

TEES VALLEY COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD

**Meeting Room 1, Cavendish House, Teesdale Business Park,
Stockton-on-Tees at 10.00am on Wednesday, 24 August 2016**

ATTENDEES

Members

Mayor David Budd (Chair)	Mayor of Middlesbrough Council	MBC
Councillor Bill Dixon	Leader of Darlington Borough Council	DBC
Councillor Christopher Akers-Belcher	Leader of Hartlepool Borough Council	
Councillor Sue Jeffrey	Leader of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	R&CBC
Councillor Bob Cook	Leader of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	SBC
Paul Booth	Chair of Tees Valley LEP	LEP

Associate Members

Phil Cook	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
Naz Parkar	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
David Soley	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP

Apologies for absence

Paul Croney	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
Ian Kinnery	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
Alastair MacColl	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
Nigel Perry	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP
David Robinson	Member of Tees Valley LEP	LEP

Officers

Gill Alexander	Chief Executive of Hartlepool Borough Council	HBC
Peter Bell	TVCA / Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	SBC
David Bond	Monitoring Officer (TVCA)	SBC
James Bromiley	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	R&CBC
Ada Burns	Chief Executive of Darlington Borough Council	DBC
Garry Cummings	Section 151 Officer (TVCA)	SBC
Linda Edworthy	TVCA	TVCA
Sharon Jones	TVCA	TVCA

Neil Kenley	TVCA	TVCA
Tony Parkinson	Interim Chief Executive of Middlesbrough Council	MBC
Neil Schneider	Chief Executive of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	MBC
Amanda Skelton	Chief Executive of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	R&CBC
Martin Waters	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	SBC
Keith Wilson	TVCA	TVCA
<u>Also in attendance</u> Councillor Phil Dennis	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council and Chair of the TVCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee	

Action

TVCA 44/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no interests declared.

TVCA 45/16 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

There were no announcements from the Chair.

TVCA 46/16 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meetings held on 7 June, 8 July and 19 July 2016.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 7 June, 8 July and 19 July 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

TVCA 47/16 UPDATE ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The following updates were given on recent developments:-

Governance Review – Consultation - Feedback

An update was given on the Governance Review Consultation that had been carried out.

The update outlined that an initial analysis had been carried out on the responses that had been submitted. There were some themes that were emerging in the answers and some of those linked closely with local context. There was also a theme around having an elected Mayor and issues involved in that process. There was also a theme around governance more widely and the need to make sure that bureaucracy

was kept to a minimum and the need to make sure that interests were represented properly in the workings of a Mayoral Combined Authority.

With regard to the question on powers the majority of people thought they were about right. Some people thought there needed to be far more checks and balances and some people thought there needed to be less checks and balances.

With regard to the next steps, DCLG were expecting that TVCA provide some feedback by 26 August 2016. A formal report would be provided by 9 September 2016.

Members felt that there was a need to get more information to the public about the powers and responsibilities of the Combined Authority and how an elected Mayor would work closely local authorities.

The next stage would be that DCLG, if they were content with the findings of the consultation would then draw up the legislation which would enact the powers on which TVCA had consulted. A meeting had been requested with the Secretary of State in September to discuss the whole position of devolution.

Given everything that had happened recently with central government Members felt that reassurance was needed from DCLG about the progress of the devolution deal and the commitment that had been made to the TVCA in relation to the offer and to the subsequent offers that had been made. Members would expect to see that reassurance sooner rather than later.

RESOLVED that the update on recent developments be noted.

TVCA 48/16 ESTABLISHING THE TEES VALLEY LAND COMMISSION

Consideration was given to a report on the establishment of a Tees Valley Land Commission.

As reported to the Tees Valley Combined Authority on 7 June 2016 the devolution deal provided for the establishment of a Land Commission (the Commission). In preparing for the establishment of the Commission and to bring forward suggested terms of reference, membership and governance arrangements, preparation work had commenced including the development of a brownfield and surplus public sector land register. Consideration was also given to the possible alignment with the Cabinet Office 'One Public Estate' programme and the opportunity to seek resources to support this work. Finally, a proposed timeline for the establishment of the Commission had been considered. The report therefore presented:-

- Proposals for the Terms of Reference, membership and governance;
- Proposals for alignment with the One Public Estate Programme;
- An update on the development of the brownfield and surplus public sector land register;
- A proposed timeline for the establishment of the Commission.

