LEP to date.
- 16.6 Councillor Turner noted that the proposal were very much focussed on housing and asked if HCA were minded of the need for balanced developments to included schools and other infrastructure.
- 16.7 Ken Glendinning clarified that the HCA was very aware of the need to support the economic needs of areas and there would be a focus on building schools, public health buildings and community buildings to supplement housing developments.
- 16.8 Peter Davies asked if the HCA could use compulsory purchase powers.
- 16.9 Ken Glendinning confirmed that the HCA could use such powers but it was not their preferred tool of governance or delivery.

**17 NEW MODELS OF HOUSING DELIVERY**

- 17.1 The Board considered a presentation from Rhys Daniel and Anna Wallace of Hyde Housing that provided information on housing delivery and context in the Greater Brighton region.
- 17.2 Councillor Theobald enquired with regard to funding and investment for housing delivery.

- 17.3 Anna Wallace stated that the Hyde Group were a large organisation and in a position to borrow and opportunities were available through European Investment Bank funding that was set at a cheap interest rate for social investment. Rhys Daniel added that the more pertinent question was that of land provision in the region and discussions with local authorities, housing associations and HCA were ongoing.
- 17.4 Geoff Raw stated that in the case of Brighton & Hove, the authority was asset rich but cash poor which meant that such a proposal was attractive in their specific case although land would still be difficult to obtain. He added that Housing Revenue Accounts and housing stock had been affected by national changes and a modal shift in housing delivery was likely to be required.
- 17.5 Jenny Rowlands enquired with regard to estimated timescales from the procurement of land to construction.
- 17.6 Rhys Daniel stated that a five year period had been set for delivering a substantial number of homes but that had to be placed in the context of the usual difficulties of development and the planning approval process.

**18 GREATER BRIGHTON PROJECT PIPELINE**

18.1 The Board considered a report of the Chair, Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board that presented an updated Project Pipeline 2016/17 comprising of the 'long-list' of projects that the City Region intended to submit for capital grant funding to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP) as part of Round 3 of the Local Growth Fund (LGF).

18.2 **RESOLVED-** That the Board:

- (1) Agree the Pipeline, recognising that new projects may still come forward;
- (2) Submit the Pipeline, as listed in Section 4, to the C2C LEP for consideration for future LGF funding and inclusion in the Strategic Economic Plan, and;
- (3) Task the Greater Brighton Officer Programme Board with developing outline business cases for each of the projects contained within the Pipeline, to ensure that the City Region's is ready to respond to any future LGF announcements.

**19 GREATER BRIGHTON PROJECT PIPELINE- EXEMPT CATEGORY 3**

19.1 The Board moved to private session to discuss confidential information pertaining to Item 18 before returning to open session.

**20 PART TWO PROCEEDINGS**

20.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Part 2 appendix and minute item remain exempt from disclosure from the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 12.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of