

This document will be published

Coast to Capital Board Meeting 39

19 April 2018: 5:00pm - 7:30pm Shoreham Port, Southwick, Brighton, BN42 4ED

Meeting Minutes

Board Members:

Tim Wates (TW) – Chairman; Steve Allen (SA) – Vice Chairman; Helyn Clack (HC); Daryl Gayler (DG); Louise Goldsmith (LG); Phil Jones (PJ); David Joy (DJ); Nick Juba (NJ); Julie Kapsalis (JK); Mike La Rooy (MLR); Manju Shahul-Hameed (MSH); Ravi Shankar (RS); Jonathan Sharrock (JS).

Attendees:

Cath Goodall (CG) - Cities & Local Growth Unit; Hazel Nicholmann - Coast to Capital; Anthony Middleton (ALRM); Katie Nurcombe - Coast to Capital; Kirsten Trussell (KT) - Coast to Capital (Items 1-4 only).

Guests:

Karen Dukes - Independent consultant; Martin Harris (MH) - Managing Director Brighton & Hove Buses and Metrobus; Tony Kershaw (TK) - Director of Law and Assurance, West Sussex County Council (Items 1-3 only); Rosaleen Liard (RL) – CEO Chequers Contract Services Ltd.

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

1. Introduction (Part A)

TW thanked Rodney Lunn (Shoreham Port Chief Executive) and Sarah Bassett (Shoreham Port Finance Director/Deputy Chief Executive) as well as the Shoreham Port team for hosting the meeting, including the informative boat trip tour which preceded the meeting.

a) Welcome and apologies

TW welcomed HC (Cabinet Member for Health, Surrey County Council) who was attending the Board in place of David Hodge. He also introduced Rosaleen Liard and Martin Harris who had been appointed as Board member and Board member/Coopted Director Transport respectively subject to completion of due diligence process. RL and MH gave short background introductions.

Apologies were noted for David Hodge; Debra Humphris; Warren Morgan; Tony Newman and Garry Wall, and Katharine Eberhart.

b) To Review Public Comments

JS confirmed that there were no public comments.

c) Minutes from last Board meeting and Matters Arising Schedule

The Minutes were agreed and the Matters Arising Schedule was noted.

d) Chairman's Committee meeting

The Minutes were noted.

e) Project Spotlight - West Sussex

Members noted the investments that Coast to Capital had made in West Sussex through the Local Growth Fund 'Project Spotlight Report'.

2. Declarations, Disclosures & Conflicts of Interest (Part A)

TW read out a new Conflicts of Interest statement, which at future meetings would be included in Item One to request confirmation of conflicts. See Annex A.

LG declared conflicts in relation to the A2300 and Burgess Hill Local Growth Fund projects. Given that these would not be discussed at this meeting it was agreed that there was no conflict to report.

JS confirmed that the updated Register of Interests was available on the website.

TW welcomed TK to the meeting. TK referred the Board to the guidance which was circulated as part of Item Two on dealing with Declarations, Disclosures and Conflicts of Interest in LEP business. The aim was to demonstrate the principles of transparency and the avoidance of bias. If there were areas of doubt Members were asked to raise them ahead of the Board meeting taking place. TK also explained how Members should operate once a conflict had been identified, with an onus on the Chair to settle any dispute. TW stressed the need for members to be accountable and personally responsible for managing and complying with the process.

JS confirmed that conflicts were covered in new Board member inductions and that the appropriate arrangements were in place. TW reiterated the importance of having governance structures of the highest quality in place so that all stakeholders could have confidence in the LEP's work.

