

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD  
BOARD MEETING**

**Minutes of Meeting on Friday, 24 July 2009  
Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining  
1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1**



**Present:** Jim Brathwaite, CBE (SEEDA; Chairman)  
Paul Carter (SEELB)  
Mike Appleyard (SEELB)  
George Beckett (SEELB)  
Dolores Byrne (SEEDA)  
Pamela Charlwood (SEEDA)  
Clive Chatters (National Parks)  
John Furey (SEELB)  
Bob Goldfield (SEEDA)  
Tony Page (SEELB)  
Tony Reid (SEELB)  
Keith Riley (SEEDA)

**Observer:** Colin Byrne (GOSE)

**In Attendance:** Peter Gilroy (LA CE Advisory Group)  
Paul Lovejoy (SEEDA)  
Diana Pogson (Partnership Board Strategy Unit)  
Catriona Riddell (Partnership Board Strategy Unit)  
Tim Stansfeld (SEEDA)  
Martin Tugwell (Partnership Board Strategy Unit/SEEDA)  
Jill Wedge (Partnership Board Strategy Unit)  
Irene Cripps (Partnership Board Strategy Unit)

**1. Formal Launch of the Partnership Board**

1.1 Jim Brathwaite and Paul Carter both welcomed members to the first meeting of the Board, saying they looked forward to making the new regional governance arrangements work. Members and officers in attendance then introduced themselves.

**2. Apologies and Declaration of Substitutes**

2.1 Apologies were received from Zenna Atkins (SEEDA), Louise Bloom (SEELB), Pam Alexander (SEEDA) and Chris Williams (LA CE Advisory Group).

2.2 Substitutions declared were Pam Charlwood for Zenna Atkins and Peter Gilroy for Chris Williams.

### 3. Terms of Reference for Agreement:

#### a) Partnership Board

3.1 Diana Pogson introduced the draft ToR. Points raised in the following discussion were:

- It was not clear to which Secretary of State the Partnership Board is accountable; it was **noted** that accountability is to the Secretaries of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS).
- It was **agreed** that the ToR should be amended to include explicit reference of the Partnership Board's role in agreeing the region's Regional Funding Advice and submissions to spending reviews.
- It was **noted** that the SEELB has yet to nominate its named alternates.
- It was **noted** that although alternates were known for SEEDA this has to be kept under review as the membership of SEEDA's Board will change over the next few months.

3.2 GOSE's Regional Director, Colin Byrne, **confirmed** that central Government does not have to approve the agreed ToR as it is for the region to determine the working arrangements required to implement the Sub-National Review.

3.3 It was **agreed** that the revised ToR would be circulated by email, with the meeting minutes, for adoption.

#### b) Strategy Board

3.4 Diana Pogson introduced the draft ToR. Questions asked were:

- If these are public meetings, then how dynamic would the Board be in seeking to engage with the wider community - could the meetings be webcast?
- If webcasting is not possible for all board meetings in the near future, how will the meetings be publicised?

3.5 Responding, Diana Pogson **advised** the Board that the Partnership's website will be operational in the next couple of weeks and that the forward programme of meetings will be on the website. An e-bulletin will be issued after each meeting, which will also include key dates.

3.6 It was **agreed** that links to the Partnership Board website from more familiar websites, including council websites, be set up to publicise the Partnership Board and its groups to help familiarise the public with the new regional governance arrangements.

3.7 Catriona Riddell **informed** the Board that she believed the stakeholders were meeting on 8 September, and that the group hoped to agree their representatives to the Stakeholder Liaison Group by the end of September; they plan to nominate representatives to the Strategy Board in time for its first meeting on 17 September. The Chairman **informed** the Board that he had been advised that the CBI wished to attend the stakeholders' meeting.

3.8 Responding to the comment that stakeholder involvement is welcomed and that the Partnership Board needs to find ways to communicate with and motivate them, Catriona Riddell **advised** the Board that she had met with the stakeholders, encouraging their involvement in the regional strategy process.

