

NINE ELMS STRATEGY BOARD

Minutes of the initial meeting held on Tuesday, 19th October 2010 at 9.30 a.m., at the Unicorn Theatre (John Lyon Conference Room), 147 Tooley Street, London SE1 2HZ

PRESENT

Members of the Strategy Board: Sir Simon Milton and Mr Giles Dolphin (Greater London Authority); Councillor Sally Prentice (Deputy Chairman) and Councillor Mark Harrison (Lambeth Borough Council); Councillor Edward Lister (Chairman) and Councillor Govindia (Wandsworth Borough Council); Mr Colin Lovell and Ms Michele Dix (Transport for London); Mr Sean Ellis (St James Group); Mr David Laycock (Ballymore Group); Mr Clive Morton and Mr Matthew Evans-Pollard (Covent Garden Market Authority); Mr Eugene Doyle (Royal Mail Group); Mr Rob Tincknell (Treasury Holdings); and Mr Jonathan Rawnsley (Sainsbury plc).

Officers and observers: Mr Colin Wilson and Mr Martin Scholar (GLA); Mr Jim Moore (National Grid plc); Mr Les Brown, Mr Zbig Blonski and Mr Clive Fraser (Lambeth Borough Council); Mr Gerald Jones, Mr Paul Martin, Mr Chris Buss, Mr Tony McDonald, Mr Steve Mayner and Mr Francis de Lima (Wandsworth Borough Council).

1, Introductions and Apologies

The Chairman, Councillor Lister, welcomed all attendees to the meeting and, at his suggestion, all present introduced themselves.

No apologies for absence were received.

2. Strategy Board Arrangements

- 2(i) Draft terms of reference. Councillor Prentice suggested that, in view of Lambeth Council's particular concerns with aspects of the draft terms of reference, it might be prudent for Members and officers from Wandsworth and Lambeth to get together in the first instance in an endeavour to resolve these issues and then report back to the Strategy Board, at the next meeting. She suggested that Lambeth Council would prefer if the matter of the Community Engagement Proposals (agenda item 4(i)) were similarly subjected to such joint consideration, again given the concerns Lambeth Council has with regard to certain aspects of the proposals.

Mr Ellis informed the meeting that the Landowners Group, which had met earlier, had similarly resolved to propose a deferment of

consideration of the terms of reference pending a more focussed consideration of the document, ideally by a small group of about six people representing interested stakeholder groups, in an endeavour to secure broad agreement by all participating bodies and organisations in the Vision for the Vauxhall-Nine Elms area and on the mechanism for achieving that Vision.

Sir Simon Milton confirmed the Greater London Authority's agreement with the Borough Councils' and Landowners Group's representatives meeting to resolve issues but asked that the GLA be kept informed about developments in connection with the proposed terms of reference and they likewise would examine them and submit any comments if appropriate.

On behalf of Transport for London, Ms Dix endorsed Sir Simon Milton's comments.

On behalf of Wandsworth Council, Councillor Lister agreed with Councillor Prentice's and Mr. Ellis's proposal.

Action: Meetings of a suitable group to be arranged between Wandsworth, Lambeth and Landowners' Group, and GLA and TfL to be kept informed of developments (Secretary to initiate).

- 2(ii) **Proposed secretarial arrangements.** Councillor Lister informed the meeting that Wandsworth Council offered the services of Mr de Lima to clerk meetings of the Strategy Board until any dedicated Support Team was established.

Councillor Prentice, Sir Simon Milton, Ms Dix and Mr Ellis confirmed, on behalf of the respective authorities and groups that they accepted the offer.

Councillor Govindia advised the meeting that, in the interest of expedition, as papers for meetings were often delayed in preparation, given the need for consultation etc., with the Strategy Board's agreement, agenda papers would be circulated electronically. Councillor Govindia's suggestion was accepted.

Mr Jones then advised the meeting that, in the interests of maintaining clear communications, it would be prudent to treat Mr de Lima as a "junction box" through which matters requiring wider dissemination ought to be channelled. Mr Jones' suggested approach was agreed.

Action: Wandsworth Council to continue to provide initial secretarial support.

- 2(iii) **Frequency of meetings.** Councillor Lister suggested that the Strategy Board ought to meet on a quarterly basis, with additional meeting convened, as required.

