

# Coast to Capital

## Investment Committee Meeting

10<sup>th</sup> November 2020 – 9:30am – 1:30pm

Coast to Capital – Zoom Meeting

### Attendees:

#### Acting chair for this meeting

David Joy – Board Member

DJ

#### Voting Members

Jonathan Sharrock- Board Member

JS

Jamie Arnell – Board Member

JA

Bob Lanzer – Deputy Board Member

BL

Daniel Humphreys – Board Member

DH

Amanda Jones – Board Member

AJ

Mark Brunt – Board Member

MB

Jane Longmore – Board Member

JL

Matthew Funriss – Deputy Board Member

MF

#### In Support

Anthony Middleton – Chief Operating Officer (Coast to Capital)

TM

Cali Gasson – Investment Programme & Risk Manager (Coast to Capital)

CG

Hannah Gosling – Investment Programme Manager (Coast to Capital)

HG

Alice Masterson – Admin Support (Coast to Capital)

AM

Kirsten Trussell – Head of Strategy & Policy (Coast to Capital)

KT

#### Governance Advisors

Kate Edwards – Accountable Body

KE

Sonia Likhari - LBC as Accountable Body

SL

Daniel Lindsay – Hatch Regeneris

DL

#### Apologies:

Colin Kemp, Lisa Taylor, Toni Wotton, Rosaleen Liard, Sean Murphy, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Clare Mason, Phelim MacCafferty, Karen Dukes.

# Coast to Capital

Time	Item	Agenda item	Action	
9:30am	1	<b>Introduction:</b> a) Open b) Welcome and Apologies	Note	DJ
	2	<b>Declaration of Interest</b>		
	3	<b>Minutes &amp; Actions of the October Investment Committee</b>		
9:40am	4	<b>Chichester School of Nursing (University of Chichester)</b> <i>9:40am Introduction from Hatch</i> <i>9:45am Chichester School of Nursing Presentation</i> <i>9:55am Q&amp;A</i> <i>10:10am Committee Discussion</i>	Approve	Hatch  UoC
10:20am	5	<b>Place St Maur &amp; Esplanade (Arun District Council)</b> <i>10:20am Introduction from Hatch</i> <i>10:25am Place St Maur &amp; Esplanade Presentation</i> <i>10:35am Q&amp;A</i> <i>10:50am Committee Discussion</i>	Approve	Hatch  ADC
11:00am	6	<b>Marketfield Way (Reigate &amp; Banstead Borough Council)</b> <i>11:00am Introduction from Hatch</i> <i>11:05am Marketfield Way Presentation</i> <i>11:15am Q&amp;A</i> <i>11:30am Committee Discussion</i>	Approve	Hatch  RBBC
11:40am	7	<b>Horsham Enterprise Park Digital Link (West Sussex County Council)</b> <i>11:40am Introduction from Hatch</i> <i>11:45am Horsham Enterprise Park Presentation</i> <i>11:55am Q&amp;A</i> <i>12:10pm Committee Discussion</i>	Approve	Hatch  WSSC

# Coast to Capital

12:20pm	8	<b>MVDC EV Charging Points (Mole Valley District Council)</b> <i>12:20pm Introduction from Hatch</i> <i>12:25pm MVDC Presentation</i> <i>12:35pm Q&amp;A</i> <i>12:50pm Committee Discussion</i>	Approve	Hatch  MVDC
1:00pm	9	<b>Business Finance update</b> <i>(Business Recovery Grants)</i>	Note	MH
1.10pm	10	<b>Full Risk Register</b>	Note	CG
1.20pm	11	<b>AOB</b>  <b>1. Innovation Centre Feasibility Funding</b>	Approve	TM &CG

*\*Minutes to be posted in the public domain following the meeting.*

# Coast to Capital

## Meeting Minutes

### 1. *Open, Welcome and Introductions*

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

### 2. *Conflicts of Interest*

2.1. JL had a conflict with Chichester School of Nursing, MB had a conflict of interest with Marketfield Way, BL had a conflict of interest with Horsham Enterprise Park, MF had a conflict of interest with MVDC EV Charging Points.

### 3. *Minutes & Actions of the October*

3.1. JS updated the Investment Committee on item 7 on the 8 October 2020 minutes. JS advised that the Investment Committee should not proceed with the offering of the loan instead of a grant JS recommended that a paper is brought to the next Investment Committee on this project or resolve this issues via correspondence.

3.2. Redacted

3.3. JS responded that it isn't a formal recommendation to offer them the grant however this does need to be reviewed due to the concerns raised.

