

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Meeting to be held in the Civic Centre (Committee Room No. 1) on Monday 27th June, 2016 at 5.30 p.m.

Membership

Cllrs Blackburn, Curran, M. Dixon, Essl, G. Galbraith, E. Gibson, Marshall, Porthouse, D. Snowdon, Taylor, Turner, W. Turton.

ITEM		PAGE
1.	Apologies for Absence	
2.	Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Shadow Economic Prosperity Scrutiny Committee held on 21st April and of the Ordinary Meeting held on 27th April, 2016 (copies attached).	1
3.	Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)	-
	Part A – Cabinet Referrals and Responses	
	No Items.	
	Part B – Scrutiny Business	
4.	Annual Work Programme 2016/17	11
	Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached).	
5.	Sunderland Software City – Phase 3	14
	Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached).	

Contact: Christine Tilley Governance Services Team Leader Tel: 561 1345
Email: Christine.tilley@sunderland.gov.uk

Information contained in this agenda can be made available in other languages and formats on request

6.	Key Cities Group - Feedback	22
----	------------------------------------	----

Report of the Chief Executive (copy attached).

7.	Notice of Key Decisions Published 24 May 2016	29
----	--	----

(copy attached).

Part C – CCFA/Members Item/Petitions

No items.

E. WAUGH,
Head of Law and Governance,
Civic Centre,
SUNDERLAND.

16th June, 2016.

At an Extraordinary meeting of the SHADOW ECONOMIC PROSPERITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the BOARD ROOM, SUNDERLAND SOFTWARE CENTRE, TAVISTOCK PLACE, SUNDERLAND on TUESDAY 21ST APRIL, 2016 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor David Snowdon in the Chair

Councillors Beck, Davison, M. Dixon, Elliott, G. Galbraith, I. Galbraith, E. Gibson, Marshall, Porthouse, Price, and Wood.

Also in attendance:-

Councillor Norma. Wright, Chairman Scrutiny Committee
Councillor Dianne Snowdon, Vice Chairman Scrutiny Committee

Mr Richard Moon, Senior Development Executive, Coventry City Council
Mr Jim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer, Sunderland City Council
Mr Andrew Perkin, Lead Policy Officer for Economy and Sustainability, Sunderland City Council
Mr David Noon, Principal Governance Services Officer, Sunderland City Council

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Blackburn, Forbes, Lauchlan, Scaplehorn, Taylor, B. Turton and M. Turton.

Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)

There were no declarations of interest made.

Policy Review Into Key Cities Group

The Head of Scrutiny and Area Arrangements submitted a report (copy circulated), which set out the background to the attendance of Mr Richard Moon, Senior Development Executive at Coventry City Council as part of the Committee's review into the Key Cities Group of Local Authorities.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Cllr David Snowdon welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that its purpose was to find out more about the work of the Key Cities Group of local authorities and the approach being taken by Coventry City Council to economic regeneration.

Mr Moon provided members with a comprehensive powerpoint presentation

explaining that he would focus on two particular areas of the work of the Key Cities Group.

- Formation, aims and objectives
- approach of Coventry to city centre development

He suggested that members should feel free to chip in with any questions as he went along rather than wait to the end of the presentation.

Members were advised that the Key Cities Group was founded in 2013 with five founding members including Sunderland and Coventry. The number of members had now risen to 26. The Group was chaired by Councillor Paul Watson from Sunderland Council (Sunderland also acted as the Lead Authority in terms of secretarial and policy support). Members comprised a wide variety of mid-sized cities. However they shared a wide range of common concerns.

The work of the Key Cities Group has focused on four priorities which were being delivered by sub groups:-

- Innovative Finance – lead city Peterborough
- Skills and Employability – lead city York
- Devolution – lead city Wakefield
- Future of the city centre – lead city Coventry

Mr Moon advised that the Key Cities Group faced four major challenges:-

- Access to funding – Combined Authority
- Influencing the Devolution Debate
- Sharing best practice with peers
- Promoting greater influence at a national level

In response to an enquiry from Councillor David Snowdon in respect of access to funding, Mr Moon advised that Coventry City Council considered that the Combined Authority would bring access to funding streams that would not otherwise be available and that failure to join could effectively worsen the economic situation in the city. In particular it was anticipated that the Combined Authority would allow access to greater borrowing and capital resources. In the case of Coventry this could bring access to £150m for 2 major schemes regeneration schemes in the city centre.

Mr Moon emphasised the important role of the Key Cities Group in lobbying central government and seeking to influence their thinking. In this regard Councillor Marshall asked whether any feedback had been received from Government Ministers as to the success of this lobbying? Mr Moon replied that while experience had shown that the views of local authorities were not always given due weight by governments of any political hue, it was important that every effort should still be made to influence government thinking. He felt that the Group could help to provide a voice and influence for mid-sized local authorities such as Coventry and Sunderland

Another area where Mr Moon felt that lobbying was vital, centred on government plans to allow local authorities to retain all locally raised business rates and phase out the distribution of the core grant. While supporting the importance of local authorities encouraging business growth in their area, it was felt that the proposed changes could have a catastrophic effect on areas such as Sunderland and

Coventry that have depended on funding from the Rate Support Grant. Mr Moon felt that the Key Cities Group, together with organisations such as CIPFA, had an increasingly important role in highlighting to government the potential financial and social consequences.

With regard to Coventry's approach to City Centre development Mr Moon advised that the City Council was the Key Cities Group lead authority on the future of the city centre. However, he stressed that there was no magic formula for successful regeneration and that the key was to learn from the experiences of others while tailoring action to the particular circumstances and needs of an area.

As far as Coventry was concerned the city centre had been badly damaged during World War II and that the standard of reconstruction and subsequent redevelopments had left a number of problems. The city centre was unattractive, public realm required improvement, the retail offer was not great and there was little vibrancy to the night time economy. The central areas contained little in the way of professional/financial employment with office space being largely located outside the city centre. This in turn had had a knock on effect on the health of the retail sector.

Under new political leadership, the city had embarked on an ambitious strategy for growth based on:-

- Improving housing numbers and mix
- Higher quality jobs in the city centre
- Improving the retail offer
- Becoming more business friendly
- Expanding the business rate
- Working closely with the University

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Davidson, Mr Moon advised that the Council owned no social housing having undertaken a stock transfer over a decade ago. Councillor M. Dixon asked if the transfer had been successful. Mr Moon confirmed that it had been and major improvements had been made to the condition of social housing in the City.