Councillor Prentice suggested that, given the difficulties generally experienced with regard to identifying dates convenient to elected members and others, as a matter of prudence, the Strategy Board ought to resolve to meet six times a year – effectively, every other month – on the understanding that meetings may be cancelled should there be insufficient business to justify convening a meeting.

Councillor Prentice’s proposal was agreed.

Action: Wandsworth to circulate possible dates (See Item10).
(Secretary).

- 2(iv) Name of the Strategy Board and use of Nine Elms “brand” on documentation. Councillor Prentice informed the meeting that, whilst Lambeth Council had no objection to Wandsworth Council employing a “Nine Elms” brand in its specific communications with its residents, she explained that the term had little relevance for the Lambeth residents in the areas within the Opportunity Area and adjacent to it – an elongated geographical area that extends from Vauxhall down to Clapham. Accordingly, she suggested that the matter of the name and the brand would benefit from more careful consideration. She indicated that she would also wish to discuss the matter with Lambeth Council’s Head of Communications.

Mr Ellis informed the meeting that the Landowners Group believe the matter of the name and the brand to be of crucial importance. For this reason, he suggested, professional advice ought to be sought and ideas for potential names ought to be invited. Whilst acknowledging that the name employed hitherto – “Vauxhall-Nine Elms Battersea” – was a mouthful and, indeed, generated a fair amount of confusion (as the landowners’ advisers had consistently pointed out), he stressed that it was vital that the Strategy Board “get this right”. Accordingly, he undertook to produce a brief and offer it to a suitable small group for consideration. Mr Ellis also stressed that it was crucial to establish a logo, a brand and an icon that adequately encapsulated the Vision in order that the Strategy Board’s efforts would generate wide appeal and support.

Councillor Prentice stated that Lambeth Council’s Head of Communications would concur with the views expressed by Mr Ellis.

The Chairman’s suggestion – that the matter of the name and brand be referred to an appropriate small group was agreed.

Action: Secretary to liaise with Mr. Ellis to place this matter on the agenda of a working group as soon as the ‘brief’ on naming etc. had been prepared. (see item 9 (a) on p. 10).

- 2(v) Any other aspects. Mr Jones asked the meeting to consider possible locations for future meetings of the Strategy Board. He noted that

expressions of the preferred locations for meetings had been for prominent places in the vicinity of City Hall, for City Hall itself and at a location within the Nine Elms area.

Mr Tincknell said that the Strategy Board were welcome to have their meeting at the Battersea Power Station.

Sir Simon Milton confirmed that the Strategy Board were welcome to have their meetings at City Hall, particularly as the John Lyon Conference Room at the Unicorn Theatre, in which this meeting was being held, proved to be inadequate in accommodating the number of attendees present.

It was then agreed that meetings of the Strategy Board be held at City Hall.

Action: Secretary to book future meetings at City Hall.

3. Proposals for a Support and Delivery Team.

The Chairman explained that the report circulated with the agenda on this item, was a Wandsworth Council document covering a proposal for general support for the implementation of the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Wandsworth Council's own planning resources requirement. He asked Councillor Prentice for Lambeth Council's views on the staffing requirements for the Support and Delivery Team.

Councillor Prentice advised the meeting that, before reporting on Lambeth Council's position, she would wish to discuss the matter fully with her Council's new Executive Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, who would be taking up her post in November 2010.

Mr Ellis informed the meeting that he had replied to Councillor Lister's letter of 8th September 2010, the previous day but expected that Councillor Lister would not yet have received it. He apologised for the delay which was due to the need to consult with the representatives of the other landowners, which he had now done. Mr Ellis explained that, in principle, the landowners were willing to contribute to the staffing costs related to the regeneration effort, the Strategy Board and Wandsworth Council's planning requirements. He reminded the meeting that there was provision within the final draft of the DIFS report for £2.5 towards staffing. However, the landowners were seeking a better understanding of the proposed posts, their respective roles, to whom precisely the post-holders would report, the competences that were being sought for the proposed posts and about "who foots the bill".

Mr Ellis elaborated further that the landowners had "learned lessons from Paddington" and were accordingly keen to ensure that the staff to be appointed were fully competent to deal with what the landowners considered to be the twin core functions for the staff team, namely, marketing and communications. He emphasised that these considerations covered the

landowners' key concerns and that the two core functions he had mentioned would give a better definition to the posts.

Councillor Lister stated that from Wandsworth Council's point of view, that Council wanted to oversee the development control aspects of developments in the Borough of Wandsworth.