3.4. JA had concerns over dealing with this issue via correspondence as it isn't a formal process.

3.5. DJ questioned if it is possible to have a meeting with CDC to discuss this.

3.6. TM suggested that a paper will be written and the letter received from CDC be circulated to the Investment Committee for the meeting scheduled at the end of November where the chief executive from CDC will be invited.

3.7. **ACTION:** The St James Industrial Estate project to be brought to the end of November Investment Committee for review.

### 4. *Chichester School of Nursing (University of Chichester- UOC)*

4.1. JL left the meeting.

4.2. DL gave a brief overview of the hatch report on this project. DL raised some concerns around indirect jobs supplied, student expenditure, and accreditation.

4.3. UOC representatives entered the meeting and presented their project to the Investment Committee. (JL, Simeon Keates SK, Pamela Baker PB).

#### 4.4. *Q&A Discussion*

4.4.1. Q. MB asked for clarification on the additional funding UOC would require to complete this project.

A. JL clarified that UOC originally applied for £2million to deliver the project. UOC have already begun recruitment so they are on a deadline to complete this by September 2021. This had been costed with UOC's delivery partner.

4.4.2. Q. DJ questioned what would happen if UOC didn't gain the accreditation they are seeking from the nursing council.

A. JL informed the committee that this is a process involving a series of stages, UOC would be informed in one of these stages if there were concerns. UOC are working very closely with the department of health agency which takes the proposals through the stages. JL was confident that they will gain the accreditation. JL informed that if they weren't to get the accreditation that they would reapply for the accreditation swiftly.

A. SK clarified that the professional bodies look to accredit and engage with universities. The professional bodies work with the universities as it's in their interest to have a high provision.

4.5. ***UOC team leave the meeting.***

4.6. DJ outlined that the Investment Committee seemed supportive of this project.

4.7. TM questioned on behalf of KD if the payment from Coast to Capital can be given after the UOC have gained accreditation? TM clarified that in this case the funding wouldn't be able to be given after accreditation because the funding is needed for UOC to move forward and complete the construction.

4.8. JS raised that UOC BCR of 4 is brilliant.

4.9. ***The Investment Committee approved this project.***

4.10. JL returned to the meeting.

## 5. ***Place St Maur & Esplanade (Arun District Council - ADC)***

5.1. DL gave a brief overview of the hatch report on this project. They are proceeding as planned out, match funding being approved, outputs are very high, no value for money assessment.

5.2. ADC representatives entered the meeting and presented their project to the Investment Committee. (Rachel Anderson RA, Karl Roberts KR, Caroline Gosford CAG)

### 5.3. ***Q&A Discussion***

5.3.1. Q. AJ asked for clarification on the economic impact this project is going to have on the local area. AJ informed that this project doesn't generate revenue. AJ asked if an economic impact assessment has been performed and what are the results of this.

A. CAG clarified that public realm work does generate income as ADC have previously seen this happen as it increases tourism. ADC want to upgrade the facilities to increase footfall into the area. CAG informed the Investment Committee that because of previous public realm work ADC have been attracting businesses from Chichester that are looking to relocate. CAG clarified that the hard economic outputs are jobs. ADC will safeguard jobs and create new jobs by creating a more pleasant area and gaining new business to the area.

KR informed the Investment Committee that this is next to ADC principle regeneration site. ADC are trying to encourage investment into the town.

- 5.3.2. Q. DJ questioned if ADC are confident in the numbers they have provided in terms of jobs, where are ADC in terms of planning permission, do they need to get approval from Highways for this project and has the public response to this project been positive?
- A. CAG clarified that it is difficult to measure the amount of jobs that will be a result of this project. ADC use a survey method to understand the business appetite at the beginning of the project and 2 years after the project is completed.
- A. KR clarified that this project doesn't require planning permission and doesn't require approval from the county council as the Highways authority. KR informed that the public are very supportive of this project.
- A. RA outlined that ADC did a consultation with the public and ADC want to re-engage with the public in relation to this project. ADC are holding a series of workshops with them to gain their views on the plans.
- 5.4. *The ADC team leave the meeting.*
- 5.5. JS outlined that this project falls within the LEP's priority of the tourism sector.
- 5.6. MB raised concern on how ADC are going to fund this project, if they don't get Coast to Capital's funding this project won't go ahead.
- 5.7. BL asked how concerned the Investment Committee is on the absence of a BCR?
- 5.8. TM outlined that it is hard to measure the economic benefits this project will generate. Coast to Capital could go back and ask ADC to provide a BCR. TM agreed with MB's inquiry that a local authority are able to borrow for any scheme that is deemed appropriate so that it has the ability to repay the debt.
- 5.9. DJ questioned if this project is a priority for the Council.
- 5.10. JS informs that there is a leadership gap in Bognor, this is a great opportunity for Coast to Capital.
- 5.11. DJ requested more information in regards to who is going to manage the space, arrange the events etc. Coast to Capital should encourage ADC to think about this and how ADC are going to be used.
- 5.12. **ACTION: to seek more details to who is going to manage the space, arrange the events etc. Coast to Capital should encourage ADC to think about this and how ADC are going to be used.**
- 5.13. *The Committee approved this project, but would like more details on certain aspects of the project.*
6. *Marketfield Way (Reigate & Banstead Borough Council - RBBC)*
- 6.1. MB left the meeting.
- 6.2. DL gave a brief overview of the hatch report on this project. DL raised some concerns around spending the funding and delivery timescales, what would happen if they didn't receive GBF and outputs.
- 6.3. TM informed the Investment Committee that one of the criteria around this funding is acceleration of a project. RBBC need to clarify if this is providing more outputs or if this project is accelerating.