3.9 The Terms of Reference for the Strategy Board were **agreed**.

#### 4. Terms of Reference for the Delivery Boards

4.1 The Chairman **declared** an interest as he is a member of the Environment Agency Board; Pam Charlwood also **declared** an interest as she is a member of the regional LSC. Martin Tugwell then introduced the paper. Points raised in the following discussion were:

- The LSC will cease to exist from 1 March 2010 and shadow arrangements will be in place from September; there is a need to ensure that the region engages with the changes and provides leadership in integrating skills issues as part of the Regional Strategy; in so doing there is a need to take into account the enhanced role of local authorities in commissioning skills and training provision.
- There is a need to consider how the linkage with the national apprenticeship scheme and the Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA) will relate to the skills dimension of the Regional Strategy.
- It is important to ensure that the agenda mapped out in the Government's New Industry, New Jobs is taken into account by the delivery boards.
- The delivery boards must give greater consideration as to their role in helping the region make hard progress towards a low carbon society.

4.2 Responding, Martin Tugwell **informed** the Board that the establishment of the Economic Development and Skills Board (EDSB) provided the opportunity for the region to address the majority of the issues raised in discussion. He also **advised** that the secretariat would work with the respective Board Chairman to ensure that linkages between economic development and regeneration were addressed.

4.3 Colin Byrne emphasised the importance of the Partnership Board engaging effectively with the Skills Funding Agency once it is established.

4.4 Responding to the question about stakeholder representation on the Regional Housing and Regeneration Board (RHRB), Martin Tugwell **advised** the Board that it was expected that there would continue to be a representative from a housing association.

4.5 He **advised** the Board that guidance would be provided by the secretariat to the Stakeholder Liaison Group as to the skills being sought for each delivery board. While it would be for the Liaison Group to nominate the stakeholder representatives, the Partnership Board would wish to ensure that the 'right people are sitting around the right table'.

4.6 It was **agreed** that the Terms of Reference for the Regional Transport Board and Regional Housing and Regeneration Board would be adopted for an initial 12 month period. It was **agreed** that they would be reviewed at

the end of that period in light of experience and amended as and if necessary.

- 4.7 The Board **noted** the progress made with the preparation of the draft Terms of Reference for the Economic Development and Skills Board. It was **agreed** that the points raised in the discussion would be taken into account in preparing the final draft of the ToR. It was **agreed** that this would be circulated by email to the Delivery Board Working Group and back to the Partnership Board for approval.
- 4.8 John Furey thanked the members and officers who had constituted the Delivery Boards' working group for achieving much in a short time.
- 4.9 The Board discussed the role of 'delivery partners' on the Strategy Board as observers. The Board **noted** that although health is an important area of public sector policy, the advice was that any linkage with the Regional Strategy could be picked up more effectively in ways other than inviting the sector to be one of the 'delivery partners' nominated to the Strategy Board. Catriona Riddell **advised** the Board that health officials are already involved in the initial thinking on strategy process, but noted that some issues may be more appropriately dealt with at sub-regional level.
- 4.10 Responding to the suggestion that Network Rail should be considered as one of the agencies to be invited to attend the Strategy Board, Martin Tugwell **informed** the Board that Network Rail is already a member of the Regional Transport Board.
- 4.11 It was **agreed** that the four regional delivery partners to be invited as observers will be the Homes and Communities Agency, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency and the Learning and Skills Council (or successor body).
- 4.12 Responding to a question in respect of the Planning Panel, Catriona Riddell **advised** the Board that the Terms of Reference for the Panel would be considered by the Strategy Board at its inaugural meeting on 17 September 2009. It was **noted** that the proposal was for 11 local authorities to be represented on the Panel.

## 5. Delegated Authority: LDF Conformity and Major Applications

- 5.1 Catriona Riddell introduced her report. The Partnership Board has a responsibility as the Regional Planning Body to advise on the conformity of local development frameworks with the statutory planning framework set out in the South East Plan. It also has a responsibility to comment on the consistency of major planning applications with the South East Plan. These responsibilities are separate from SEEDA's role as the Regional Development Agency.
- 5.2 Points raised in the ensuing discussion were:
- It was not clear in the second bullet point under 3.2 who deems LDFs or major planning applications contentious etc. Catriona Riddell **advised** the Board that the test is whether the proposal is consistent with the statutory planning framework; if there were to be any doubt the matter would be referred to the sub-group.
  - It is important that development does not happen before the necessary infrastructure is in place and it was asked if the conformity process would control this. Catriona Riddell **advised** that

consideration of individual proposals is a matter for local determination; she noted that the wording in the South East Plan was helpful in this regard.