In response to a further enquiry from Councillor M. Dixon, Mr Moon advised that the Company had built a few homes for sale but had generally concentrated on its core business of social housing. With regard to an enquiry from Councillor I. Galbraith, Mr Moon confirmed that concerns existed over the effect of the extension of the right to buy to social housing and the disincentive effect it would have on any growth in social housing building.

In terms of housing, Mr Moon noted that 70% of housing was located in the lower Council Tax band. (A/B). The city also experienced a sharp demographic divide; with a more affluent area located in the south of the city and a less affluent area to the north. This created a very visible and stark reflection of social and economic inequality within the city.

The City was felt to suffer from an insufficient amount of higher value housing and as a result had difficulties retaining and attracting people with a higher level of disposal income. The Council was therefore keen to increase the amount of house building in the city, particularly at the higher end of the market with 42,000 new homes planned

by 2031. It was anticipated that this growth in housing would generate a welcome income revenue stream for the city and contribute to a growth in retail demand and vibrancy within the city centre.

A major priority for Coventry Council was to attract more and better quality employment opportunities to the city centre. Central to this was the Friargate development which would involve the redesign of a large part of the city centre and include a new Council complex located near Coventry railway station. The development would include office space, two hotels, new homes, retail space and restaurants. Plans for the 37 acre site could create 7,800 construction jobs over the next 15 years and 13,400 office jobs. New infrastructure work should also help link the area around the railway station to the city centre and thereby help to regenerate the city centre as a whole.

The Council would play a vital role in promoting and facilitating development by providing substantial financial support and relocating its offices to the site. This relocation would also involve the sale of existing Council office buildings to the University which would be used as part of their planned expansion and redevelopment. Around £30m of ERDF/RGF has also been secured to support transport infrastructure.

Mr Moon considered that without this support from the Council it was unlikely that the development would have been viable. Inevitably such an ambitious project brought with it an element of risk to the Council in terms of its financial commitment. However, the Friargate development was seen as very much a long term project and necessary given the considerable challenges facing the city. The decision to build a new Civic Centre in the city centre had not been without public and press criticism but the Council had tried to emphasise the long term advantages involved including the savings to be made on running costs and the economic stimulus it would provide to the city centre.

In response to a query from the Chairman regarding the use of local labour clauses in Coventry, Mr Moon noted that they had been used but that there were a number of legal difficulties associated with them. The Council preferred to use persuasion and encouragement rather than legal enforcement in order to ensure that the local workforce was given access to the employment created through the regeneration of the city centre.

As well as the Friargate development there were a number of other initiatives designed to improve the retail offer in the city. These included a revamp of the Cathedral Lanes shopping centre and the redevelopment of Broadgate which had traditionally been the heart of the city centre. Improvements had also been made to the public realm and the new square in Broadgate was kept vibrant with regular events. Again, the Council was standing behind the schemes financially. This was seen as essential to stem the flow of spending that had leaked out of the city in recent years. Hopefully, this would result in bigger high street names locating in the city centre and an improvement in the vibrancy of both the day time and nighttime economy.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Price, Mr Moon informed members that Coventry has two Universities located in the city; Coventry University in the city centre and Warwickshire University which is on the southern outskirts. Both were seen as vital to the city in terms of building up the local skills base and attracting in

people and investment. The University were working closely with local businesses to develop the engineering courses vital for the growth of the advanced manufacturing sector. This included working with Jaguar Land Rover which remains a major employer in the city.

Councillor M. Dixon commented that the population of Sunderland had recently started to decline and asked what the position was in Coventry. Mr Moon advised that the population of Coventry was growing. That was a constant drift to the suburbs but this had been more than made up for by an influx of migrants from eastern Europe.

In conclusion, members referred to the considerable similarities between Coventry and Sunderland in terms of the economic challenges they faced and the way in which they are responding to those challenges. It was felt that the session had provided an opportunity for each to learn from the experience of the other and that it was important to ensure that the dialogue between the two authorities continued into the future. Mr Moon advised that he would be more than happy to host a visit of a delegation from Sunderland to Coventry.

The Chairman having thanked Mr Moon for his presentation, it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the report and presentation be received and noted.

The Chairman then closed the meeting having thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions to the meeting.

(Signed) DAVID SNOWDON,
Chairman.

At a meeting of the SHADOW ECONOMIC PROSPERITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE, SUNDERLAND on WEDNESDAY, 27TH APRIL, 2016 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Scanlan in the Chair

Councillors Beck, Davison, M. Dixon, Elliott, English, Foster, G. Galbraith, I. Galbraith, E. Gibson, Kay, Marshall, Porthouse, Scaplehorn David Snowdon and Taylor.

Also in attendance:-

Mr David Abdy, SSTC Project Director
Mr Jim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer
Ms Alison Fellows, Executive Director of Commercial Development
Mr Ian Flannery, Project Director Sunderland Tall Ships 2018
Mr David Noon, Principal Governance Services Officer

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Curran, Forbes, Lauchlan, Price and Wood.

Minutes of the Last Meeting of the Shadow Committee held on 29th March 2016

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Shadow Committee held on 29th March, 2016 (copy circulated), be confirmed and signed as a correct record

Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)

Councillor Scanlan made an open declaration in the Tall Ships 2018 Project Report as a Board Member of Sunderland Live.

Tall Ships Race 2018 – Progress Report

The Assistant Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated), which introduced a presentation by Ian Flannery, Project Director, which provided for Members' information, an update on preparations for the Tall Ships event to be hosted in Sunderland from 11-14 July, 2018.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

In response to an enquiry from the Chair, Mr Flannery advised that the dredging of the river in preparation for the event was expected to begin in June 2017.

Councillor E. Gibson sought assurances that the opportunity to become Sail Trainees and Sail Training Ambassadors would be open to all and Mr Flannery confirmed that it was. Councillor Gibson further suggested that the presentation was provided to the Area Committees so they were aware of the opportunities available.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Porthouse, Mr Flannery advised that horizon scanning had been undertaken to ensure that there were no competing major events that clashed with dates of the Tall Ships visit to Sunderland. The Chair asked whether visitors would be required to pay to visit the ships whilst they were berthed in Sunderland. Mr Flannery replied that they would not as there would be free public access.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Scaplehorn, Mr Flannery informed Members that Sail Trainees were required to be 15 years of age to take part in the race. There was no upper age limit. Sail Ambassadors were required to be at least 12 years of age. Councillor David Snowdon asked what was being done to ensure that Sunderland companies benefited from the event. Mr. Flannery replied that at the tendering stage, where procurement rules allowed, priority would be given to Sunderland firms, followed by firms based in the North East and then those located outside the region.