3. Independent Scrutiny Report Recommendations (Part B) – this item will be published

Report findings

TW invited KD to present the key findings of her Independent Scrutiny Report, which had been commissioned in line with the assurance framework. KD confirmed her satisfaction that sound governance was embedded throughout the organisation. A strong governance culture was being developed and enforced through the implementation of the assurance framework. KD had used her review to scrutinise the implementation of the 2017 funding round process, in the context of the 2017 Assurance Framework. Her review summarised her findings using a RAG assessment process:

- Transparency it was noted that Coast to Capital had committed to transparency in its Assurance Framework. Applicants' Business Plans could not however be published in advance of funding decisions being made as they are commercially sensitive. Consideration was given to the idea of publishing a summary document on each project in any future funding rounds.
- Process KD confirmed the need for a robust process in monitoring and managing the projects going forward as well as consistent decision making.
- Conflicts of Interest recommendations were for conflicts of interest to be handled in a more consistent way.

KD offered her thanks to those involved in the production of the Report, which included the Chair of the Coast to Capital Board; Chairs of the Investment and Audit Committees; other Board Members; the s151 Accountable Body representative; LEP officials and project pillar staff.

High Risk Project Monitoring Protocols

The Scrutiny Report had identified areas in the governance framework which needed to be clarified in relation to project monitoring, tracking the delivery of objectives and developing a response in the event that delivery milestones were breached. JS confirmed that the company's approach to these issues would be reviewed. A paper would be presented to the July Board meeting which would include:

- Confirming our current accredited routine project monitoring processes to be included in our Assurance Framework.
- A new written process for High Risk Project Monitoring by the Board to be included in our Assurance Framework.
- A Board decision making process / protocol on High Risk Projects to be included in our Assurance Framework.
- The process for the allocation of future funding and recycled Growth Deal Funding.

The paper would be consulted on by the Investment Committee and delivery partners in advance of presenting it to the Board.

Members discussed project reporting methods including the monitoring of high risk projects and milestone plans. For RED and RED/AMBER projects (including Growing Places Fund) it was recommended that a one page summary status sheet (including the component calculations of the risk status) was produced for future Board meetings as an appendix to the highlight report. This could be derived from existing data already provided.

JS confirmed that the process was evolving but was aligned with national guidance. He also stated that focus should be placed on higher risk projects which were closer to reaching their financial deadlines. It was noted that projects were reviewed by the Projects Pillar Committee, which in itself was scrutinised by the Accountable Body.

TK left the meeting.

4. Draft Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and Local Industrial Strategy (Part A)

JS presented the draft SEP.

The Board welcomed the evidence presented in the draft and expressed positivity about progress to date. They noted the extensive engagement which had already taken place, including JS's recent discussions with Local Authority Chief Executives. It was agreed that more work was needed to finalise the SEP vision. It was also agreed that professional expertise should be engaged on the formatting and presentation of the document and supporting materials.

Members noted the timeline set out to finalise the document which would be approved by the Joint Committee in June and launched at the AGM in July. TW emphasised the scale of the project and asked Members to individually provide comments by the end of April on the Eight Priorities for our Economy in the document.

KT left the meeting.

5. Business Plan and Budget for 2018/19 (Part B) – This item will be published

The Board approved the Business Plan and Budget for 2018/19. The Business Plan would be updated to be aligned with the final SEP. The Board also agreed funding of £129,678 for the Enterprise Adviser Network for financial year April 2019 to March 2020.

6. Chief Executive Report (Part A)

JS outlined his Report and noted in particular that Block J would be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting.

Communications and Corporate

The central government LEP Review was ongoing. The scope of the review included the principle of boundary overlaps across the LEPs. Coast to Capital was affected because of overlaps in Lewes and Croydon. We were working hard to explain the strategic importance of Croydon, our largest urban area, to the region and to our evolving SEP.

Our Local Assurance Framework would be further updated in the summer, when the 2018 National Assurance Framework would also be issued.

JS updated members on the Brighton Mainline Alliance project, which now had over 60 members.

Projects Pillar

There was a discussion surrounding the University of Sussex Bio Innovation Centre project, which was rated as a red risk. ALRM provided further background on this, including a commitment by the Centre to deliver the project and its outputs later

this summer as detailed in the original Growth Deal application. The Board has asked for an assurance letter from the University's Vice Chancellor confirming this which would be circulated to Board Members. **Action:** JS to request letter of assurance from the University of Sussex Vice-Chancellor for the Bio Innovation Centre project.

