



Strategy and Policy Committee

Thursday 6 April 2017, 2.00pm – 4.00pm

Coast to Capital, Horsham Training Centre, Hurst Road, Horsham, RH12 2DN

Members:

Jonathan Sharrock	Coast to Capital (Chair)
Kirsten Trussell	Coast to Capital
Trevor Pugh	Surrey County Council
Shifa Mustafa	Croydon Borough Council
Lee Harris	West Sussex County Council

Present:

Jamie Watson	Coast to Capital
--------------	------------------

Apologies:

Nathan Elvery	West Sussex County Council
Nick Hibberd	Brighton and Hove City Council
Alison Young	Brighton and Hove City Council

1. Welcomes and Introductions

- 1.1. Welcomes and introductions from JS.
- 1.2. Lee Harris is substituting for Nathan Elvery.
- 1.3. Apologies were received from Brighton and Hove.

2. Action points from previous meeting

- 2.1. JS noted that there are issues around making board papers available directly to members in electronic format, but clarified that board papers can be shared within their own organisations if they are cascaded down from recipients.
- 2.2. ALL agreed that a statement of principal that Coast to Capital are the first responders to any government issues, recognizing that partners may wish to make their own responses, should be written into the Terms of Reference.

Action: KT to update Terms of Reference

Action: JW to send out committee meeting dates

3. Terms of Reference

- 3.1. KT went through the changes made to the Terms of Reference following the last meeting.
- 3.2. ALL agreed to the changes.

Action: Review Terms of Reference in three meetings time

4. Industrial Strategy response

- 4.1. JS gave an overview of Coast to Capital's response, noting that the steer from government was that they expected LEPs to fully engage with the process and that LEPs should give a strong view of their region. The response is a letter with an annex that gives the context of the region, what makes it distinct, the key issues the region faces, and how the LEP already works with government and how it can further strengthen this relationship to face these issues. The response does not aim to respond to each pillar or question, but to focus on those areas where Coast to Capital is qualified to answer.
- 4.2. ALL members broadly agreed that this was the right format and that the response was well written, comprehensive, covered the region fairly, focused on the right strategic approach, and had synergies with other local responses.
- 4.3. Members agreed that there were four changes to be made to document: to reference the importance of devolution in local decision making; to highlight the significance of Coast to Capital's contribution to the UK economy; to be more assertive in our recognition of our productivity issues; and to reference the asks of government more clearly and assertively make clear Coast to Capital's economic contribution to the UK.

Action: KT to add in comments to Industrial Strategy response as agreed with committee

5. High priority projects

- 5.1. KT introduced the pillar dashboard which provides a snapshot of the progress of the work streams currently undertaken by the Strategy and Policy pillar and the risk profile of each piece of work.
- 5.2. KT also noted that recruitment was underway for a Strategy and Policy Manager and a Newhaven Enterprise Zone Project Coordinator to add resource to the pillar.
- 5.3. ALL members liked the dashboard and agreed that it was clear and informative.
- 5.4. Discussion of top 8 priority activities:
 - 5.4.1. JS introduced the housing mandate paper, a programme of future work for the Housing Vehicle, which has been discussed with board about recommendations from the Housing and Regeneration Task Force paper. The main recommendation was to support LAs identify and unlock land and investment for housing and regeneration. The next steps are to recruit a regeneration lead to take on this mandate and develop programme of work.