The Chair noted that Festival Park would provide an excellent venue during the course of the event however it was in need of a complete overhaul. Mr Flannery replied that a 19 point plan to improve the Riverside had been put in place and that this included the Festival Park site.

Councillor Davison questioned whether the event would make a profit for the Council as the event was mid-week, outside the school holidays and that historically the event left hosting Councils facing a budget deficit. Mr Flannery agreed that there would be a cost to the Council and that Cabinet had agreed to support the event with a budget of £3million. This would be offset by £500,000 received in sponsorship and £750,000 from hospitality.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor I. Galbraith, Mr Flannery advised that the University were involved in the planning and staging of the event. The Dean had attended the recently held inaugural planning meeting and confirmed that he would be looking to involve as many students as possible particularly those on Event Management Courses. With regard to an enquiry from Councillor Beck regarding the number of ships signed up to date, Mr Flannery advised that formal registration did not open until 18 months before the event however he envisaged that up to 30 ships would have confirmed their attendance prior to this.

There being no further comments or questions for Mr Flannery, the Chair thanked him for his attendance and it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the report and presentation be received and noted.

New Wear Crossing

The Assistant Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated), which introduced a presentation by Alison Fellows (Executive Director of Commercial Development) and David Abdy (SSTC Project Director), which provided for Members' information, an update on progress made in delivering the new Wear Crossing and associated infrastructure.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Ms Fellows introduced the presentation by placing the new Wear Crossing within the context of the Sunderland strategic transport corridor (SSTC), a planned continuous dual carriageway, linking land at the A19 to the Port of Sunderland. The corridor would be developed in the following four distinct phases:-

Phase 1 - Improvements to St Mary's Way (work complete)

Phase 2 - New Wear Crossing (construction started spring 2015)

Phase 3 - Dual-carriageway linking the south end of the new Wear bridge with St Michael's Way in the city centre (construction start planned for spring 2018)

Phases 4 and 5 - Improvements on Wessington Way, between A19 and north end of new bridge and improvements to routes into the Port

The full route, including the new Wear crossing, would bring significant economic, regeneration and transport benefits to Sunderland and the wider North East region, helping to create 6000 new jobs in the river corridor alone. Other benefits included:-

- i) establishing a strategic public transport corridor connecting Washington, Nissan, the new Enterprise Zones and the A19 with the city centre and the Port of Sunderland
- ii) relieving congestion on and allow enhanced priority for public transport and cyclists across the Wearmouth and Queen Alexandra bridges
- iii) make a major contribution to the regeneration of the city centre and the Port of Sunderland
- iv) reducing journey times and improve journey time reliability for people travelling by car, public transport and by bike on routes across the city
- v) opening up the Metro to thousands of residents and workers in the Castletown area who will be a short walk across the river from Pallion Metro station
- vi) improve journey times along the existing A1231 Wessington Way by reducing the number of roundabouts and improving the road surface itself.

The total cost of the Wear Crossing amounted to £117.6 with £35.1 coming from the Council and the remaining £82.5 being funded from central Government.

Ms Fellows then introduced Mr Abdy who showed the Committee two animations detailing the construction methodology for the crossing and an aerial view of a journey along the SSTC from the Bridge to the Port. In addition Mr Abdy briefed members on:-

- i) The Project Team
- ii) Project Governance, and
- iii) The Key Construction Milestones

In conclusion Mr Abdy informed members that full and up to date information on the delivery of the Crossing could be found on the dedicated website

www.newwearingcrossing.co.uk A 24hr helpline was also available on 08002230379.

Councillor Davison referred to the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) and noted that Nissan had carried out test runs from their factory to the Port of Sunderland. Councillor David Snowdon also noted that Vantec had built a second plant adjacent to Nissan and asked whether the IAMP was closer to the Port of Tyne than Port of Sunderland. Ms Fellows advised that the purpose of the SSTC was to drive growth and develop potential at both ends. Everything possible was being done to drive usage of the Port and the IAMP was an important element of this.

Councillor Kay reported that the pressing concern for Millfield Councillors was Phase 3 of the SSTC (Dual-carriageway linking the south end of the new Wear bridge with St Michael's Way in the city centre) Members would welcome the improved connectivity it should bring. He referred to bridge maintenance and asked if cost were available. Mr Abdy advised that costings would fall into two categories, annual costs which were known and well understood (street lighting and road maintenance etc) and irregular, periodic maintenance such as cable replacement (potentially every 25 years) and painting (potentially every 15-25 years). In response to a further request from Councillor Kay, Mr Abdy advised that a ballpark figure for annual maintenance would be approximately £100,000 to £200,000 per year.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Porthouse, Mr Abdy advised that the Highways Agency would not be taking over responsibility for the Bridge maintenance once construction was completed and that the burden would rest with the Local Authority. With regard to a further question from Councillor Porthouse regarding whether or not the bridge would be constructed with British steel, Mr Abdy replied that it would not. The contract had been awarded to Victor Buyck Steel Construction, a Belgian firm who would be manufacturing the steel used. Members were advised however that by far the greatest component used in the construction would be concrete and that would be sourced entirely from within Sunderland.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Elliott, Ms Fellows informed Members that the completion of phase 5 of the SSTC would be some 4 to 5 years distant. Ms Fellows advised that should Members wish, she would ask Mark Jackson, Head of Transport and Infrastructure to attend a future meeting to apprise the Committee of the SSTC Project as whole. Councillor I Galbraith stated that this would be useful. Given the prominence of the Bridge within the Project, the man in the street tended to see it as a North/South link rather than East/West.

There being no further questions or comments, the Chair thanked Ms Fellows and Mr Abdy for their presentation and it was:-

Yim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer presented the report and addressed comments and questions from members together with Ms Rowlands and Mr Gustard who were present to provide technical information in respect of their area of expertise.

Consideration having been given to the report, and members having debated the merits of education versus enforcement it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the report and presentation be received and noted.

Policy Review into Key Cities Group

The Head of Scrutiny and Area Arrangements submitted a report (copy circulated), reporting on the visit to Sunderland of Mr Richard Moon (Senior Development Executive, Coventry City Council) as part of the Policy Review into the Key Cities Group.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mr Jim Diamond, Scrutiny Officer presented the report and provided members with a detailed note of the meeting held with Mr Moon at the Software Centre on 21st April, 2016 (copy tabled).