The Board noted that preferred bidder stage would be reached on the Accountable Body review at the end of April.

Services Pillar

On International Trade, the Board report highlighted a 40% drop in Foreign Direct Investment into the region compared to the previous year. There was close work with Department for International Trade on these figures, which reflected national trends. JS summarised the success of the Burgess Hill Technology Park and its inclusion in the UK Investment portfolio brochure.

Strategy and Policy Pillar

JS also reported progress on the University of Brighton's Digital Research and Innovation Network project under the European Regional Development Fund.

7. Close: (Part A)

a) AOB

None.

b) Future Meetings

- Meetings would take place on the following dates with locations to be confirmed:
 - o 5pm Wednesday 4 July
 - o3pm Thursday 19 July (AGM)
 - o 5pm Thursday 18 October

ANNEX A

Declarations, Disclosures & Conflicts of Interest Statement

'Can I ask members now to declare any interest they may have and to say which item or part of an item on the agenda the interest relates to. If a member realises a need to make any declaration later on during the meeting they may do so. If any member requires any assistance on how their interest affects their contribution to the meeting we will deal with it as the item arises. Are there any declarations please?'



Board Meeting - 19 April 2018 Matters Arising Schedule

Meeting Ref.	Action	Ву	Status
Projects Review	Steve Allen to lead a Working Group on the A2300/A29 which is due to report back to the Board	SA	Working closely with WSCC, MSDC and DfT to take this work forward. Attended recent DfT project review meeting.
19.04.18 Minute	Develop High Risk Project Monitoring Protocols	ALRM	Protocols to be developed and included with the July Board papers.
	Tony Middleton to confirm position with University of Sussex on the Bio Innovation Centre.	ALRM	Assurance letter from the VC of the University of Sussex to confirm their commitment to the Bio Innovation Centre and delivering their growth deal business case included with the minutes.



Mr Anthony Middleton
Chief Operating Officer
Coast to Capital LEP
Arun House (Horsham Training Centre)
Hurst Road
HORSHAM RH12 2DN

1 May 2018

Dean Mr. Middle to-

I am writing in response to your request to provide written confirmation that the University of Sussex remains committed to delivering the Bio-innovation Centre as part of the Life Sciences estate development at the University.

As we informed you in early March, the University's Executive Group recently took the reluctant decision to review our designs for the proposed Life Sciences building. When the original plans for the Life Sciences building were first approved, several years ago, the Higher Education sector was in a very different place. In light of the changing economic environment, we felt it was prudent to review the plans for the new building to ensure it would continue to meet the long-term needs of the institution and deliver best value for money. As originally conceived, the Life Sciences building was designed to provide laboratory space for both teaching and research in Life Sciences together with the Bio-innovation centre and office space for academic staff and researchers. In its review, the Executive's aim was to seek to service the teaching needs of a broader range of Science schools within the new Life Sciences estate by creating additional teaching laboratories to support these subjects.

Having explored the options available, the conclusion reached was that, unfortunately, it would not be possible to widen the scope of the building to incorporate teaching space to meet the requirements of all the sciences within the approved budget envelope of £145m. As a result, the Executive decided that it was prudent not to go ahead with the original design.

Our immediate focus is now on delivering a new state of the art building that focusses solely on meeting our research requirements for Life Sciences, together with the establishment of

continued/2

the Bio-innovation Centre. At its March meeting the University Council approved the Executive's revised proposals for the building and gave us the green light to progress with new plans. More recently, at the last meeting of the Strategy, Planning and Resources Committee of Council that took place at the end of April, the Committee approved the budget to embark on the design development phase of the new building. We anticipate the new building to house Life Sciences research and the Bio-innovation centre being complete in early 2022.

I am very pleased to confirm, therefore, that the University is strongly committed to delivering this project together with the original core outputs and outputs for business support, as detailed in the original Growth Deal application for support to establish the Bioinnovation Centre at the University of Sussex.

not best mobes

Ad Tabell

Professor Adam Tickell

Vice-Chancellor