It was noted that the proposals and recommendations as outlined in the report were based on discussions with DCLG who were providing support in the preparations for the establishment of the Commission.

The aim of the Commission was to maximise the use of brownfield land and land held by Government departments and their agencies to support economic development and housing supply. The proposed terms of reference for the Tees Valley Land Commission were:

- Identify brownfield and surplus public sector land in Tees Valley and prepare a database;
- Work with the Combined Authority and individual Local Authorities to identify and agree priorities;
- Take account of existing analysis, intelligence and plans including the:
Tees Valley Housing Strategy and Action Plan;
HCA / LA Growth Sites analysis 2016;
The revised Strategic Economic Plan;
Local Plans.
- Assess the opportunities to bring forward brownfield and public sector land for development to support economic growth, within the context of local priorities;
- Identify the barriers preventing or delaying brownfield and public sector land being brought forward for development;
- Identify how brownfield and public sector land may better support local investment priorities and economic growth;
- Work in support of the Combined Authority to overcome identified barriers;
- Consider mayoral development corporation powers and make recommendations to the Combined Authority on any sites that may be better brought forward through such a vehicle;
- Consider opportunities and make recommendations to the Combined Authority on the potential of strategic development approach to smaller infill sites by working with and supporting the SME sector;
- Where appropriate make recommendations to the Mayor, Combined Authority and Government to ensure development opportunities are brought forward and the value of land assets are retained locally and utilised to support the local economy and investment requirements.

It was important to note that the Commission would undertake analysis and assessment to identify opportunities and barriers and based on this assessment make recommendations to the Combined Authority and to asset owners. The Commission therefore would not have any powers to determine decisions on brownfield and public sector land.

In fulfilling its remit the Commission would also need to take account of existing analysis, intelligence and plans including but not exclusively the:

- Tees Valley Housing Strategy and Action Plan;
- HCA / LA Growth Sites analysis 2016;
- The revised Strategic Economic Plan;
- Local Plans.

Membership of the Commission would need to reflect the interests of the Tees Valley Combined Authority, the Government, the key public sector landholders and potentially private owners with significant brownfield landholdings.

Dialogue had taken place with DCLG regarding establishing the membership of the Commission and a process agreed. With the support of the Cabinet Office Government Property Unit, DCLG would work with TVCA to facilitate the identification and appointment of senior civil servant / officer representation for the key public sector landholders to form the bases of a working group to support the commission. This was dependent upon the completion of the brownfield and public sector land register that was being prepared. Once the register was completed, the key public sector landholders would be identified and dialogue would then take place with the relevant Government departments and their agencies. It was expected that this process would take place over the summer/autumn 2016.

The proposed membership of the Commission, in part would be subject to completion of the register and the identification of key landholders, however the following was proposed as a starting point for the Commission and working group:

Commission

- Elected Mayor, Tees Valley Combined Authority (Chair) – TVCA Chair as interim
- Relevant Portfolio Leads, Tees Valley Combined Authority– TBC
- Government Minister/s, and/ or Senior Civil Servant representing cross government interests
- Senior HCA Representative
- Lead TVCA Officer

Working Group Supporting the Commission (Note, Working Group members should attend the Commission when matters relating to assets under their ownership were under review).

- Combined Authority and Tees Valley Local Authorities Officers - TBC
- Department for Communities and Local Government – TBC
- Cabinet Office Government Property Unit – TBC
- Department for Transport – TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Department for Education - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Department of Work and Pensions - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Department of Health - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Ministry of Justice - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Ministry of Defence - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Department of Business, Innovation & Skills - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified

- Homes & Communities Agency - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Network Rail - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Highways Agency - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified
- Significant private landholders - TBC, dependent on landholdings identified

Membership would be subject to formal agreement by both the Tees Valley Combined Authority and DCLG.

The Commission would be directly accountable to the Tees Valley Combined Authority and operate in an advisory capacity, reporting progress and making recommendations as appropriate. The Combined Authority would determine the terms of reference for the Commission and agree its membership. Where appropriate the Commission would seek the support of the Combined Authority in securing Government intervention to overcome barriers.