Councillor David Snowdon having thanked all the Panel members and officers for their contributions to the Review and expressed his wish to see it continue into the new municipal year, it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

The Chairman then closed the meeting having thanked Members and Officers for their attendance and contributions.

(Signed) L SCANLAN,
Chairman.

ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider and agree a work programme for the Committee for the municipal year 2016/17.

2. Background

- 2.1 The work programme is designed to set out the key issues to be addressed by the Committee during the year and provide it with a timetable of work. The Committee itself is responsible for setting its own work programme, subject to the coordinating role of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee.
- 2.2 To be most effective, the work programme should provide a basis and framework for the work of the Committee, while retaining sufficient flexibility to respond to any important issues that emerge during the course of the year. The work programme is therefore intended to be a working document that the Committee can develop and refer to throughout the year.
- 2.3 In order to ensure that the Committee is able to undertake all of its business and respond to emerging issues, there will be scope for additional meetings or visits not detailed in the work programme.
- 2.4 The remit of the Economic Prosperity Scrutiny Committee covers the following:-

Any matter relating to the economic prosperity of the city and the performance of services to support that including physical infrastructure, sector growth and skills, economic vibrancy, Safer Sunderland, licensing and trading standards, strategic transport, environmental services, libraries, heritage and tourism.

- 2.5 The work programme should reflect the remit of the Committee and the need to balance its responsibility for undertaking scrutiny, performance management and policy review (where necessary). In accordance with the recent independent review of the scrutiny function there will be an increasing emphasis on accountability and performance management in the composition of the work programme for the year ahead.
- 2.6 The work programme should also reflect and be aligned to the key priorities of the Council as set out in documents such as the Sunderland Strategy and Corporate Plan, reflect issues highlighted following external assessments and issues raised during the Annual Scrutiny Debate.
- 2.7 In terms of the Economic Prosperity Scrutiny Committee, central to this will be the document “Sunderland - Transforming Our City The 3,6,9 Vision. A copy of the link for this document will be provided and copies will be available at the meeting.

3. Draft Work Programme 2016/17

- 3.1 Members are asked to consider the issues it wishes to consider for the year ahead. A draft Committee Work Programme based on some of the key issues facing the Council and raised during the Scrutiny Debate is attached marked Appendix 1. This will hopefully provide a useful framework for developing the work programme for the year.
- 3.2 During the year the Committee will have the opportunity to review service performance and will be involved in key strategic policy such as the Core Growth Strategy and other planning documents. These will be included in the work programme when timescales become available.

4. Recommendations

That the Scrutiny Committee consider and agrees a draft Annual Scrutiny Work Programme for 2016/17 and incorporates emerging issues as and when they arise throughout the forthcoming year;

5. Background Papers

Contact Officer : _____
Jim Diamond

REASON FOR INCLUSION	27 JUNE 16	19 JULY 16	13 SEPTEMBER 16	11 OCTOBER 16	8 NOVEMBER 16	6 DECEMBER 16	10 JANUARY 17	7 FEBRUARY 17	7 MARCH 17	4 APRIL 17
Cabinet Referrals and Responses										
Scrutiny Business	Remit and Work Programme of Committee Key Cities – Feedback on visit(Jill Laverick/JD) Sunderland Software City (Andrea Winders)	Business Centres ((Evolve, Washington, Software Centre) – Progress Report(Andrea Winders) Environmental Enforcement - Feedback(Mark Speed)	Port Progress Report and Visit (Andrea Winders/Mathew Hunt) Advanced Manufacturing Business Park – Progress Report (Alison Fellows)	Prevent – Progress Report(Stuart Douglass) Tall Ships – Progress Report (Ian Flannery) Airshow - Preparations (Andrea Winders)	Development of Skills in the City (Andrea Winders) Contribution of FE sector to Skills Development	Siglion – Progress Report Update (John Seager)	City Of Culture – Progress Report (Rebecca Ball) Key Cities – Progress (Jill Laverick)	Development of Social Enterprise Sector (Andrea Winders) Environmental Enforcement (Mark Speed)	Business Improvement District – Progress Report Tall Ships – Progress Report (Ian Flannery)	Business Centres (Evolve, Washington, Software Centre) - Progress Report (Andrea Winders) Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor/New Wear Bridge – Progress Report (Alison Fellows)
Performance / Service Improvement										
Policy Framework										
Consultation										
Information / Awareness Raising	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17	Notice of Key Decisions Work Programme 16-17
CCFA/Members' items/Petitions										

SUNDERLAND SOFTWARE CITY – PHASE 3

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To consider a report on the progress being made with regard to the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 Project and its contribution to the continued development of the software and technology sector in the city.

2. Background

- 2.1 On 22 June 2016, the Cabinet considered a report on the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 Project. The report sought approval to enter into a Funding Agreement with the Department of Communities and Local Government to secure resources from the European Regional Development Fund for Phase 3 of the Project and to enter into a partnership agreement with the North East Business Innovation Centre (BIC) to underpin delivery.
- 2.2 The report sets out the background and development of the project and its role in the city's software and technology sector. A copy of the report is attached as an appendix.

3 Current Position

- 3.1 Andrea Winders (Executive Director of Enterprise Development) will be in attendance to discuss the report and answer any questions from members.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 The Committee is asked to note the information.

CABINET MEETING – 22 JUNE 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET – PART I

Title of Report:

Sunderland Software City Phase 3

Author(s):

Executive Director for Enterprise Development

Purpose of Report:

The report seeks approval to enter into a Funding Agreement with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to secure resources from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) for the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 project (the Project) and to develop and enter into a revised new partnership agreement with the North East Business Innovation Centre (BIC) to underpin delivery of this next phase of the Project in order to support the continued development of the city's software and technology sector.

Description of Decision:

Cabinet is requested to:

- Agree to enter into a Funding Agreement with DCLG to enable delivery of the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 Project;
- Authorise the Executive Director for Enterprise Development in consultation with the Interim Director of Corporate Services and the Leader of the Council;
- Authorise the Head of Law and Governance to execute all necessary legal agreements in order to give effect to the above; and
- Authorise the underwriting of agreed operational costs for Sunderland Software City until the Partnership Agreement and Funding Agreement are completed.