Sir Simon Milton said that, with regard to the Paddington Basin development, he viewed Kay Buxton as acting on behalf of the developers there in a co-ordinating role. He stated that as long as Wandsworth and Lambeth Councils and the GLA were satisfied that there was sufficient capacity on the planning control side, he was happy with what was being proposed in terms of staffing, timing and contributions towards staffing costs.

By way of clarification, Councillor Govindia explained that two sets of staff were being proposed. Firstly, the staff associated with the Support and Delivery Team (comprising initially 3 full-time equivalent staff) whose tasks were to champion the VNEB proposals as a whole; to provide strategic leadership for the implementation of infrastructure; and to drive the day to day delivery of a business plan. The costs associated with the work of this team would be met by the landowners. Secondly, planning staff at Wandsworth and Lambeth Councils would be seconded to work on the Nine Elms regeneration programme in their respective boroughs. At Wandsworth, as stated in the Wandsworth Council report (Paper No. 10-685) circulated with the agenda, "external funding from partners would be required to meet the additional staffing costs of backfilling not covered by planning application fees."

Ms Dix stated that there were a number of considerations on the TfL side which would be reported on to the Strategy Board, at their next meeting.

Councillor Lister said that Wandsworth Council was keen to move forward on staffing and suggested that this aspect ought to be progressed through the small working group proposed to be convened.

Mr Ellis reiterated his earlier arguments particularly with regard to the £2.5m allocation included in DIFS, which was sufficient to cover the landowners' commitment over a 5-year timeframe. Councillor Lister confirmed that Wandsworth Council would send an early response to Mr Ellis' message.

Actions:

- (a) Councillor Prentice to hold initial discussions with her new Executive Director in November.
- (b) Landowners' Group to be provided with further details of the respective roles, competences and reporting arrangements for the proposed team. (Wandsworth Council Officers via Secretary).
- (c) TfL to consider Support and Delivery implications and report any views to the January meeting of the Strategy Board.

- 4(i) Governance Structure. Community Engagement Proposals, it was noted that, as agreed earlier in the meeting, this matter would be considered by the small working group of stakeholders' representatives to be convened.

Action: Following any further discussions among stakeholders, Community Engagement to be referred to the stakeholders working group (Secretary).

- 4(ii) Governance Structure Diagram, it was noted that this matter would also be considered by the working group referred to above, but Mr. Jones commented it was the same as previously widely circulated to all parties, with the sole addition of the proposed Housing Working Group of officers.

Action: Secretary to refer to Stakeholders Working Group.

- 4(iii) Proposed Housing Working Group of Officers, Mr Jones explained that this proposal arose from a suggestion by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to establish whether it was possible for funds to be recycled. He said that it was expected that the Working Group would comprise officers from Wandsworth and Lambeth Councils and the GLA and would report to the Strategy Board, at future meetings.

Councillor Prentice endorsed this proposal.

Action: Housing Working Group to be convened in due course.

- 4(iv) Arrangements and timing for other working groups, the Chairman commented that working groups could be set up as they are required.

Mr Ellis advised the meeting that the landowners were exceedingly "keen to get started" on the regeneration project, to assess the scopes of the various projects and to bring these scopes back to the Strategy Board, at their January meeting. He advised the meeting that the landowners "have lots of good minds" working on the various aspects including the public realm and the linear park, whilst Treasury Holding are involved with the Northern Line Extension.

Councillor Prentice explained that Lambeth Council viewed the proposed Transport Working Group as having a crucial importance. She said that her Council, whilst accepting the benefits that the Northern Line Extension would bring to the area, was strongly of the view that the other existing Underground Lines and stations in the area at Vauxhall and Clapham ought to be maintained and improved. She also stressed the importance of investment in the public realm and green spaces.

The Chairman accepted the Landowners' Group's suggestion and agreed that this should be discussed at the Strategy Board's next meeting.

Mr Ellis undertook to circulate the landowners' draft proposals to relevant to the working groups in due course.

Action: Working groups to be initiated via the Secretary as soon as necessary, and any relevant material to be forwarded for the agendas.