Any future proposals regarding the delegation of decision making powers to the Commission would need to be agreed in advance by the Tees Valley Combined Authority.

It was also proposed that, on an annual basis, the Combined Authority reviewed the ongoing need for the Commission and the extent of its remit.

In preparing for the establishment of the Land Commission, and as an interim measure, resources to date had been provided through contributions from the five Tees Valley local authorities. These interim resources should be sufficient for the establishment of the Commission; however, its ongoing resource requirements would need to be funded through the Combined Authority. DCLG had confirmed that additional Government funding for the Commission was unlikely and the expectation was that it would be funded through local resources.

In fulfilling its remit the Commission would need to undertake selected site assessments and evaluations to fully understand the opportunities, barriers and options for bringing forward development and making best use of asset values to support economic growth. In addition, the Commission would require dedicated officer resource to manage its programme of work. Finally, the Commission would require secretariat resource.

The Managing Director was undertaking a review of Combined Authority capacity and future resource requirements.

Potentially, some of this resource requirement might be offset by the alignment of the One Public Estate programme and associated funding.

One Public Estate (OPE) was a pioneering initiative delivered in partnership by the Cabinet Office Government Property Unit (GPU) and the Local Government Association (LGA). It provided practical and technical support and funding to councils to deliver ambitious property-focused programmes in collaboration with central government and other public sector partners.

OPE partnerships across the country had shown the value of working together across the public sector and taking a strategic approach to asset management. At its heart, the programme was about getting more from our collective assets – whether that was catalysing major service transformation such as health and social care integration and benefits reform, unlocking land for new homes and commercial space, or creating new opportunities to save on running costs or generate income. This was encompassed in four core objectives:

1. Creating economic growth (new homes and jobs)
2. More integrated, customer-focused services
3. Generating capital receipts
4. Reducing running costs.

OPE began as a pilot programme with 12 pilot areas in 2013. In 2014, a further 20 pilots were successful in joining the programme. Together, these 32 partnerships had shown that with the right expertise and support, a small investment can unlock significant benefits in service transformation, local growth and efficiency savings. In December 2015, the Government announced a major expansion to the OPE programme. Backed by £6 million funding announced at the Summer Budget 2015, 107 local authorities working in 24 partnerships successfully joined the programme. These partnerships had developed a wide range of land and property-focused projects. Together they expected to deliver 16,500 new homes, 36,000 new jobs, raise £138 million in capital receipts and save £56 million in running costs over the next five years.

GPU were looking to build a national programme on the successful foundations of earlier pilot phases. This meant new partnerships would continue to record and map assets, establish property boards to bring together public sector partners, and agree and implement joint projects. They also retained the philosophy of cross-public sector working on land and property to unlock major service transformation and/or economic growth priorities locally. GPU were inviting partnerships to apply, putting forward ambitious and credible work programmes to be delivered in collaboration with other public sector partners in the area. For partnerships to deliver an ambitious and credible programme of work, GPU were offering:

- Funding of up to £500,000 per partnership to: build effective partnerships and/or capacity in your area; fund project management expertise to drive and coordinate across your programme; support partners to unlock progress on more complex or ambitious projects; optimise outputs where, for example, a large central government site is released.
- Practical LGA and GPU support including barrier-busting and sharing good practice.
- Technical support from analysts and data experts, including on recording, mapping and benchmarking.
- Access to senior central and local government experts.
- Access to a Ministerial Star Chamber to help overcome barriers to delivery.
- Facilitated Opportunities Workshops to identify new projects to

take forward.

- Continued development of government policy to assist local delivery.
- A pool of experts to provide additional support and capacity, for example on master-planning, feasibility work, business case development, cost evaluation, etc.

Discussions had taken place with the Cabinet Office Government Property Unit and an application to join the OPE programme from the Tees Valley Combined Authority was being encouraged. The programme provided the opportunity to access the funding and support on offer, align this resource to support the remit of the Land Commission in bringing forward land to support economic growth. The Cabinet Office Government Property Unit endorsed an approach that sought the alignment of the OPE programme and the remit of the Land Commission. It was planned that the next round of applications would open in September with an expression of interest deadline of 7 October 2016. If successful an award of up to £50,000 would be made to develop the full submission (to be submitted 16 December 2016). If the final application was successful Tees valley Combined Authority would join OPE and be awarded up to £500,000 to deliver the programme (successful applications to be announced 27 January 2017).