- 5.3 Colin Byrne **noted** the benefit of the Partnership Board, as the Regional Planning Body, being able to offer a view on major planning applications.
- 5.4 The Board **agreed** that the proposed process to handle conformity be put in place:
- All non-contentious Local Development Frameworks and major planning applications that are sent to the Partnership Board as RPB will be managed by the Strategy Unit and dealt with under delegation by the Director of Planning.
  - Local Development Frameworks or major planning applications that are identified as being contentious or raise issues of non-conformity will be determined by a small sub-group of the proposed Planning Panel (Terms of Reference for the Planning Panel will be considered by the Strategy Board at its meeting on 17 September) comprising three local authority members and one SEEDA Board member. This group will operate mainly as a virtual group.
- 5.5 It was **noted** that SEEDA will continue to respond separately to LDFs and major planning applications as a Statutory Consultee in its own right. It was also **noted** that local authorities continued to have their own rights to be consulted on major planning applications.
- 5.6 The Strategy Unit and SEEDA staff will continue to meet regularly to share views and identify proposals that are potentially contentious.
- 6. Implementation Update: to Report on RFA Submission and Identify Key Funding and Delivery Issues for the Next 12 Months**
- 6.1 Martin Tugwell introduced his report and tabled a paper summarising the Government's response to the RFA submission; he drew particular attention to the references within the response to the growing pressure on public sector finances.
- 6.2 Points raised during the following discussion were:
- Transport cuts are an easy option.
  - The Partnership Board needs to be more aggressive in reminding the Government that the South East is the 'bread basket' of the economy. Since making the RFA submission the economic situation has worsened; there is a need to make the strongest possible case to the Government that the region's contribution cannot be taken for granted.
- 6.3 The Board **agreed**:
- a) That the Delivery Boards assess the implications and potential risks to delivery arising from the Government's response to the region's Regional Funding Allocation submission.
  - b) To reaffirm the commitment to bring the Implementation Plans of the South East Plan and Regional Economic Strategy together into a single Regional Delivery Plan.

- c) That the Strategy Unit begins work on preparing the region's case in support of a submission to the next spending review.

## 7. Regional Transport Board: Update on Work Programme

- 7.1 Martin Tugwell introduced his report, **advising** the Board that reports from the Delivery Boards to inform the Partnership Board of work in hand will be made on a rotational basis; the next one would possibly be from the Regional Housing and Regeneration Board.
- 7.2 The Board **noted** the contents of the report and **agreed** that the Regional Transport Board should continue with its work programme and report back to the Partnership Board.

## 8. New Regional Strategy: Evidence Papers and Workshops on Key Scenarios

- 8.1 Tim Stansfeld introduced his report; points raised in the following discussion were:
- The themes for the evidence papers are "spot on" but economic activity should be included in all of them, not just one as at present.
  - Part of the region's investment is its world class universities.
  - Each theme is huge in its challenge; we need to be realistic as well as optimistic.
  - An urgent piece of work is reviewing the relevance of the existing strategies to adapt to the current situation, before work on the new Regional Strategy is undertaken.
- 8.2 Responding to these points, Catriona Riddell **advised** the Board that these workshops are intended to show how much of the existing strategies are still relevant or if the Partnership Board is really starting with a blank sheet of paper.
- 8.3 The Board **agreed** that, as part of the initial work on the new Regional Strategy, the Partnership Board Strategy Unit should:
- a) Produce six Evidence Papers on key scenarios which will affect the region over the next 20 years, on the following topics:
    - o Climate Change and a low carbon society.
    - o Demographic change and the ageing population.
    - o Improving Housing Affordability.
    - o Technological Innovation and Economic Growth.
    - o Dealing with Economic Disadvantage.
    - o Funding for Infrastructure and investment.
  - b) Hold three workshops with invited decision makers and stakeholders to discuss the Evidence Papers and the issues raised.
  - c) The first workshop to be held in November/December.

**9. Items for Information:**

**a) South East Plan: to Report Key Messages**

- 9.1 The Board **received** the report and **noted** that there is a partial review of the Plan, with an EiP in October 2009 on aggregates and an EiP in February 2010 on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

**b) Forward Programme**

- 9.2 The Board **received** the forward programme, **noting** that it is regularly updated and will be available on the Partnership Board's website when launched.

**10. Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday, 9 February 2010, 14.30 to 17.30**

- 10.1 The date and time of the next meeting were **noted**; however it was **agreed** that the possibility of holding an additional meeting at an earlier date would be investigated.

**11. Any Other Business**

- 11.1 There was none.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 16.25.