5. Latest position of Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) Report.

On item 5, Mr McDonald introduced the report prepared by Wandsworth Council and circulated with the agenda, and elaborated on aspects of the report, particularly in relation to the funding gap of between £58m and £79m, depending on the level (15% or 40%) of affordable housing provision. He drew attention to the advice in the DIFS report to possible reduction (by about £29m) in the funding gap through the elimination "of the VNEB attributable costs [is] not critical to the development of the Opportunity Area." Mr McDonald cautioned that, even if these elements (possibly such as community and emergency facilities) were not pursued, it was still likely that there would be a shortfall which would need to be addressed by the partners.

The Chairman accepted the findings of the DIFS as good news and confirmed Wandsworth Council's own general calculations (via another study (the PFDS)).

Mr Tincknell argued that costs of £25m estimated to be spent on the park at the Battersea Power Station site could be "stripped out", thereby reducing the shortfall. It would still be possible to provide for a park at the site.

Sir Simon Milton commented that a funding gap of this order ought not to act as an impediment to the commencement of the regeneration project.

Mr Laycock commented that provided the various working groups worked well there was no reason why the regeneration of the area would not be successful.

Ms Dix commented in relation to the Northern Line Extension that it was vital that all works associated with the extension be undertaken at the same time as costs would inevitably increase if the development were undertaken in a piece meal fashion. She added that the same would happen if the extension works were delayed. In response, Councillor Govindia commented that it was always Wandsworth Council's understanding that the two station "boxes" would be constructed at the same time. Mr Tincknell observed that both the DIFS and the Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) study showed that works on the two station boxes could be undertaken simultaneously.

Councillor Prentice said that Lambeth Council officers would examine the issue of the S106 tariffs in relation to the Northern Line Extension. She remarked that, while there was a good business case for Wandsworth as regards the extension of the Line as far as the Battersea Power Station site, the considerations for the borough of Lambeth were different in that Lambeth residents experience difficulties with the existing Northern Line in the wider Clapham area, particularly in the light of new housing developments in that area in recent years. Difficulties, which needed to be addressed, were also being experienced on the Victoria Line to Victoria at Stockwell and Vauxhall Stations.

Sir Simon Milton argued that it was “not in our interest” to add congestion to the Underground system. Ms Dix, whilst acknowledging that TfL were aware of the congestion prevailing on the existing Lines, argued that the Northern Line Extension was nevertheless a critical part of the VNEB regeneration. She explained that TfL wanted to address all the issues in the area, not only improvements to Vauxhall Station.

Mr Tincknell, (in assuring Councillor Prentice), stated that the Northern Line Extension would not be serviced by trains diverted from service on other Lines. Councillor Govindia informed the meeting that Wandsworth Council agreed to the Northern Line Extension because the Council were assured that Wandsworth residents would not be inconvenienced either, as a result of its operations.

Sir Simon Milton then asked that TfL representatives talk to counterparts at Lambeth Council to assure them that the construction of the Northern Line Extension would not lead or contribute to deterioration in Underground services on other Lines operating through, and serving the population of, Lambeth.

Mr Tincknell the reported that Treasury Holdings were conducting discussions with H. M. Treasury on the introduction of a TIF to assist the financing of the Northern Line extension. Sir Simon Milton indicated that the two Borough Councils and other stakeholders would need to indicate their support soon for a TIF. Councillor Lister promised that Wandsworth Council would write again to H. M. Treasury and Sir Simon Milton confirmed that the Mayor would also be happy to sign a supporting letter to H. M. Treasury.

Mr Lovell commented on the need to secure a TIF as S106 funding would gradually be phased out.

At the end of the discussion, the recommendations at the end of the report were agreed.

Actions:

- (a) TfL representatives to discuss with Lambeth Council counterparts to provide assurances in relation to their Northern and Victoria Line

concerns.

- (b) Wandsworth Leader to arrange for a letter to HM Treasury supporting a TIF for the NLE.
- (c) Sir Simon Milton to sign an appropriate similar letter of support.

6. Implications for NLE funding and timing.

On item 6, Ms Dix commented that the construction of the Northern Line Extension and its timing were dependent on the outcome of funding decisions through DIFS and agreement on tariffs. She stressed that the assurance of adequate funding for the project was vital. She hoped that plans could then be put in place by the autumn 2011. This view on the vital need for an assurance on funding was endorsed by Sir Simon Milton.

Mr Tincknell commented that what was required was a guaranteed “path to money – not money in the box”. He revealed that Treasury had had a useful discussion on financing the project with the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Eric Pickles, MP.