6.4. RBBC representatives entered the meeting and presented their project to the Investment Committee.( Mark Brunt (MB) and Peter Boarder (PB))

6.5. MB informed the Investment Committee that the additional support of the LEP's funding enables RBBC to have confidence in continuing with investment and delivering this project.

## 6.6. *Q&A Discussion*

### 6.6.1. **Q. Redacted**

6.6.2. Q. DJ enquired if RBBC have double counted the outputs.

A. PB reassured DJ that the outputs haven't been double counted with the LGF outputs.

### 6.6.3. *The RBBC team leaves the meeting.*

6.7. JS raised if the funding is to mitigate market failure, are RBBC proposing to use the funding for reinforcing the sewer and public realm works. JS questioned why is a private developer performing this work. They need to enable private investment by public funding.

6.8. DL clarifies that it is hard to see if this is due to market failure but this should be explored in more detail.

6.9. TM outlined that Redhill is an area that requires regeneration.

6.10. JL informed the Investment Committee that Redhill is built on a marsh and drainage is a very big issues surrounding this site.

### 6.11. *The Committee approved this project.*

6.12. MB reentered the meeting.

6.13. MF leaves the meeting (not COI related)

## 7. *Horsham Enterprise Park Digital Link (West Sussex County Council)*

7.1. BL leaves the meeting. (COI)

7.2. DL gave a brief overview of the hatch report on this project. DL raised some concerns around contingency, outputs and why GBF is needed.

7.3. TM suggested that the Investment Committee asks for more clarification on the outputs and how the Cornwall report relates to this project.

7.4. WSCC representatives entered the meeting and presented their project to the Investment Committee.( Bob Lanzer BL, Nicola Scullard NS, Sarah Buzen SZ)

## 7.5. *Q&A Discussion*

7.5.1. Q. MB asked for clarification on how WSCC have identified the figure for jobs created. MB raised that the figure is purely statistical, how does the Cornwall report relate to this area.

A. NS clarified that WSCC used the superfast Cornwall report to base on how they determine the safeguarding of jobs. The Cornwall report is an industry standard report that WSCC used to get to the figure stated in the business case.

A. SZ informed the Investment Committee that WSCC have drawn from two reports to gain their figures, one is the regenerative report around the connective cities which is about understanding impact of fibre on urban areas within a 15 year time period. The second report is the superfast Cornwall report to gain a more rural perspective

on the fibre impacts. WSCC have taken elements from each report that is relevant to different sections of the route, this is how they reached the figures.

7.5.2. Q. DJ questioned if this is an acceleration project rather than additional outputs.

- A. SZ responded that this is a onetime opportunity for WSCC to have a deliverable mechanism to allow them to join this in and have value for money. If this project was done at a later date it would be at a higher cost. This project will produce additional benefits.

7.5.3. *The WSCC team leave the meeting.*

7.6. MB raised a concern at the number of digital fibre projects the LEP's funding.

7.7. JS informed the Investment Committee that digital infrastructure is part of Coast to Capital's priorities. The digital infrastructure in West Sussex and Brighton is recognised by government. Coast to Capital has supported this site through many different stages and this site has been in need of redevelopment.

7.8. Redacted

7.9. DJ informed the Investment Committee that this project is going to bring forward and promote the Business Park.

7.10. *The Committee approved this project.*

7.11. BL re-entered the meeting.

## **8. MVDC EV Charging Points (Mole Valley District Council - MVDC)**

8.1. DL gave a brief overview of the hatch report on this project. DL raised some concerns around outputs, match funding commitment and potential delays.