Is the decision consistent with the Budget/Policy Framework? **Yes**

If not, Council approval is required to change the Budget/Policy Framework

Suggested reason(s) for Decision:

Software is identified as a key growth sector in the city's Economic Master Plan. By acting as lead applicant for the ERDF funding and committing match funding in the form of innovation grants to SMEs, with the associated private sector leverage, the Council can secure the continuation of Sunderland Software City activity to September 2018. A new Partnership Agreement for Phase 3 with the BIC will enable the relevant roles and responsibilities of each party in respect of the delivery of Phase 3 to be formalised and is a requirement of the funding offer. Acceptance of the Funding Agreement with DCLG and the subsequent delivery of the Project will facilitate continued development of the city's software and technology sector, leveraging significant levels of additional resources and expertise to support the sector's growth.

Alternative options to be considered and recommended to be rejected:

The option of not pursuing the ERDF project and therefore not leveraging the associated third party funding has been considered and rejected as this would lead to a reduced level of funding available to support the ongoing development of the city's software and technology sector, and the significant economic benefits to the city that are likely to arise from the next phase of the Project would be lost.

Impacts analysed;

Equality **Privacy** **Sustainability** **Crime and Disorder**

Is the Decision consistent with the Council's co-operative values? Yes

Is this a "Key Decision" as defined in the Constitution? Yes

Is it included in the 28 day Notice of Decisions? Yes

SUNDERLAND SOFTWARE CITY – PHASE 3

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

1.0 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The report seeks approval to enter into a Funding Agreement with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to secure resources from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) for the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 project (the Project) and to develop and enter into a new partnership agreement with the North East Business Innovation Centre (BIC) to underpin delivery of this next phase of the Project in order to support the continued development of the city's software and technology sector.

2.0 Description of Decision

- 2.1 Cabinet is requested to:

- i) Agree to enter into a Funding Agreement with DCLG to enable delivery of the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 Project;
- ii) Authorise the Executive Director for Enterprise Development in consultation with the Interim Director of Corporate Services and the Leader of the Council to develop and agree a new Partnership Agreement between the Council and the BIC in respect of delivery of the Project; and
- iii) Authorise the Head of Law and Governance to execute all necessary legal agreements in order to give effect to the above; and
- iv) Authorise the underwriting of agreed operational costs for Sunderland Software City until the Partnership Agreement and Funding Agreement are completed.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 Sunderland Software City was developed as an initiative in 2006 at the time of One North East's first Regional Economic Strategy. It was initially funded through a combination of Regional Development Agency (RDA) funding and ERDF as one of the region's Innovation Connectors as a partnership initiative involving Sunderland City Council, the University of Sunderland, the North East Business Innovation Centre (BIC) and the private sector and placing Sunderland at the heart of the region's economy in this area.

- 3.2 Following the closure of the RDA, partners were keen to continue the work of the Sunderland Software City initiative given Sunderland's central role in this sector within the wider region. Partners from the Council, University and the BIC continued to work together and developed proposals for a Phase 2 of Sunderland Software City. This reflected the continued commitment to the development of the city's software and technology sector. At that stage, in 2012, the Council identified funding through existing resources which could act as match-funding and secured ERDF resources to underpin the continued operation and development of Sunderland Software City into a second phase (from October 2012 to September 2015).
- 3.3 Phase 2 of the project was overseen by the Sunderland Software City Partnership, with the Council acting as the accountable body for the ERDF funding application. Sunderland Software City staff continued to be employed by the BIC and the financial and delivery arrangements between the Council and the BIC for the Phase 2 ERDF project were governed by a Partnership Agreement. This Phase 2 project ended on 30 September 2015. During Phase 2 the project supported 15 new businesses and 58 existing businesses within Sunderland, and 174 jobs were created across the city as a result of the project. Through the innovation grants included as part of the Phase 2 project, 30 Sunderland-based SMEs were supported with financial assistance, helping them to grow their businesses and explore new markets.
- 3.4 The potential to provide continuity of provision after the Phase 2 project finished, through a further ERDF application, has been explored on an ongoing basis together with the available sources of potential match-funding. Sunderland Software City (acting through the BIC) was successful in securing the support of both the North East and Tees Valley Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in its bid for Sunderland to become a local centre for activity under central government's Digital Catapult bringing valuable resource to the city and wider region. Sunderland was announced as one of only three areas in the UK for Digital Catapult activity in November 2015. The other local centres are Bradford and Brighton. The Digital Catapult is a national centre to advance digital ideas and therefore is complementary to the ethos of the Sunderland Software City initiative. It is therefore possible to align Sunderland Software City activity with Digital Catapult activity and funding, and for this new activity and match funding to form the basis of a further ERDF proposal.
- 3.5 An application for a third phase of Sunderland Software City was submitted by the Council on behalf of the partnership for ERDF resource under the new European Structural and Investment Funds programming period from 2015. The outline application for Sunderland Software City Phase 3 was submitted in May 2015, and agreement to progress to submission of a full Business Case was received from DCLG in August 2015. The Business Case was approved in April 2016 and a conditional approval letter issued on 6 May 2016 setting out a number of conditions associated with providing the funding.

4 .0 Current Position

- 4.1 A Funding Agreement has now been issued by DCLG for the Sunderland Software City Phase 3 Project following approval of the full Business Case. The Funding Agreement enables funding to be drawn down with effect from 1st October 2015 (i.e. when the Phase 2 project ended). The Phase 3 Project will be overseen by the Sunderland Software City Partnership Group. Sunderland Software City staff will continue to be employed by the BIC and a new Phase 3 Partnership Agreement will be entered into between the Council and the BIC to reflect the ERDF funding requirements and to set out the project governance and delivery responsibilities for the Project, including the utilisation of the Digital Catapult funding. . The completion of this Partnership Agreement is a condition of the ERDF Funding Agreement.
- 4.2 Two other ERDF funding conditions are also stipulated. These require the Council to confirm the grant criteria in respect of the proposed Innovation Grants to be provided to SMEs and to engage with the North East Growth Hub to ensure a co-ordinated business support offer.
- 4.2 The Project will support the continued growth of the digital technology sector. It builds on the successful activity undertaken during Phases 1 and 2 and has a number of output targets including providing direct support, financial assistance and access to market opportunities for 204 new and existing businesses, creating an employment increase of 106 over the lifetime of the project. The Project will leverage both public and private match funding, as well as expertise from the Digital Catapult who will become an end delivery partner via its funding agreement with the BIC, following the launch of the North East and Tees Valley Digital Catapult Centre based within the city's Software Centre.
- 4.3 The total project costs for the Phase 3 Project across the three years are £2,356,331, with an approved ERDF contribution of £1,201,729. The match funding for the project totals £1,154,601. The Council's primary financial contribution is £225,000 which is being provided from the Business Investment Team's existing financial assistance budget in the form of the Innovation Grants to support SMEs within Sunderland that will leverage the equivalent level in private sector contributions. A limited amount of Council staff time will provide additional match-funding. Significant third party match-funding, of approximately £500,000 is also being provided through the Digital Catapult over the lifetime of the project via the BIC. A detailed breakdown of the funding package including match-funding is set out below:

Digital Catapult	£498,213
Sunderland City Council	
- BIT Innovation Grants	£225,000
- Software City indirect staff costs	£113,103
- SCC Direct costs	£50,871
- SCC Indirect staff costs	£7,631
Private Sector Contributions	£225,000
NE Business Innovation Centre	£34,783
ERDF	£1,201,727
	£2,356,328

SCC direct costs relate to those individuals directly supporting the project activities. SCC indirect costs are calculated by applying a 15% flat rate charge to direct staff costs as an overhead and are intended to cover those costs which cannot be connected directly to project activity such as support/back office staff or shared premises costs.

- 4.4 The match-funding provided by the Council, as well as its role as lead applicant and the ERDF accountable body for the Project, will enable activity to be delivered with effect from October 2015 (retrospectively) to September 2018. This is important in supporting the continuation of the development of the city's software and technology sector through the Sunderland Software City partnership.
- 4.5 In accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 15, Cabinet is asked to agree to underwrite costs from 1st July 2016, estimated at £25,000 per month, until such time as the partnership agreement with the BIC is in place, which at this stage is anticipated to be the end of July 2016. The requirement for this to be called upon is considered low risk given the Funding Approval received for ERDF from DCLG and the very limited conditions.

5.0 Reasons for the Decision

- 5.1 Software is identified as a key growth sector in the city's Economic Master Plan. By acting as lead applicant for the ERDF funding and committing match funding in the form of innovation grants to SMEs, with the associated private sector leverage, the Council can secure the continuation of Sunderland Software City activity to September 2018. A new Partnership Agreement with the BIC for Phase 3 will enable the relevant roles and responsibilities of each party in respect of the delivery of the Project to be formalised and is a requirement of the funding offer. Acceptance of the Funding Agreement with DCLG and the subsequent delivery of the Project will facilitate continued development of the city's software and technology sector, leveraging significant levels of additional resources and expertise to support the sector's growth.

6.0 Alternative Options

- 6.1 The option of not pursuing the ERDF project and therefore not leveraging the associated third party funding has been considered and rejected as this would lead to a reduced level of funding available to support the ongoing development of the city's software and technology sector, and the significant economic benefits to the city that are likely to arise from the next phase of the Project would be lost.

7.0 Relevant Consultations

7.1 Financial Implications

The match funding required from the Council is provided through a combination of £225,000 (£75,000 per year from 2016/17 to 2018/19) from the Business Investment Team financial assistance budget and existing officer time. Further match funding for the ERDF is through the leverage of £225,000 in associated private sector contributions through the innovation grants and the contribution from Digital Catapult.

7.2 Risks

Risks associated with the delivery of Sunderland Software City Phase 3 will be managed through the governance arrangements to be set out in the Phase 3 Partnership Agreement with the BIC including how any potential liabilities are shared. These principally could arise through claw back of grant (eg through expenditure claimed being ineligible) or through match funding not being secured, in which case the Project will seek further alternative sources of funding.

8.0 Background Papers

- 8.1 The following background papers are available from the Office of the Chief Executive:
Sunderland Software City phase 3 full application

KEY CITIES GROUP – FEEDBACK REPORT

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To report on the outcome of the meeting with Mr Richard Moon (Senior Development Executive - Coventry City Council) as part of the Committees review into the Key Cities Group of local authorities.

2. Background

- 2.1 During 2015/16, the Skills, Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel as part of its work programme considered the work of the Key Cities Group of local authorities and how Sunderland Council was using its involvement to promote economic growth.
- 2.2 As part of this work, members met with Mr Richard Moon (Senior Development Executive at Coventry City Council) on 21 April 2016 to discuss and share any learning on how best to promote economic development within the city.
- 2.3 The city of Coventry was chosen in view of its many similarities with Sunderland in terms of the economic challenges it faces and the way in which these challenges are being addressed.

3 Current Position

- 3.1 A feedback report setting out the issues raised at the session is attached for members information.
- 3.2 It is suggested that members may wish to consider continuing to monitor the progress being made by the members of the Key Cities Group as part of its work programme for the year ahead.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 The Committee is asked to note the information.

FEEDBACK FROM MEETING WITH RICHARD MOON, COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL

21 APRIL 2016

HELD AT THE BOARDROOM SUNDERLAND SOFTWARE CENTRE

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Cllr David Snowdon welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that its purpose was to find out more about the work of the Key Cities Group of local authorities and the approach being taken by Coventry City Council to economic regeneration.
- 1.2 Richard Moon (Senior Development Executive) from Coventry City Council had been invited to the meeting to outline the views and experiences of Coventry City Council. Cllr Snowdon hoped that the meeting would represent an opportunity for a free exchange of ideas and experiences.
- 1.3 A paper outlining the major developments going on and planned for both cities was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 1.4 Richard explained that he would focus on two particular areas of the work of the Key Cities Group:-
 - Formation, aims and objectives
 - approach of Coventry to city centre development

2 Development of Key Cities

- 2.1 The Key Cities Group was founded in 2013 with five founding members including Sunderland and Coventry. The number of members had now risen to 26. The Group was chaired by Councillor Paul Watson from Sunderland Council. Members comprised a wide variety of mid-sized cities. However they shared a wide range of common concerns and common.
- 2.2 The work of the Key Cities Group has focused on four priorities which are being delivered by sub groups:-
 - Innovative Finance – lead city Peterborough
 - Skills and Employability – lead city York
 - Devolution – lead city Wakefield
 - Future of the city centre – lead city Coventry
- 2.3 For Richard the Key Cities Group faced four major challenges:-
 - Access to funding – Combined Authority
 - Influencing the Devolution Debate