Ms Dix then enquired as to which organisation would be the sponsor of the Northern Line Extension project. She stressed that the identification of a sponsor was a critical issue and one of significant concern to TfL. She emphasised that this issue was as crucial as the early establishment of precise funding details. She urged the early establishment of the relevant NLE Working Group and for this Group to meet and report on these vital issues as early as possible to the Strategy Board.

The Chairman, acknowledging the consensus view of the meeting, agreed that this Working Group ought to be convened as a matter of some urgency, to consider primarily matters relating to the funding and the identification of a sponsor for the project. Mr. Jones emphasised it was important to note that the relevant Working Group was identified as the “NLE Working Group” on the Governance diagram, and there was a separate Working Group considering other transport issues, including rail, bus, river and other modes.

Action: NLE Working Group to be convened as quickly as possible (TfL and Secretary).

7. Updates from Board Members on general progress and other issues.

- 7(i) On behalf of the GLA, Mr Dolphin reported that the consultation on the Planning Framework for the VNEB OA has been completed and the results would be placed on the GLA’s website. He revealed that about 80 responses were received, some quite complex, and that these were on the whole supportive of the proposed Planning Framework.

Mr Dolphin reported that among the concerns expressed were: the pressure on Vauxhall Station, tall buildings at the Vauxhall end of the

Opportunity Area, and the availability of funding to meet infrastructure needs. However, the idea of a linear park met with much support. Mr Dolphin said that there would be a consultation on the draft Framework document and it was hoped that the Framework would be published in early 2011.

- 7(ii) On behalf of Transport for London, Mr Lovell reported that TfL had been working closely with the GLA on the Planning Framework and had commissioned a gyratory study. Work was also being undertaken with Treasury Holdings on the Northern Line Extension and with colleagues on TIF.
- 7(iii) On behalf of Wandsworth Council, Mr McDonald informed the meeting that planning permission for the United States embassy had been issued recently and that the planning application for the Battersea Power Station site was intended to be submitted to the Planning Applications Committee in November 2010. He reported that discussions were being undertaken with other landowners/developers and expected that the planning application for the Tideway Basin site would be considered by Committee in February 2011.

Mr McDonald reported that National Grid were carrying out testing this winter on a pressure reduction system to replace gas holders, and would then look at progressing the redevelopment next spring, if successful. National Grid also had discussions with the Health and Safety Executive on what developments would be appropriate in the vicinity of the gas holders. He commented that there had been a muted public response to this development proposal.

Councillor Lister drew attention to the schedule on the current major planning applications in the Opportunity Area part of the Borough of Wandsworth, which was included with the agenda papers for the meeting.

- 7(iv) On behalf of Lambeth Council, Councillor Prentice introduced a paper entitled 'Schedule of Vauxhall Development Sites (LB Lambeth VNEB Opportunity Area)' and advised the meeting that these developments would form part of the Core strategy, a report on which would be submitted to Committee in December 2010. She added that developments across the border would have to be managed and that Lambeth would seek to align with Wandsworth and the GLA on S106.
- 7(v) On behalf of the Landowners Group, Mr Ellis reported that the Group would endeavour to meet on a bi-monthly basis and hoped to provide feedback regularly to stakeholders.

Councillor Govindia commented that the Wandsworth and Lambeth lists of developments would hopefully reflect what is in the DIFS so that there was no disconnect with the common theme.

8. Proposed CABE Study.

Councillor Lister stated that Wandsworth Council's view is that it would be useful if the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) were 'on board' in respect of the VNEB regeneration.

Mr Ellis commented that developers and landowners were already subject to CABE scrutiny and advised the meeting that, based upon the level of service that developers received from CABE, they were concerned about what service they would receive over and above what they now receive, for the additional outlay that would be required from them. He added that there was an element of reticence among landowners in view of the £50,000 or £90,000 they were being asked to contribute which members of his Group feel amount to a salami-slicing approach to landowner contributions.

Mr Laycock commented that the developers already had good architectural teams working with them.

In response, the Chairman said that landowners were not being obliged to contribute but that it was felt that there was much merit in having CABE review the development proposals. Councillor Govindia, in endorsing the Chairman's comments, referred to his discussions with Mr McConnell and reiterated the value of having an organisation like CABE review proposals of this magnitude for reshaping an area on such a significant scale. He stressed the value of having the same panel throughout, which would offer consistent advice across the Opportunity Area.

