

# Coast to Capital

## **Board Meeting 54**

Thursday 14 October 2021

Ricardo Centenary Innovation Centre, Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham, West Sussex, BN43 5FG

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **Board Members:**

Julie Kapsalis (JK) – Chair; Mark Brunt (MB); Martin Harris (MH); Richard Hopkins (RH); Daniel Humphreys (DH); Amanda Jones (AJ); David Joy (DJ); Jane Longmore (JL); Natalie Bramhall (NB); and Claire Mason (CM).

Apologies are noted from; Phelim Mac Cafferty, Jonathan Sharrock, Frances Rutter, Jamie Arnell, Karen Dukes, Rosaleen Liard and Paul Marshall.

Both Mark Brunt and Natalie Bramhall joined the meeting virtually.

### **Other attendees:**

- Clare Mulholland (CMH) – BEIS (Cities & Local Growth Unit)
- Cavendish Elithorn – DfT (LEP Senior Support)
- Steve Waight (SW); West Sussex County Council (Deputy for Paul Marshal)
- Nigel Manvell (NM); Wendy Mc-Rae Smith (WMS); Stephen Trigg (ST); Accountable Body (Brighton and Hove City Council).
- Nicholas Darwin (ND); Anthony Middleton (ALRM); Kristel Smith (KS); Matt Wragg (MW); Kirsten Trussell (KT) – Coast to Capital
- Alison Addy (AA); Tim Norwood (TN) – Gatwick Airport

**Part A items will be published. Part B items will also be published unless specified otherwise.**

## **1. Introduction**

### **a) Welcome and apologies**

JK welcomed Board members to the 54<sup>th</sup> Coast to Capital Board, which was the first in person meeting for a considerable period.

JK thanked Ricardo for hosting us at their facility for this meeting.

JK noted that the Board was to be recorded for the purpose of taking minutes. With

the recording deleted after those minutes have been produced.

JK noted to the Board that this meeting was a “hybrid” meeting and certain Board members, Natalie Bramhall, and Mark Brunt, would be joining through Zoom.

## **b) Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

## **c) Minutes of the July Meeting and Matters Arising documents**

The minutes of the July Board meeting were approved by the Board.

AM stated that All Matters Arising are closed or are to be addressed at the meeting.

## **d) Declarations, Disclosures & Conflicts of Interest**

JK confirmed all conflicts of interest are updated and the Conflicts of Interest statement was stated to the Board.

ND stated the Conflicts of interest identified for the meeting and that:

- For Item 3 SW, MB, NB, and DH would be conflicted for their involvement in projects mentioned in the paper but would not be asked to leave the meeting as no decisions were to be taken. DH clarified that he is not involved in the project mentioned in the paper and would not be conflicted.
- At Item 7 DH and MB would be conflicted as there was a decision related to their terms as Board directors. They would not be asked to leave the meeting as the approval of their terms does not rest with the Board.
- At Item 9 SW would be conflicted but not asked to leave the meeting.

## **2. LEP Review Update**

AM outlined the current context surrounding the LEP review. Discussion revolved around Government withholding the second tranche of Core Funding, £250,000 until the result of the LEP review. AM outlined the potential timeline for a response from Government regarding the remaining funding. AM further outlined how Local Authorities, are also withholding half of their funding. AM explained how this affects the budget but noted that the new income streams from the consultancy work can help with cash flow going forward.

AM built on this by sharing with the Board information and discussions that have been held around the LEP review with Stakeholders. Item 8 would build on these scenarios. AM did note the strong financial position of the LEP, the LEP’s ability to adapt to many scenarios and the potential opportunities this does present.

JK added that the Board will have the opportunity to discuss further after the AGM in November with the hope of more information from the LEP review. CMH closed by providing further context from Government, noting the result of the review will be around the completion of the spending review and the white paper. and reassured

the Board that Area Leads are working with the Treasury over the funding delay. The Board agreed to set a date for a decision to be made on the use of reserves, which will be discussed at the Finance and Resources Committee in December.

### **3. Delivery**

The Board discussed the paper and closed the item by approving the remaining recommendations in the paper by the Investment Committee.

### **4. Regional Projects Paper**

AM updated the Board on the progress of the regional projects team and the work to identify key projects that have significant economic impact and the seed funding available for these projects. AM also explained the work taking place within the team on paid consultancy services to generate income for the LEP, noting Tandridge as an example. As part of this conversation, KT illustrated to the Board a successful bid received for analysis to be provided for the Sussex Chamber of Commerce, furthering the potential income streams developed by the LEP and demonstrating the “added value” the LEP has.

MW built on this by illustrating the market testing the team has undertaken. MW noted the balance to be found between regional and local projects. The benefit of local projects to the LEP were displayed to the board, noting a £250,000 potential pipeline of consultancy work. MW also touched upon the role Board Sponsors can play in these regional projects.

