

**Urban Renewal Specialist Strategic Partnership (UR SSP) Meeting Minutes  
Conference Room 2, Municipal Building, Kingsway, Widnes WA8 7QF**

**3.00 pm, Wednesday, 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2010.**

**Present:**

Cllr Ron Hignett	(RH) (Chair)	HBC/Member;
Hayley Dooley	(HD)	Care Partnerships Manager, Job Centre Plus;
Janitha Redmond	(JR)	Homes & Communities Agency;
Len Naughalty	(LN)	For Pat Broster, Groundwork Merseyside;
Cllr Rob Polhill	(RP)	HBC Leader/Chair of HSPB (visiting);
Cllr Eddie Jones	(EJ)	HBC/Member/ELS SSP/Critical Friend to UR SSP
Len Naughalty	(LN)	Director of Operations, Groundwork Merseyside
Mark Butchard	(MB)	Head of Strategy/The Mersey Partnership

**In Attendance:**

Wesley Rourke	(WR)	HBC/Operational Director – Employment, Economic Regeneration & Business Development;
Anne Moyers	(AM)	HBC/Policy Officer;
Pat Audioire	(PA) Minutes	HBC/Urban Renewal SSP Co-ordinator;
Alan Graham	(AG)	HBC/Communications Officer – Partnerships
Shelagh Semoff		HBC/HSPB Partnerships Officer (visiting)

**Apologies:**

Claire Bunter	Environment Agency;
Claire Griffiths	PlusDane Group;
Steve O'Connor	Stobart Ports;
Dick Tregoe	HBC/Strategic Director – Environment;
Claire McDade	Norton Priority;
Georgina Crabtree	Peel Holdings;
Neil McGrath	Halton Housing Trust;
Chris Koral	NWDA;
Andy Sharp	Daresbury Labs;

			<b><u>Action s</u></b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies, Minutes &amp; Matters Arising</b>	1.1 1.2	RH accepted apologies and welcomed delegates to the meeting and asked for introductions around the table. There were no Actions from the Minutes of the last meeting and these were accepted as a true record.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Presentation: Liverpool Super Port – by Mark Butchard, TMP</b>	2.1 2.2 2.3	MB gave a very interesting overview of developments in and around the Liverpool SuperPort initiative, taking in our own 3MG and proposals by Peel Holdings. MB explained that this initiative fits into the governance of the City Region and proposed Local

		<p>2.4</p> <p>2.5</p> <p>2.6</p> <p>2.7</p> <p>2.8</p> <p>2.9</p>	<p>Enterprise Partnership (LEP). It is anticipated that SuperPort will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- generate 26,000 jobs;</li> <li>- support 1,000 companies;</li> <li>- generate £0.9 billion GVA;</li> <li>- become the 4<sup>th</sup> largest container berth</li> </ul> <p>The Liverpool City Region is supporting and promoting Tourism, the Knowledge Economy, the Low Carbon Economy and the Liverpool SuperPort.</p> <p>This will be achieved in partnership with the 6 Merseyside Local Authorities and The Mersey Partnership (TMP).</p> <p>This partnership working aims to stimulate demand to feed the supply potential on Merseyside through development of the major SuperPort infrastructure and the wealth of diverse 'sector' working (e.g. free industrial zones, ICT, transport technology, commercial property, skills, professional services and ancillary industries).</p> <p>The SuperPort Committee consists of major players – some from Halton (including 3MG and Ineos) – with 21 private sector, 10 public sector and 6 public/private hybrid companies represented on the SuperPort Panel.</p> <p>MB explained that the Mersey Gateway and the work/growth of Stobart is critical to the SuperPort development.</p> <p>With Liverpool John Lennon Airport and its new links with Amsterdam offering us a worldwide hub, there is a focus on managing port access with regard to motorways and electrification of the West Coast mainline to Manchester/Liverpool.</p> <p>We also need to ensure the quality of business property and warehousing is available to support this initiative.</p>	
3.	<p><b>HSPB Call for Review of Priorities</b> – Wesley Rourke; Pat Audoire</p>	<p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p>	<p>WR referred to a covering report on the Halton Strategic Partnership Board call for a review of priorities by each of the SSPs, as WNF runs out, and to ensure that the HSPB had agreement of what activities it should support for the future. This was supported by a review and evaluation of each of the major projects supported by this partnership.</p> <p>PA talked members through the matrix which summarised the UR projects, concluding that, with only three major projects wishing to be considered for future assistance, these should be fully supported.</p> <p>Members fully backed this proposal and the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Widnes Waterfront programme;</li> </ul>	

