



Investment Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday 15 July: 13.30-15.00pm
Coast to Capital – Pacific House – Tilgate Room

Attendees:

Acting Interim Chair

Julie Kapsalis – Interim Chair of the Investment Committee – Private sector Board Member (JK)

Voting Members

Jonathan Sharrock - Coast to Capital Chief Executive and Board Member (JS); Colin Kemp – Deputy Local Authority Board Member (CK); Karen Dukes – Private sector Board Member (KD); Jamie Arnell – Private sector Board Member (JA); Mike La Rooy – Private sector Board Member (MLR); Adam Tickell – High Education Board Member (AT)

In Support

Anthony Middleton (AM); Cali Gasson (CG); Hannah Gosling (HG); Taygan Paxton (TP)
- Coast to Capital

Governance Advisors

Carli Foster (CF) - Accountable Body; Sean Murphy – Accountable Body (SM);
Cath Goodall – BEIS (CGo)

Apologies

Tony Newman
Martin Harris
Louise Goldsmith
Lisa Taylor
Manju Shahul-Hameed
Frances Rutter
Dan Yates

1. Open, Welcome, & Apologies

- 1.1 Welcome, introductions and apologies were made. The Chair of the Committee gave a brief overview of the purpose of the meeting.

Secretary Note: The Chair of the Committee dialed into the meeting via Skype. Both JA and KD dialed into the meeting via conference call. CK took over as chair of the committee as there was difficulty with the Skype.

2. Conflicts of Interest

- 2.1 The Conflicts of Interest statement was read out and committee members were asked to declare any conflicts. Three conflicts were highlighted;
- 2.2 AT has a conflict the Haywards Heath submission due to supporting the EOI submission.
- 2.3 CK is conflicted with Surrey County Council bids due to his role as Leader for Surrey County Council,
- 2.4 JK is conflicted with the Haywards Heath College bid due to Chichester College Group being the lead Delivery Body.
- 2.5 It was agreed that it was appropriate for all Committee members to be a part of the decision taking regarding item 3. However, if any Committee members wanted to discuss in detail any of the EOI submissions, members who had declared any Conflicts of Interest would exit the room while these discussions took place.

3. Unallocated LGF – Recommendations for Full Business Case (FBC)

- 3.1 The paper was introduced and the overall process was outlined. 35 Expressions of Interest (EOI) had been received against one or more of the 8 priorities from Gatwick 360 Strategic Economic Plan. The initial compliance sift exercise found that all applications were deemed eligible for further evaluation, and a robust session for scoring had been undertaken by the Senior Management Team.
- 3.2 The Investment Committee were therefore asked to agree the ranked list of EOI applications following the scoring exercise. It was recommended that due to a clear 'step change' in scores that the 15 EOI applicants who had scored 50% and above should be shortlisted for the Full Business Case (FBC) stage. All FBCs would then come back to the Committee for further scrutiny, evaluation and presentation at the September meeting.
- 3.3 AM expressed that he had not taken part in scoring of EOI submissions as part of the Senior Management Team at Coast to Capital.

Coast to Capital

Secretary note: Members of the committee noted that the process was robust and had worked well, with a number of good applications being received.

- 3.4** It was noted that Transport projects had not scored well due to their nature not meeting the strategic criteria of this call. It was highlighted that previous rounds had put funding into 'separate pots' one of which being transport. However, one of the key reasons that the process had changed from previous years, was to include only one set of strategic criteria specifically aligning with Gatwick 360.
- 3.5** It was confirmed that the scoring mechanism had been split between 5 categories (none of which were specific to any of the priority areas) to help frame the call for bids. The LEP had been looking for particularly innovative bids, that matched Coast to Capital's Strategic Economic Plan 'Gatwick 360' and the 8 priorities which had been set out clearly. There had been an attempt to find innovative bids in the region, including those that could be delivered on time producing outcomes that were tangible and credible. It was also noted that Committee members had approved this process and the scoring criteria at the June 2019 meeting.
- 3.6** It was confirmed that the next stage of the process would include Investment Committee members scrutinising each Full Business Case (subject to conflicts), and that any submissions that are not awarded funding would still be able to re-apply for future funding should it become available.
- 3.7** It was asked whether the transport bids that had submitted EOI applications should have been reviewed as per guidance within Annex O 'the Transport Assurance Framework'. It was confirmed that this process would only be undertaken as and when a transport project is called to Full Business Case stage as this would be the first review by the Investment Committee. As per the National Assurance Framework 2019, there was a greater requirement upon Coast to Capital to independently scrutinise Full Business Cases received. It was confirmed that a full independent Business Case assessment would be carried out for all FBC submissions.
- 3.8** It was highlighted to Committee members that following their scrutiny of FBCs they would have the ability to take the decision on full/partial funding awards.
- 3.9** FBCs will be circulated to Committee members in advance of the meeting, to give adequate time for full appraisal and evaluation. Scoring would then be conducted in advance of the meeting, and members will have the opportunity to refine their scores following a detailed presentation and Q+A session with each applicant. It was agreed that Committee members who were unable to attend the next Investment Committee could complete and return their score sheets prior to the meeting, but would not have the ability to refine.
- 3.10** The Investment Committee agreed the recommendations to include the 50% cut off threshold. This would be formally noted at the July Board meeting via the

4. Claire & James House

4.1 . Following on from the June Investment Committee where Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) came in to present, it was agreed a discussion with MVDC had been urgently needed to discuss the changes in scope of the project. A telephone conversation was held between both the Chief Executive of MVDC and Chief Executive of Coast to Capital. A face to face meeting was also held. A letter was sent to Coast to Capital from MVDC outlining and requesting change of scope to the project.

4.2 MVDC had agreed to confirm all points in writing again to the LEP which would return to the following Investment Committee in September, for members to make an informed decision on how they want to proceed with this project.

5. A29 Re-alignment

5.1 The Committee were updated following a formal letter response from WSCC in relation to the A29 scheme. Committee members were reminded that at the meeting on Friday 21 June 2019, WSCC presented the FBC which raised a number of questions to which Coast to Capital addressed via a formal letter to WSCC.

5.2 WSCC have now clarified and provided answers to those questions, and have clearly stated the drawdown of LGF monies on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the scheme. All members confirmed their support for the scheme however there still remained a high level of concern around Phase 2 of the scheme and the uncertainty of deliverability.

5.3 The Committee agreed that there was now enough information, and that a clear recommendation would be brought forward at the September meeting to decide how to proceed with the scheme.

END.