- Sharing best practice with peers
 - Promoting greater influence at a national level
- 2.4 Richard considered that there had been a big change in the political landscape since the Key Cities Group formed in 2013. Increasingly a central issue for the Group was the devolution debate which has pushed authorities in the direction of Combined Authorities. Coventry City had agreed to be part of a West Midlands Combined Authority though it was recognised that this would bring a number of challenges and that the Council had a number of misgivings. In particular, how far local authorities were being used as an instrument to deliver central government spending cuts and also the proposed introduction of an elected Mayor. He noted that the population of Coventry had previously voted against the introduction of an elected Mayor and it now appeared that one was being effectively imposed.
- 2.5 However, the Council considered that the Combined Authority would bring access to funding streams that would not otherwise be available and that failure to join could effectively worsen the economic situation in the city. In particular it was anticipated that the Combined Authority would allow access to greater borrowing and capital resources. In the case of Coventry this could bring access to £150m for 2 major schemes regeneration schemes in the city centre.
- 2.6 While Coventry was committed to the Combined Authority, they did not anticipate that this would involve the devolution of services and were committed to continuing to deliver services independent of the Combined Authority.
- 2.7 Richard emphasised the important role of the Key Cities Group in lobbying central government and seeking to influence their thinking. He felt that the Group could help to provide a voice and influence for mid-sized local authorities such as Coventry and Sunderland. While experience had shown that the views of local authorities were not always given due weight by governments of any political hue, it was important that every effort should still be made to influence government thinking.
- 2.8 Richard suggested that in future it might be necessary to refocus the work of the Group in order to best influence the devolution debate on questions such as how the Key Cities Group could best engage with central government and how could best redefine its objectives for a changed world.
- 2.9 Another area where lobbying was vital centred on government plans to allow local authorities to retain all locally raised business rates and phase out the distribution of the core grant. While supporting the importance of local authorities encouraging business growth in their area, it was felt that the proposed changes could have a catastrophic effect on areas such as Sunderland and Coventry that have depended on funding from the Rate Support Grant. Richard felt that the Key Cities Group, together with organisations such as CIPFA, had an increasingly important role in highlighting to government the potential financial and social consequences.

3 Future of the City Centre

- 3.1 Richard noted that Coventry City Council was the Key Cities Group lead authority on the future of the city centre. However, he stressed that was no magic formula for successful regeneration and that the key was to learn from the experiences of others while tailoring action to the particular circumstances and needs of an area.
- 3.2 Richard noted that Coventry city centre had been badly damaged during World War II and that the standard of reconstruction and subsequent redevelopments had left a number of problems. The city centre was unattractive, public realm required improvement, the retail offer was not great and there was little vibrancy to the night time economy. The central areas contained little in the way of professional/financial employment with office space being largely located outside the city centre. This in turn had had a knock on effect on the health of the retail sector.
- 3.3 Under new political leadership, the city had embarked on an ambitious strategy for growth based on:-
- Improving housing numbers and mix
 - Higher quality jobs in the city centre
 - Improving the retail offer
 - Becoming more business friendly
 - Expanding the business rate
 - Working closely with the University

Improving Housing Numbers and Mix

- 3.4 In terms of housing, Richard noted that 70% of housing was located in the lower Council Tax band. (A/B). The city also experienced a sharp demographic divide; with a more affluent area located in the south of the city and a less affluent area to the north. This created a very visible and stark reflection of social and economic inequality within the city.
- 3.5 The City was felt to suffer from an insufficient amount of higher value housing and as a result had difficulties retaining and attracting people with a higher level of disposal income. The Council was therefore keen to increase the amount of house building in the city, particularly at the higher end of the market with 42,000 new homes planned by 2031. 25,000 of these would be within the Council's boundaries and 17,000 in neighbouring local authorities to the south of the city, though these would be located as close to the city centre as possible. It was anticipated that this growth in housing would generate a welcome income revenue stream for the city and contribute to a growth in retail demand and vibrancy with in the city centre.
- 3.6 Understandably, the Council had faced considerable resistance to plans to build housing on what had been designated as green belt land. However, it was precisely those areas where the higher valued housing was most in

demand rather than in the less affluent areas of the city which were adjacent to brownfield sites in the north of the city.

- 3.7 Richard noted that Coventry City Council had transferred their housing stock ten years ago and major improvements had been made to the condition of social housing. However there were concerns over the effect of the extension of the right to buy to social housing and the disincentive effect it would have on any growth in social housing building.
- 3.8 In terms of population, Coventry differed from Sunderland in having experienced significant growth over recent years. This had been largely the result of inward migration from Eastern Europe.

Better Quality Jobs

- 3.9 Richard noted that a major priority for the Council is to attract more and better quality employment opportunities to the city centre.
- 3.10 Central to this was the Friargate development which would involve the redesign of a large part of the city centre and include a new Council complex located near Coventry railway station. The development would include office space, two hotels, new homes along with retail space and restaurants. Plans for the 37 acre site could create 7,800 construction jobs over the next 15 years and 13,400 office jobs. New infrastructure work should also help link the area around the railway station to the city centre and thereby help to regenerate the city centre as a whole.
- 3.11 The Council would play a vital role in promoting and facilitating development by providing substantial financial support and relocating its offices to the site. This relocation would also involve the sale of existing Council office buildings to the University which would be used as part of their planned expansion and redevelopment. Around £30m of ERDF/RGF has also been secured to support transport infrastructure. This had done much to improve movement around the city and make the city more attractive and pedestrian friendly.
- 3.12 Richard considered that without this support from the Council it was unlikely that the development would have been viable. Inevitably such an ambitious project brought with it an element of risk to the Council in terms of its financial commitment. However, the Friargate development was seen as very much a long term project and necessary given the considerable challenges facing the city.
- 3.13 Richard noted that the decision to build a new Civic Centre in the city centre had not been without public and press criticism but the Council have tried to emphasise the long term advantages involved including the savings to be made on running costs and the economic stimulus it would provide to the city centre.
- 3.14 While the decision to build in city centre had not been without public and press criticism, the Council had tried to emphasise the advantages involved,

including the savings to be made on running costs and the economic stimulus provided to the city centre. The Council would also have less office space for staff than previously. In response it would use a mixture of “hot desking” and working from home. It was also looking to make better use of IT and on line delivery of services. While there had been concerns at the prospect of a reduction in “face to face” responses to public queries, the Council’s considered that the move was necessary given the scale of the current financial situation.

- 3.15 In response to a query regarding the use of local labour clauses in Coventry, Richard noted that they had been used but that there were a number of legal difficulties associated with them. The Council preferred to use persuasion and encouragement rather than legal enforcement in order to ensure that the local workforce was given access to the employment created through the regeneration of the city centre.