		3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contaminated Land project and</li> <li>- Town Centre Initiatives programme</li> </ul> <p>were recommended for consideration by the SSP Chairs on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2010. Thanks was given to EJ for acting as the UR critical friend.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) 2011-2026 Consultation – Anne Moyers</b>	4.1	AM spoke to a powerpoint presentation, outlining the vision, the strategic objectives and priorities to be considered by the SCS renewal, the one main change affecting this partnership being a revision to the name of the Priority from ‘Urban Renewal’ to one which will encompass issues related to the Environment.	
		4.2	This is yet to be finalised, but ‘Halton’s	
		4.3	Environmental Quality and Urban Regeneration’ was put forward. AM reviewed the strategic objectives of this priority together with the long term challenges and cross cutting issues, finishing on a note that consultation would continue in tandem with HBCs Core Strategy	
		4.4	consultation, so that the two documents could be aligned both in time and emphasis.	
		4.4.1	AM asked for comments.	
		4.4.2	PA had received feedback from Chris Koral (CK) (of the NWDA) who had asked for this to be aired in his absence. Essentially, CK suggested that environmental quality merits priority status in its own right as it impacts on all of the other priorities. He noted that it will be important to ensure the work of the different SSPs is joined up effectively, but especially between ELS and the new Urban Renewal/Environment priority around Halton’s competitiveness as a location for business investment.	
		4.4.3		
		4.4.4		
		4.5.1	AM responded that, given the uncertain times with regard to funding, it was important to ensure that both priorities were taken forward and this amendment provided a vehicle for that.	
		4.5.2	WR noted that the evidence base was good, but that solutions and challenges now needed to be addressed and asked how this would be achieved. AM said there would be a shopping list of priorities over the next 25 years. Based on various consultations in several areas, including the core strategy, etc., feedback would be analysed and a wish list identified. In the shorter term, recognition would be given to the current priorities/objectives and residents would be consulted, to determine (in tandem with resource availability) a 5-year plan.	
		4.6		
		4.7.1		

		<p>4.7.2 EJ thought that there was no need to change the name of the priority: that this would merely confuse people; that environmental issues were already encompassed within the UR agenda.</p> <p>4.7.3 He was concerned that although we could not make commitments at this time, some of the wording would suggest to the public that we <b>were</b> making commitments.</p> <p>4.7.4 He thought we should be seeking to reinforce that these are things we <u>could</u> do.</p> <p>4.8 AM responded that the text EJ had referred to showed that we aspired to achieve, but EJ countered this, noting that many of the elements identified have already been achieved and there was now a need to find the revenue to maintain them.</p> <p>4.9</p> <p>4.10.1 EJ asked for realism when presenting these issues to the public.</p> <p>4.10.2 WR noted that the wealth of green assets the borough has needs to be recognised, especially when addressing climate change, referring also to the CO<sup>2</sup> generation by the chemical industry locally, which is mitigated by the work of Ineos. However, one 'positive' borne out of Halton's industrial heritage is the borough's excellent connectivity.</p> <p>4.10.3 MB intervened asking, as an observer, whether he could comment and was given leave so to do. He noted that, working with Halton there was a strong sense of reality. He suggested Halton should isolate the issues out, i.e.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ask what yet needs to be done;</li> <li>- Ask what transformational issues are there (e.g., carbon reduction).</li> </ul> <p>4.11 This should then give a better argument with regard to transformational issues which can be linked to the City Region LEP (e.g., tourism, industry, the knowledge economy, transport and logistics). Those that are transformational will identify critical paths and Halton should reap benefits out of that. AM asked that any further comments or feedback should be directed to her by e.mail.</p>	
5.	<b>Members' Agenda Items</b>	8	None.
6.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	9.1.1	It was noted that, with regard to the LEP, the submission date deadline had passed the previous day (6 <sup>th</sup> Sept.) and that the 6 Merseyside LAs (Halton, Sefton, Knowsley, Liverpool, St.Helens and Wirral) had submitted as one under the

		9.1.1 9.2	<p>Liverpool City Region. This complements and builds on the existing good work and reporting arrangements of City Region agenda to date. It was further noted that the LEP proposals seek to strengthen the private sector.</p> <p>JR offered to give an HCA update at the next meeting, when hopefully there would be more clarity about its future.</p>	
7.	<b>Next Meeting &amp; Future Diary Dates</b>	10.1 10.2	<p><b>The next meeting will take place at 3.00 pm, Tuesday, 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2010</b> in the Marketing Suite, Municipal Building, Widnes.</p> <p>Future meeting dates beyond that are yet to be confirmed, subject to HSPB arrangements which this partnership need to align with. An UR SSP &amp; Env. Subgroup 2011 Year Planner will be circulated in due course.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 4.25 pm.</p>	