In establishing the Commission a brownfield and surplus public sector land register was required. With the support of land specialists work had been completed to review existing data sources and develop proposals for the creation of a Tees Valley brownfield and public sector land register.

Work had commenced on the next phase which was to create the land register in advance of the Commission being established. Working with DCLG and the Cabinet Office Government Property Unit TVCA were engaging with Government departments and their agencies on the data collection. The aim was to have the land register completed by September 2016, which would be in advance of an inaugural meeting of the Commission.

The proposal was to formally establish the Land Commission in autumn 2016. In part, this would enable emerging findings regarding the use of mayoral development corporation powers to be considered in advance of the mayoral election in May 2017. Emerging findings would also support the development of proposals regarding devolution of housing funding and the creation of an investment pipeline.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments on the report. These questions and comments could be summarised as follows:-

- Differences between the Land Commission and the role of the South Tees Development Corporation needed to be made clearer, how they sat together, how they worked together and where the overlaps were.
- Would the South Tees Development Corporation land be included in the Land Commission remit and where was that discussion taking place?

Officers made the following comments in response to some of the issues that had been raised by Members:-

- The Land Commission would be focused on the land across the whole of the Tees Valley with analysis and assessment of that land. The Land Commission would not be a delivery vehicle or delivery mechanism. Development Corporation powers were the delivery vehicles.
- The Land Commission would be more of a task and finish body, making recommendations to try and bring leverage and pressure to make better use of land, overcoming barriers particularly around the national public sector stock.
- In terms of Mayoral Development Corporation powers, South Tees had been agreed and was progressing and had not been put on the back burner.
- For using Mayoral Development Corporation powers which only had powers around redline for sites identified when the powers are triggered.
- Outside of the South of the Tees there was a piece of work to be done to identify where there would be value in doing that across the Tees Valley. Part of that identification process was through the Land Commission, it might identify strategic sites or cross boundary sites.
- Between now and the end of the calendar year there would be work done with individual local authorities to ask them where they saw the strategic sites or portfolio of sites and how they see Mayoral Development Corporation powers being effective. The intention was then to produce a business analysis / business case for using those powers outside of the South of the Tees for recommendations to the newly elected Mayor.
- Because it had been agreed that the South Tees Development Corporation would deal with the land there would be no added value for the Land Commission to consider that land.
- The Land Commission would not try to deliver all surplus brown field land across the Tees Valley, it would try to add value, provide an evidence base and give additional leverage where needed.

RESOLVED that:-

1. The Tees Valley Land Commission Terms of Reference as set out in paragraph 2.1 be approved.
2. The interim appointment of the current TVCA Chair as interim Chair of the Tees Valley Land Commission be approved.
3. Other authorities be invited to identify a lead member to join the Tees Valley Land Commission.
4. The Lead Chief Executive and TVCA Managing Director to establish the necessary working group arrangements.
5. The proposed governance for the Tees Valley Land Commission be approved.
6. A detailed Land Commission resource plan be developed as part

of the wider review of Combined Authority capacity.

7. An expression of interest be submitted to join the One Public Estates programme. The approval of the expression of interest document be delegated to the Managing Director, in consultation with the appropriate portfolio holder in advance of submission.
8. The progress in preparing the brownfield and public sector land register be noted.
9. The plan to establish the Tees Valley Land Commission in autumn 2016 be approved.

TVCA 49/16 IMPACT OF BRITISH WITHDRAWAL OF MEMBERSHIP FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION

Consideration was given to a report on the Impact of British withdrawal of membership from the European Union.

Attached to the report was a policy note that identified the possible implications for economic development in the Tees Valley of the recent referendum decision for the withdrawal of British membership of the European Union ('Brexit').

