

Coast to Capital Investment Committee Meeting
14th July 2017 14.00-16.00pm
Coast to Capital Offices, room: Carpenter

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Chair

Daryl Gayler – Board Member DG

Voting Members

Jonathan Sharrock – Chief Executive (Coast to Capital) JS
David Hodge – Board Member DH
Tony Newman – Board Member TM
Steve Allen - Board Member SA
Mark Watson – Board Member MW

In Support

Anthony Middleton – Chief Operating Officer (Coast to Capital) AM
Hannah Gosling – Project Manager (Coast to Capital) HG
Cali Stanton – Projects Administrator (Coast to Capital) CS

Governance Advisors

Arinola Adebekun – WSCC Accountable Body AA
Susan Taylor-Searle – WSCC Accountable Body STS
Andy Thorne – WSCC Accountable Body AT
Cath Goodall – BEIS CG

In Attendance for Business Case Presentation

John Reed – Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, (Horley Business Case) JR
Robin Firth - Croydon Council (Fairfield Halls & College Green Business Case) RF
David Morris – Croydon Council (Fairfield Halls & College Green Business Case) DM
Stephen Tate- Croydon Council (Fairfield Halls & College Green Business Case) ST
Colm Lacey - Croydon Council (Fairfield Halls & College Green Business Case) CKL
Nick Hibberd – Brighton & Hove City Council, (Blackrock Business Case) NH
Katharine Pearce – Brighton & Hove City Council, (Blackrock Business Case) KP
Mark Ireland - Brighton & Hove City Council, (Blackrock Business Case) MI
Duncan Barratt – West Sussex County Council (Crawley Growth Programme Business Case) DB
Clem Smith – Crawley Borough Council (Crawley Growth Programme Business Case) CSm

Apologies:

Martin Heffer – Board Member
Katharine Eberhart – WSCC Accountable Body
Warren Morgan – Board Member

Louise Goldsmith – Board Member
Debra Humphris – Board Member
Phil Jones – Board Member

Agenda Item;

1. Welcome & Introductions & Conflicts of Interest

DG Opened the meeting as chair.

DG ran through the agenda and highlighted the projects which were coming in to present their business cases from 2.30pm.

A recap of the last Investment Committee was given, and it was agreed that the previous minutes are a true representation of what happened.

MW raised that he had a conflict of interest with Croydon Fairfield Halls project, and will leave the room prior to this Business Case presentation.

SA declared that he is a member of the Brighton Marina Association, and Brighton Marina berth holders, but has not had any involvement regarding the original application or business case for Blackrock.

AA raised that previously to her current role with the LEP, she provided advice to the Crawley Growth Programme, and will leave the room prior to this Business Case presentation.

DH will leave the room when the Horley Business case is being presented.

2. Local Growth Fund Update for 2017/18

AM ran through his paper on the Local Growth Fund.

Within the last Investment Committee, it was highlighted that the Investment Committee members would like a more active part in deciding both criteria and direction for the LGF allocation. The paper set out a framework, in which the Investment Committee discussed regarding the pot of funding that needs to be allocated by 2021.

The 7 main suggested areas are defined needs that have been drawn from the Coast to Capital Business Plan and the Coast to Capital Industrial Strategy Response. It is however, by no means set in stone, and there is a lot of opportunity to decide on what is done with the unallocated funding, therefore the Investment Committee is encouraged to discuss these themes, and if funding should be spread widely or if it should be more focused on 'game changing' projects.

There were concerns that C2C is not getting its name out there in the wider market, and the new call for bids could be an opportunity to be more proactive. The Investment Committee were in agreement, and discussed C2C getting signage created which can be passed onto new and existing projects.

The key points of the paper were summarized. The Investment Committee were all in agreement regarding the allocation of money, and all recognized the importance of game

changing projects. It was also agreed that all 7 theme areas (after a few slight modification to the titles and criteria) should be used within the new call round, and that there was a strong need regarding digital projects and SME growth.

AM finally provided some information regarding assurance reviews, in which deep dives on various transport projects will be conducted and presented at the next board meeting.