Mr Tincknell informed the meeting that Treasury Holdings had had seven meetings with CABE and were fortunate to have had the same team.

Mr McDonald confirmed that the planners at Wandsworth did wish to work closely with CABE and believed that this would be a productive process. The Chairman suggested that, as a way forward, Wandsworth Council and 27th October 2010. The matter could then be discussed with Lambeth Council representatives, in case Lambeth Council wished for a CABE involvement with development proposals in their borough.

Mr Dolphin suggested that, if CABE were to be employed to review development proposals, they ought to be given a very specific brief and required to focus on a particular aspect, e.g. to review and comment upon how developments correspond to the park they will surround – rather than give them the scope to rewrite the OAPF.

Ms Dix commented that CABE had been dismissive of TfL in the past and, therefore, she hoped that, in view of the strategic link between the development proposals and transport, TfL would have the opportunity to respond to CABE's findings.

At the end of the discussion, Mr Ellis argued that perhaps the design review panel ought to be reduced from 12 to 6, with substitutes and that the scope of the review ought to be narrowed down as well.

In response, Councillor Lister asked Mr McDonald to consider Mr Ellis' suggestion, which would be discussed further at the Wandsworth Council – Landowners Group meeting on 27th October 2010.

Action: CABE Study to be discussed further at future Landowners' Group.

9. Plans for Events and Publicity through to end-2011.

Councillor Lister stated that these plans would also need to be discussed at the Wandsworth Council – Landowners' Group meeting on 27th October 2010. He observed that fairly significant amounts of money would be required to fund these events, which he hoped could be subject to 'light touch' arrangements in-house, undertaken by the two Borough Councils and the GLA. He enquired whether it was the general view that the model of the regeneration area ought to be kept going.

Councillor Prentice noted that Lambeth Council had also used the model. She suggested that it would be helpful if the Communications Working Group got off the ground soon, as that would be the optimum body to consider matters relating to publicity and events.

Mr Ellis noted that there are many events that do not cost much. As an example, he suggested that a publicity event, which the media would be invited to attend, could be held at Battersea Studios.

Mr Mayner, in endorsing Mr Ellis' comments observed that, if the various partners contributed their skills to work together, they would produce "a powerful force". He suggested that a press release be prepared and undertook to co-ordinate this effort and to consult on it with all key players.

Mr Tincknell commented that "today is a good story" whereby the various partners had come together and were beginning to work in cooperation on a major regeneration of the VNEB area. This approach was supported by Councillor Govindia as well as by Mr Ellis who suggested that DIFS – the second "good story" – should also be included in the proposed press release.

Ms Dix suggested that the statement ought to indicate that the DIFS was good and would be consulted on. Mr Dolphin suggested that the statement ought not to focus merely on the DIFS but should seek to publicise the whole Vision.

Sir Simon Milton acceded to the Chairman's suggestion that he should ask the Mayor to contribute a positive comment for inclusion in the press release.

In response to Councillor Harrison's comment that it was important to keep the wider community informed as well, the Chairman, in agreeing with the

suggestion, commented that nevertheless the proposed press release would be directed primarily at the property media.

At the end of the discussion, it was agreed that the press release would be drafted by Mr Mayner who would then consult with all parties on its content.

Actions:

- (a) Communications Group to be initiated by Mr. Mayner and Mr. Townsend with other Stakeholders and co-ordinate the future media and publicity approach and actions, reporting back to the January meeting (Messrs. Mayner and Townsend).
- (b) the initial press release statement to be agreed by all stakeholders and issued as soon as possible (Mr. Mayner).
- (c) Publicity plans for 2011 to be considered by the Landowner's Group at their meeting (Mr. Ellis).

10. Date of next meeting.

The Chairman noted that there was general agreement for the next meeting of the Strategy Board to be held in January 2011, and thereafter, every other month, as business required. He also noted the earlier agreement that Strategy Board meetings would be held at City Hall. The Chairman then asked and received concurrence to having 9:30 am as the start time for Strategy Group meetings and for these meetings to be limited to a 2 hours duration.

Mr Jones said that he and Mr de Lima would circulate possible dates for the first few meetings and he asked that Mr de Lima be kept advised of the dates of working group meetings so that this information could then be available to all parties.

Action: Secretary

The meeting ended at 10.44 am

Francis de Lima
Secretary

Strategy Group/FDL/25.10.10