AM clarified how the seed funding would work, with reporting to the new Programme Committee which would oversee the decision making process of granting this funding. It was stressed that separation, with strict governance, would be implemented between local consultancy projects with fees going to the LEP, and the grant of seed funding. This was also to be held accountable to the Audit and Risk Committee. The Board raised concern over managing potential conflicts, especially with bodies applying for seed funding but paying the LEP for consultancy work. It was stressed explicitly to the Board that the consultancy work would sit entirely separate from the Programme Committee overseeing the allocation of seed funding.

The Board praised the work conducted to establish the regional and local projects. It was noted the LEP needed to change as a business and grow alternative work streams and this presented a strong strategy to do so. Queries around the role of the Board Sponsors in both challenging and supporting the projects arose, there was concern that conflicts would arise not only for Board members themselves but for the organisations they represented. Furthermore, the question arose if the Directors were undertaking paid work, this was in contrast to their current, unremunerated, role. JK and AM did stress the nuances in the Board Sponsorship role, noting it was not the intention for these sponsors to undertake large scale work but to offer contacts and advice. Work would be undertaken after the LEP review to organise how the LEP would provide these consultancy services and this would be discussed further at the AGM strategy afternoon.

In addition, the Board suggested development of this business model and stress testing. AM re-assured the Board of one of the USP's of the LEP in its competitive pricing strategy as a not-for-profit organisation. The Board gave approval to the terms of reference for the Programme Committee, noting further work to be done on Board Sponsor roles. The Board did endorse the Regional projects team service offer but, in light of conversations held, agreed to discuss further the growth of this service offer.

JK noted that this discussion was to be furthered at the AGM in November.

AA and TN joined the meeting.

## **5. LEP Response to Gatwick Northern Runway**

The Board noted the presentation given and discussed how Coast to Capital would respond.

## **6. Business Engagement Paper**

KT presented the Business Engagement paper, noting in her role as Acting Head of Business Engagement, Skills, and Innovation, she oversees a large number of Coast to Capital functions. KT highlighted to the Board the work done by the team but paid specific attention to business support function of the team, noting the expert knowledge, network and influence we can offer. KT outlined how we will work with business's going forward to keep building these key relationships. Due attention was also paid toward the business intelligence development, with focus on the MnAI projects and gender disaggregation.

## **7. Executive Report**

JK opened the item by updating the Board on the Chairs Report. AM updated the Board on the Executive Report, noting the successful developments across the business. AM notified the Board on work done to fine tune the restructure that the company has undergone and illustrated the successes of the Away Day for staff collaboration. The Board was also informed of the Acting CEO and Chairs conversations with MPs. Further note was given to the publication of business plan in the summer, the AGM to be held on the 10 November and the extensive number of virtual events held by the Enterprise Advisor Network team as detailed in the report. AM focused the Board on 4 approvals outlined in the paper:

1. The approval of the Annual Report. JL raised a desire for more knowledge intensive business case studies to be brought out in the report. The Annual report was approved with this amendment.
2. The approval of Version 8.1 of the Assurance Framework. AM highlighted how this was scrutinised by the Audit and Risk Committee at their previous

meeting. It was also raised that further amendments are to be made to the document so that it is in line with the Business Plan and the LEP Review outcome.

3. The approval of additional annual leave for all staff during the Festive period. Approval for this had been given by the Finance and Resources Committee but the decision was to be ratified by the Board to emphasise the thanks from Directors for all the hard work undertaken by the team. Approval was given by the Board.
4. The approval to invoke Article 11.2 to extend the terms of the District and Borough Councillors subject to approval from the relevant District Council bodies. Specific note was given that the Board was not approving their appointment but the process required for re-appointment. Approval by the Board was given.

It was highlighted to the Board that we have been served notice of termination on our lease for our current Office at Three Bridges. It was noted this move can be an opportunity to reduce costs. The Executive team would be working with our landlords to find a mutually beneficial exit from the office and alternative provisions for office space.

## **8. Crawley Innovation Centre Update**

The Board noted the paper presented and discussed further.

## **9. LEP Review Response Framework**

The Board noted the paper presented and discussed further.

## **10. Reflection and Close**

### **AOB**

JK confirmed the AGM is to be held on 10 November at The Harlequin Theatre, Redhill with a Board Away Day in the afternoon. JK thanked MB for arranging the venue and tour of the Marketfield Way Project which will follow the AGM.

JK informed the Board of the plans for monthly All Team meetings to take place at the Coast to Capital offices and invited Board members to attend where possible, to meet the team and hear about company developments. It was advised that further information would follow.

JK concluded by thanking the team for their help in preparing the Board and finally extended her personal thanks, as well as the Board's, to AM for the incredible work he had done in the last few months as Acting Chief Executive.

There was no further business raised.

JK thanked the Board for their participation and the Coast to Capital team for their hard work in the preparation and delivery of the Board meeting.

*Unconfirmed minutes – to be approved at the next Board meeting.*