Improving the Retail Offer

- 3.16 Richard noted that over the years there had been a decline in the city’s retail offer and a need for its major overhaul in order to attract more people into the city centre. Central to this was encouraging more people to live and work in the city by providing more apartments and student accommodation and the development of financial/professional sector employment opportunities.
- 3.17 As well as the Friargate development there were a number of other initiatives designed to improve the retail offer in the city. These included a revamp of the Cathedral Lanes shopping centre and the redevelopment of Broadgate which had traditionally been the heart of the city centre. Improvements had also been made to the public realm and the new square in Broadgate was kept vibrant with regular events.
- 3.18 Again, the Council was standing behind the schemes financially. This was seen as essential to stem the flow of spending that had leaked out of the city in recent years. Hopefully, this would result in bigger high street names locating in the city centre and an improvement in the vibrancy of both the day time and nighttime economy.
- 3.19 It was recognised that changes in shopping habits had led to a decline in retail, and particularly secondary retail, in the city centre. However, it was felt that there would always be demand for a main shopping area where people gathered to meet and shop. It was felt that the successful city centre of the future will be more tightly defined and include a range of activities such as leisure, arts and entertainment.

Becoming More Business Friendly and Expanding the Business Rate

- 3.20 A major priority was to promote Coventry as a business friendly city in order to help generate wealth and deliver jobs. Such an approach was also seen as helping to grow the business rate at a time of increasing pressure on Council funding and draw in inward investment.

- 3.21 Every effort was being made to ensure that the strategy and policies of the Council as a whole were aimed at promoting rather than deterring business investment.

Working Closely with the University

- 3.22 Coventry has two Universities located in the city; Coventry University in the city centre and Warwickshire University which is on the southern outskirts. Both are seen as vital to the city in terms of building up the local skills base and attracting in people and investment.
- 3.23 As mentioned earlier, the former Council buildings were being sold to the University as part of their plans for expansion and redevelopment. This would provide more student accommodation in the city centre and help to add to its footfall and vibrancy.
- 3.24 The University was also working closely with local businesses to develop the engineering courses vital for the growth of the advanced manufacturing sector. This included working with Jaguar Land Rover which remains a major employer in the city.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 In conclusion, members referred to the considerable similarities between Coventry and Sunderland in terms of the economic challenges they faced and the way in which they are responding to those challenges.
- 4.2 It was felt that the session had provided an opportunity for each to learn from the experience of the other and that it was important to ensure that the dialogue between the two authorities continued into the future.

The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Notice is given of the following proposed Key Decisions (whether proposed to be taken in public or in private) and of Executive Decisions (including key decisions) intended to be considered in a private meeting:-

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160215/51	To seek approval to review school places for pupils with autism.	Cabinet	Y	During the period 10 May to 31 July 2016. This entry was also on notices issued 22 March and 11 April 2016.	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160505/70	To approve the Minster Quarter Masterplan (MQMP) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the purposes of public consultations and as a material consideration in assessing planning applications, pending its finalisation following public consultation.	Cabinet	Y	During the period 22 June 2016 to 31 July 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report MQMP SPD Habitat Regulations Assessment	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160517/71	To consider the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee arising from policy reviews into the Transition from Child to Adult Care Services, Core Sexual Health Services in Sunderland, Approach to Environmental Enforcement and Use of Customer Feedback.	Cabinet	Y	22 June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160520/78	To seek approval to procure and appoint contractors to deliver the North Bridge Street Northern Gateway scheme.	Cabinet	Y	20 July 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160513/72	To agree the next steps in relation to the establishment of the proposed Children's Services Company/Trust	Cabinet	Y	22 June 2016	Y	The report is one which relates to an item during the consideration of which by Cabinet the public are likely to be excluded under Paragraphs 3 and/or 5 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, as the report will contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and/or information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings. The public interest in maintaining these exemptions outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160513/73	To consider an update on progress towards a Citywide Culture Offer, proposals for an alternative delivery model for the Northern Gallery for Contemporary Arts (NGCA) and changes to museum opening hours.	Cabinet	Y	22 June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160516/74	To agree the next phase of the Sunderland Software City phase 3 project being delivered through a partnership agreement with the North East BIC	Cabinet	Y	During the period 22 June to 30 June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160516/75	To consider the International Advanced Manufacturing Park – Consultation Draft Publication for the Area Action Plan	Cabinet	Y	22 June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160516/76	To approve the Revenue Budget Outturn 2015-2016 and First Revenue Review 2016-2017	Cabinet	Y	22nd June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160516/77	To approve the Capital Programme Outturn 2015-2016 and First Capital Review 2016-2017 including Treasury Management	Cabinet	Y	22nd June 2016	N	Not Applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk
160524/79	To award garden waste treatment contract via South of Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership commencing 1 August 2016.	Cabinet	Y	20 July 2016	N	Not applicable	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Item no.	Matter in respect of which a decision is to be made	Decision-maker (if individual, name and title, if body, its name and see below for list of members)	Key Decision Y/N	Anticipated date of decision/ period in which the decision is to be taken	Private meeting Y/N	Reasons for the meeting to be held in private	Documents submitted to the decision-maker in relation to the matter	Address to obtain further information
160104/48	To consider the freehold acquisition of two properties to provide children's services accommodation.	Cabinet	Y	Between 1 July and 30 September 2016	Y	The report is one which relates to an item during the consideration of which by Cabinet the public are likely to be excluded under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, as the report will contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). The public interest in maintaining this exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.	Cabinet Report	Governance Services Civic Centre PO BOX 100 Sunderland SR2 7DN committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Note; Some of the documents listed may not be available if they are subject to an exemption, prohibition or restriction on disclosure.

Further documents relevant to the matters to be decided can be submitted to the decision-maker. If you wish to request details of those documents (if any) as they become available, or to submit representations about a proposal to hold a meeting in private, you should contact Governance Services at the address below.

Subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure, copies of documents submitted to the decision-maker can also be obtained from the Governance Services team PO Box 100, Civic Centre, Sunderland, or by email to committees@sunderland.gov.uk

Who will decide;

Cabinet; Councillor Paul Watson - Leader; Councillor Henry Trueman – Deputy Leader; Councillor Mel Speding – Cabinet Secretary; Councillor Louise Farthing – Children’s Services; Councillor Graeme Miller – Health, Housing and Adult Services; Councillor John Kelly – Public Health, Wellness and Culture; Councillor Michael Mordey – City Services; Councillor Cecilia Gofton – Responsive Services and Customer Care

This is the membership of Cabinet as at the date of this notice. Any changes made by the Leader will be specified on a supplementary notice.

Elaine Waugh
Head of Law and Governance

24 May 2016