AM gave a brief introduction into the presentations that were going to now take place, and how the original applications for Growth Deal 3, and funding allocations have all previously been agreed by the full board. The Investment Committee's role is to review the Business Cases that have now come forward. However, on each of the schemes further discussions will need to be had with C2C and the AB to ensure satisfaction of the scheme.

3. GD3 Croydon Fairfield Halls Business Case

MW left the room.

HG introduced the Croydon Business case, and ran through the executive summary key points.

The Delivery body entered the room.

Croydon Council ran through their presentation on the Business case, and gave a good overview of the scheme. They explained the scheme in further detail, and where the project progress currently was.

The Investment Committee asked various questions to the delivery body based on the project and their business case to help form a decision.

The Delivery body left the room.

DG summarised the points raised throughout the presentation. The Investment Committee felt there was a need for this scheme. It was agreed that a funding agreement can be drawn up, providing that Croydon Council supply C2C and the AB with further evidence and clarify a few points.

Subject to final clarification on a few points the Investment Committee are happy to approve this project and go forward to the funding agreement stage.

4. GD3 Horley Business Park Business Case

DH left the room.

AM gave an overview of the project.

CS introduced the Horley Business case, and ran through the executive summary key points.

The Delivery Body entered the room, and gave a presentation of Horley Business Park, and explained the two phases of the project in detail.

The Investment Committee asked various questions to the delivery body based on the project and their business case to help form a decision.

The Delivery Body left the room.

It was identified that this investment of LGF funding is key. The Investment Committee felt the presentation was clear, and subject to a few points raised about clarity, the project can go forward to the funding agreement stage. The Delivery Body to provide C2C and AB with clarification on a few areas.

5. GD3 Blackrock Business Case

CS introduced the Blackrock Business case, and ran through the executive summary key points.

The delivery body entered the room.

BHCC provided the Investment Committee with a well thought out overview and summary of the investment of the Waterfront Project. It was highlighted this is broken into Waterfront East, which is the Blackrock Site, and Waterfront Central, which is the Churchill Square site.

The Investment Committee asked various questions to the delivery body based on the project and their business case to help form a decision.

The Delivery body left the room.

DG ran through the key points taken from the presentation, and the Investment Committee were in agreement that upon some final clarity and information coming forward from the Delivery body, they would be happy to award a funding agreement to this project. BHCC to send through clarification on a few areas to C2C and the AB.

6. Crawley Growth Programme Business Case

AM introduced the Crawley Growth Programme Business case, and ran through the executive summary key points and the history of the scheme. (This scheme is not part of Growth Deal 3).

The Delivery Body entered the room. WSCC and CBC provided the Investment Committee with a detailed overview of where the project started, and how over time, the Programme has developed alongside the relationship with Crawley Borough Council.

The Delivery Body outlined the individual schemes involved within this Growth Programme, and the various partnerships this scheme will create.

The Investment Committee asked various questions to the delivery body based on the project and their business case to help form a decision.

The Delivery body left the room.

DG highlighted that due to the LGF allocation, this Business Case will need to be formally presented to the next board. The Investment Committee would like to see the Chief Executive of Crawley involved in the next presentation at Board Level.

The Investment Committee were in agreement that the Business Case needs a slight refresh, to give a clearer picture on the individual schemes, and where the LGF will come into play. There was more information that came across from the presentation. They would also like to see an A3 map of Crawley, to highlight how all the schemes come together.

DG closed this, and all were in agreement, that a funding agreement should be awarded on condition that the full board agree in September.

7. AOB

It was raised that BHCC Digital catapult scheme has been asked if it would create an immersive technology hub, and if we can match an offer from the National Catapult of LGF funding.

The Investment Committee were in agreement that C2C should support this, and it is a small amount of funding to allow BHCC to maintain their lead. It was highlighted that a scheme like this also fits within one of the priority strategic themes.

The Committee exercised their powers under the terms of reference to decide the evaluation method and approach to the award of funding to the Digital Catapult through the planned circulation of a report on the matter for decision.

The scheme was agreed, subject to a paper being created and sent around to the Investment Committee members, and Accountable body post meeting.