The proposed movement away from full membership of the European Union (EU) would have impacts on the following economic development functions:-

- Funding/Investment support: Tees Valley was the second largest recipient per head in England of European Structural Funds (£245 per head, Cornwall: £920). Unless replacement funds were secured there was potential for the loss of £131m (total allocation of £170m) of direct financial support to the Tees Valley region. However the announcement by HM Treasury of supporting all projects which had been 'signed off' prior to the Autumn Statement potentially meant that Tees Valley's £14m Business Compass programme should secure funding;
- Regulatory Environment: Dependent on the type of trading relationship the UK had with the EU would determine the UK's ability to freely set the type and level of support on offer to businesses and the degree to which UK environmental policy might vary from European environmental regulations. There was however an opportunity to amend existing UK competition policy and provide additional support aimed at enhancing the productivity / international competitiveness of strategically important industrial sectors;
- Exporting and foreign direct investment: The North East (including Tees Valley) exported more goods to the EU than any other UK region. This position was further compounded by the high levels of Foreign Direct investment attracted to the region as a potential entry point to the Single European Market. There was a need to address two issues:

Ensure continued access to core European markets for priority sectors

such as chemicals and advanced manufacturing; and
Develop new trading arrangements and support for Tees Valley firms in diversifying international trade activity to faster growing non-European markets.

- Attraction and retention of talent: At present, in-migration by European nationals was approximately 1,000 per year. Many people had concerns regarding high levels of immigration, particularly its impact on access to low skilled jobs. However, curbs on migration might lead to a short term reduction in the skilled workforce and exacerbate existing and projected skills gaps, particularly in priority sectors. In addition, it might lead to a reduction in the number of international students attending Tees Valley's various higher and further education institutes. Aside from the financial bonus such students bring to the region, there might be a reduction in other in-kind benefits, including:

The boost to external demand as a consequence of increased familiarity with locally produced goods;

Increased tourism revenues for returnees and/or their families; and

Increased international awareness of the Tees Valley as a place to live, work and play.

- International knowledge transfer: There was the potential that Tees Valley universities and research bodies might have restricted access to European research programmes such as Horizon 2020.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments on the report. These questions and comments could be summarised as follows:-

- In terms of the attraction and retention of talent do you envisage it would be significantly more challenging to recruit to higher skilled positions?
- In terms of further and higher education the impact would be fairly limited as many of the international students come from countries outside of the EU.
- The issue of £131 million potential loss of EU funding was of concern to Members. Government needed to give the Tees Valley guarantees that schemes would still proceed.
- With regard to the Industrial Strategy that was being negotiated, what was that? What did that look like? What was the TVCA role in that? TVCA should be preempting this by preparing an Industrial Strategy rather than waiting to be asked.
- How was the Tees Valley voice being represented in the Brexit negotiations?
- TVCA needed to consult with the local business community to discuss what the best outcome would be for them.

Officers made the following comments in response to some of the issues that had been raised by Members:-

- With regard to the attraction and retention of talent it was hard to estimate at this moment in time as it was not known if there would be any constraint on migration into the region. It would be

very hard to plan over the next 3 to 5 years for medium to long term labour planning. Some of the higher skilled positions couldn't be sourced locally at present so it was a case of signposting this element of risk at the present.

- Many students did come from outside of the EU but the perceptions of the UK and the Tees Valley needed to be considered. The message needed to get out that the UK and the Tees Valley were open for business and inward investment which would ensure the attraction of talent.
- It was hoped the LGA would have a seat round the table during the Brexit negotiations.
- The TVCA was committed to producing some sector action plans resulting from the detail that the SEP contained.
- Understanding how the TVCA delivered the new additional 25,000 jobs. Part of that work was working with businesses to understand what the challenges and opportunities were to achieving that and what role the TVCA could play.

RESOLVED that the Combined Authority:

Funding:

1. Secure from Central Government ring-fenced funding for the region comparable in scale and range of support to that previously supported under the European Structural and Investment Funds.

Regulatory Environment:

2. Ensure that the emerging British Industrial Strategy recognises the strategic importance to national competitiveness of Tees Valley's priority sectors and develops additional support aimed at mitigating constraints to those strategically important industrial sectors.

Exporting:

3. Consult with local businesses to assess the impact of Brexit on existing trade and identify emerging markets; and
4. Identify target markets and develop additional wraparound support for emerging market opportunities.

Foreign Direct Investment:

5. Establish sector strategies for key industries, developed in collaboration with business, with a particular focus on maintaining and developing the supply chain, to encourage investment in those areas which will most benefit industries in which the UK has existing strengths; and
6. Implement policies that support an attractive investment climate, in particular investing in adequate new transport infrastructure, investing in sufficient generating capacity to provide affordable power and ensuring the planning regime is fit for purpose.