- 5.4.1.1. LH noted that the scheme needs balance, as the population gets older it will lead to more housing geared towards older people, taking away resource for the working ages, and that it is not just about getting a return on investment but also social need. It would be useful to get the Local Authorities input on job description and recruitment. ALL members agreed.
- 5.4.2. Airports consultation – JS: Heathrow is the clear choice, but we should be aware of issue of M25 being blocked off by Heathrow and HS2 infrastructure building and the fact that the South East could have its connections to the rest of the country potentially reduced.
- 5.4.3. European Structural and Investment Funds – KT updated on the programme. An ESF Project Manager has been recruited to fully resource and embed in S&P pillar, however Coast to Capital is limited in how much can be changed with timescales left. ERDF may only have one more call window left, while ESF will have until end of 2017 for calls and also has more money left to spend. JS – looking for new committee Chair to replace John Peel who is stepping down.
- 5.4.4. Newhaven Enterprise Zone – JS: update on the Enterprise Zone, which launched on the 1st April, there will be an official launch event happening on 18th May in Newhaven. More work is required to get the message out about Newhaven and the Enterprise Zone as having the potential for large scale investment & regeneration.
- 5.4.5. Strategic Economic Plan Rewrite – JS: the rewrite will be beginning soon following the response to the Industrial Strategy, which KT will be leading on with an expected deadline of the end of 2017.
- 5.4.6. Brighton Mainline – JS: four roundtable events have been arranged to discuss the importance of investment in the Brighton Mainline. The first event on 26th April is at Parliament and hosted by Henry Smith MP and JS with MPs and government officials the main invitees. Three further events will take place in Croydon, Crawley and Brighton for MPs, senior local politicians and business leaders. JS will host these events. A report will be produced at the end detailing next steps.
- 5.4.7. A/M23 Upgrades – JS: we have written to CEO of Highways England (letter tabled at meeting) outlining the need for more national focus on the Gatwick

to London transport corridor and the separate issues around the corridor. The letter asks for more engagement with HE to explore these issues, to build a single work programme to take all these issues as one interconnected strategic issue, and to further explore funding options for developing this work stream.

5.4.8. All members agreed that it was good to hear progress on the priority work streams.

5.4.9. TP noted that there was potential for the Gatwick-London work stream to link with the wider M25 study.

5.4.10. LH asked what funding is available for investment in the Brighton Mainline – JS – there is currently no money currently available, network rail are not committing to anything new, but that we should be lobbying chancellor ahead of next budget to commit funding, whilst understanding it may not be possible to get any firm commitments.

5.4.11. KT – any evidence of disruption of strikes would be welcome

Action: ALL to provide any evidence of disruption caused by Southern Rail strikes

6. Horizon scanning

6.1. JS shared comments from Sajid Javid that suggested there will be a review to strengthen LEPs in the near future, and that he referred to end of Local Growth Funding and there may potentially be a successor to EU funding, however nothing has been confirmed.

6.2. LH noted that there are increasing issues around recruiting for low skilled workers, particularly after the Brexit vote.

6.3. JS suggested that a data gathering or evidence audit exercise may be a future agenda item.

7. Update from Projects and Services

7.1. JS introduced the Projects pillar dashboard, noting concern around the number of projects that are running (60+) and that many are not on track for spending, initiation, or output targets for the financial year. Funding is being recovered from certain projects and redistributed, which may lead to commissioning of projects to meet the needs identified in the rewritten SEP.

7.1.1. TP asked for a future agenda item about project delivery, lessons learned, and calibrating ambitions. ALL agreed.

- 7.2. JS noted that we should start preparing for how we will deal with any future funding streams, from both private and public sources, and to build a different relationship with partners who see the LEP as an easy source of funding and moving towards a relationship based on shared strategic goals and an agreement on what type of projects should be funded.
- 7.3. JS introduced the Services pillar dashboard, it is based on the Business Navigator's and Enterprise Advisor Network's work, including the number of business supported, what questions SMEs are asking service, and schools supported. More data will be included as it is collected.
- 7.4. In the future there are plans to align business support with our business grants, particularly around scale up businesses, and to work on identifying issues around business space, however this work is at an early stage.

8. A.O.B

- 8.1. JS noted at future meetings we will continue to review Strategy and Policy pillar work streams, but also identify strategic issues to explore, e.g. London plan.
- 8.2. ALL agree currently covering all that we needed to.

9. Actions:

- 9.1. Action: KT to update Terms of Reference
- 9.2. Action: JW to send out committee meeting dates
- 9.3. Action: Review Terms of Reference in three meetings time
- 9.4. Action: KT to add in comments to Industrial Strategy response as agreed with committee
- 9.5. Action: ALL to provide any evidence of disruption caused by Southern Rail strikes