8.2. MB questioned how this project compares with other projects.

8.3. HG informed that the LEP hasn't funded EV charging points before.

8.4. JS raised concern on the scale of this project as it is the market that drives the requirement for EV charging points.

8.5. JA informed the Investment Committee that the areas that struggle with EV charging are those with on street parking as home owners will charge their vehicles at home. In rural areas people won't buy cars because there isn't charging but then private companies won't invest as there isn't enough cars. There is the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) that funds EV charging points across the country, this is available to councils. MVDC representatives entered the meeting and presented their project to the Investment Committee. ( Emma Day ED, Karen Brimacombe KB)

## **8.6. Q&A Discussion**

8.6.1. Q. JS asked why MVDC are seeking funding from Coast to Capital and no other funds that are available.

- A. ED informed the Investment Committee that the OLEV scheme only applies to work place car parks not off street parking.



A. KB informed the Investment Committee that MVDC installed some EV charging points at their own cost.

8.6.2. Q. BL questioned about the existing charging point network which is below average allocation ahead of population.

Have MVDC undertaken any assessment to understand the usage of the network and looked at best and worst cases of usage.

A. ED outlined that MVDC haven't done any assessment and the only data they have regarding this is for the charging points that are in the town centre which are in a car park that is closed overnight so the data isn't conclusive.

8.6.3. Q. JA raised a number concerns and questions and these were; there is an OLEV scheme for off street charging points, does this project specifically envisage installation of carparks providing they are open, are the costs in the business case related to the network and the works rather than the infrastructure, agree to provide the infrastructure, are these going to be 7kw or 50kw, If the charging points are only going to be 7kw then the consumer is going to get a very small amount of charge whilst visiting local shops and are going to want to stop at a higher kw charger, is this project more for the on street parking residents and how many residents are going to benefit from this.

A. ED responded with; MVDC are not required to provide on street charging infrastructure it is Surrey County Council's responsibility. OLEV only allows MVDC to have charging points in their own workplace carpark, MVDC own 23 off street car parks across the district and this project focuses on off street car parks., the charging points will be 7kw, this funding is to supply cross substation to the location of the EV bays.

A. KB informed the Investment Committee that they have a regular amount of cars parked in MVDC's overnight carparks.

8.6.4. Q Redacted

8.6.5. *The MVDC left the Meeting.*

8.7. JA believed MVDC should have had communication with providers prior to the Investment Committee.

8.8. BL raised that if these chargers are targeted for local shoppers then they wouldn't need a full charge to get home from the town centre.

8.9. JA mentioned that with consumer behavior majority of charging is done at home and not in a public charge point as this is an extra expense.

8.10. MB raised that the funding from the government doesn't prohibit Mole Valley applying for funding and can be used in car parks.

8.11. DH suggests this project needs to provide Coast to Capital with more details surrounding this project and to have conversations with neighbouring councils

8.12. AM raised a point for MF that MVDC should work with Surrey County Council on this. AJ asked if this project isn't awarded funding is there another project that can be reviewed to receive this funding.

8.13. TM stated that there is a list of projects that could be presented to the Investment Committee.

8.14. **ACTION:** Ask MVDC for more clarification on this project and ask MVDC to undertake conversations and figures. MVDC to set this as a wider strategy and coordinate with Surrey and surrounding councils .

8.15. JA queried if there is any merit in the LEP driving this strategy.

8.16. JS informed that the LEP has the mechanism for that within the pipeline that was approved at the board.

8.17. *The Investment Committee agreed to give MVDC the opportunity to revise their business strategy and clarify the concerns raised DL and BL leave the meeting.*

## 9. *Business Finance Update*

9.1. Matthew Heath MH and Malcolm Brabon MB entered the meeting and gave an update on the Business Finance project. The committee had no questions and was pleased with the update.

## 10. *Risk Register*

10.1. CG informed the Investment Committee that at the next meeting some high risk projects would be brought forward to discuss.

10.2. AJ clarified that this was raised at the Audit Committee for each chair to review and add comments to. This will be going forward from comments received and discussed thoroughly by the Investment Committee.

## 11. *AOB*

11.1. TM outlined that the Investment Committee previously approved the funding for the Innovation Centre in Crawley, and approved initial funding for feasibility work to take place so the full business case could be developed to bring back to the Investment Committee in January. TM requested that the Investment Committee supports the delegation to the steering board (that is chaired by JS)

11.2. *The committee approved this delegation.*

**END**