Attraction and Retention of Talent:

7. Work with local industry to assess emerging skills demands and to signpost skills gaps to Central Government to inform subsequent migration targets;
8. Work with all local Higher and Further Education Institutes to ensure that sufficient numbers of foreign students can access further and higher education opportunities in the Tees Valley area; and
9. In liaison with local authorities and the community and voluntary sector work with the local community and recent and long established migrants to signpost the scope and scale of emerging opportunities and how they can best access them.

International Knowledge Transfer:

10. Work with local Universities and research bodies to assess current Horizon 2020 and other transnational programme commitments and identify any emerging constraints to future access

TVCA 50/16 RESPONDING TO LORD HESELTINE'S REPORT ON THE TEES VALLEY

Consideration was given to a report on the publication of Lord Heseltine's report on the Tees Valley and made recommendations on how best to exploit the opportunity offered by it.

Lord Heseltine's independent report "Tees Valley: Opportunity Unlimited" was published and launched on 7 June. At the meeting on the same day Members made a number of suggestions on how to capitalise on the opportunity offered by publication.

The report set out a bright future for the Tees Valley. During his work, Lord Heseltine said repeatedly that he was very impressed with the progress that was being made in Tees Valley following the economic shocks of the past year and with the leadership shown by the Combined Authority, local authorities and partners. In his report he said:

"I make no apology for indulging in mission creep. It is the only way I can adequately salute and praise the transformation that is taking place in the Tees Valley" (introduction to the report)

and

"I have been hugely impressed with the number of people in local government, the public and private sectors who are determined to lead this new opportunity" (introduction to the report).

The report made recommendations in seven key areas:

- Industrial regeneration;
- Growth opportunities and wider regeneration;

- Education, employment and skills;
- Energy economy;
- Housing;
- Transport Infrastructure; and
- Leisure, environment and tourism.

An analysis of the Heseltine report had taken place against the revised Tees Valley Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). This had demonstrated that the Heseltine report and the SEP were largely complementary – just as hoped, having worked closely with the team on the publication of the Heseltine report. In many cases the Heseltine recommendations echoed things which were already underway or were planned. In these cases the recommendations gave extra force to the proposals and might help to lever in additional support where that was required.

The full set of recommendations and suggested responses were attached to the report. Where the recommendation was directed at a third party or Government an action was set to ensure that the recommendation was delivered.

The proposal to stage a major conference in the Tees Valley had been made in a number of different contexts. Lord Heseltine recommended the idea of a conference; before that it was discussed as part of the devolution deal and Government undertook to support such a conference.

Having considered the options, the report outlined that the best option was one which set out the progress being made in Tees Valley across a variety of fronts – devolution; regeneration; and the circular economy. Building on Lord Heseltine’s view that Tees Valley could be marketed more strongly and the conference could be used to showcase successes and attractiveness as a place to live and work to a wider audience.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments on the report. These questions and comments could be summarised as follows:-

- The content and audience of the conference needed to be right.
- Members would like a further report giving the scope of the conference, potential costs, how it was going to be developed and resourced

RESOLVED that:-

1. The publication of Lord Heseltine’s report and the actions that are taking place in response to the report be noted.
2. A further report be prepared on the developing of a major conference in the Autumn to publicise the progress on devolution in the Tees Valley and to mark the opportunity offered by the Heseltine report.

TVCA 51/16 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

TVCA 52/16 LOCAL GROWTH FUND – SKILLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to a report on the recent process to invite activity to come forward in relation to the skills capital element of the Local Growth Fund Programme.

RESOLVED that the following projects for entry in to the Local Growth Fund Programme be approved subject to formal due diligence:

- Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council: Kirkleatham Catering Academy (£2.4m LGF);
- Stockton Riverside College: NETA Skills Centre (£0.824m LGF); and
- Hartlepool College of Further Education: Skills Enhancement – Telecare and Electric Vehicles (£0.130m LGF).

TVCA 53/16 FORWARD PLAN

Consideration was given to the TVCA Board Forward Plan.

RESOLVED that the TVCA Board Forward Plan be noted.

TVCA 54/16 DATES OF THE NEXT MEETINGS

The date of the next meeting on 2 November 2016 was noted.

Chair