

**PLANNING & ECONOMIC STRATEGY BOARD**

**Meeting held at the City Learning Centre, Normanby Road, South Bank  
at 2.00pm on Tuesday 15 April 2008**

---

ATTENDEES

Councillor Bob Cook	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council (SBC)	Chair
Councillor John Williams	Darlington Borough Council (DBC)	
Councillor Mark Hannon	Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC)	
Steve Petch (SP)	DBC	
Peter Scott (PS)	Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC)	
Chris Hawking (CH)	MC	
Lisa Walker (LW)	RCBC	
Richard Poundford (RP)	SBC	
Paul Whitaker (PW)	North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC)	
Mike Lakinski (ML)	Business Link North East (BL)	
Mike McNulty (MM)	Environment Agency (EA)	
Malcolm Potter (MP)	Tees Valley Engineering Partnership (TVEP)	
Keith Robinson (KR)	Keith Robinson & Co	
John Irwin (JI)	Storey:ssp	
John Lowther (JL)	Tees Valley Living (TVL)	
Jonathan Spruce (JS)	Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU)	

---

PRESENTERS

Vicky Patterson (VP)	EA
----------------------	----

---

---

**APOLOGIES**

Councillor David Budd	MC
Stuart Drummond	HBC
Richard Alty	DBC
Tim White	MC
Ian Wardle	RCBC
David Elliott	Richmondshire District Council (RDC)
Bob Ward	Durham County Council (DCC)
Malcolm Bowes	North East Assembly (NEA)
Nick Muse	One NorthEast (ONE)
Joe Docherty	Tees Valley Regeneration (TVR)
Jonathan Lamb	BL
Stan Higgins	North East Process Industries Cluster (NEPIC)

---

Draft

---

Action

**1 APOLOGIES**

1.1 As noted previously (including substitutes).

**2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

2.1 None declared.

**3 NOTES OF THE MEETING ON 15 JANUARY 2008**

3.1 Agreed as a true record.

**4 MATTERS ARISING**

4.1 Item 5 – **JL** indicated that the asset analysis part of the work will soon be underway, that ONE is soon to commission work to examine the future capacity of the National Grid in the area, and TVR has been investigating the availability of sites for development.

4.2 Item 6 – **PW** stated that there was little extra to report, but asked about progress on joint working with regard to the skills of MoD employees and the potential match with the process industry. **JL** confirmed that such work was being progressed by NEPIC.

4.3 Item 7 – **JL** confirmed that an announcement regarding new housing growth points was now expected in early May.

4.4 Item 8 – **JL** provided the Board with a short update on progress with the Multi-Area Agreement (MAA), particularly the forthcoming negotiating session with Government planned for 24 April.

**5 SECRETARY OF STATE'S FURTHER PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT REVISED REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE NORTH EAST**

5.1 **JL** introduced the report for information, with the generally positive response to the proposed changes for the Tees Valley, based on previous representations.

5.2 **Councillor Williams** asked that further representation be made on the need for improvements to the A66 around Darlington following the recent work co-ordinated by the JSU and the Highways Agency. **JL** to arrange for a letter to be prepared and sent to GONE.

**JL**

---

Action

5.3 Resolved that the report be noted.

**6 TEES VALLEY GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY –  
PROGRESS UPDATE**

6.1 **JL** introduced the report and emphasised that funding for 2008/09 had been agreed with ONE.

6.2 As the finalised Action Plan is to be discussed at the next Board meeting, **Councillor Williams** suggested that Members and Senior Officers with responsibility for the environment be invited to the next meeting.

**JSU**

6.3 **CH** asked how much of the initial funding will be spent on feasibility work. **JL** replied that much of the initial funding will be spent on developing interventions, but funding was available for actual schemes provided they sat within the agreed green infrastructure framework.

6.4 **MM** stressed the need to look at selected projects in the initial phases which will give the concept greater credibility.

6.5 **JL** expressed the wish that he hoped that the prioritisation process would not become too parochial.

6.6 **KR** asked if there is any idea of the overall cost of all of the identified projects. **JL** replied that this exercise had not yet been undertaken.

6.7 **RP** suggested that adding economic impact to the assessment criteria would be logical and appropriate.

6.8 Resolved that the report be noted and the final Action Plan be brought to the next meeting.

**7 TEES VALLEY FLOOD RISK STRATEGY**

7.1 **VP** gave a short presentation on the emerging findings from the EA's flood risk strategy for the Tees Valley.

7.2 **Councillor Hannon** asked how the Tees Valley compares with other rivers on the East Coast and whether there was any priority scoring. **VP** replied that each flood cell had been assessed against a set of national indicators.

7.3 **Councillor Cook** asked whether conditions had been made worse by previous development patterns. **VP** confirmed that flood defences in the Tees Valley were generally quite poor for a number of reasons.

---

Action

- 7.4 **JI** questioned the inclusion of a flood cell at Teesside Park given that this was upstream of the Tees Barrage.
- 7.5 **PS** asked whether there was an overview that considers all flood risk issues, including coastal and tidal.
- 7.6 **Councillor Williams** asked about the longevity of the plan. **VP** replied that it was intended to be a 100 year strategy.
- 7.7 **CH** asked about the consultation process with Local Authorities during the development of the strategy and whether all future developments have been accounted for. **VP** stated that Local Authorities had been consulted in 2006, and that the latest strategy would be made available. **MM** confirmed that all known developments had been accounted for.
- 7.8 **KR** stated that, in terms of the outline cost of £85 million for a 100 year plan to minimise flood risk in the Tees estuary, business may be a willing contributor given the extent of investment planned.
- 7.9 **RP** asked for further clarification of the flood risk for each of the flood cells identified.
- 7.10 The Board thanked **VP** for the presentation.

## **8 SUB NATIONAL REVIEW**

- 8.1 **JL** gave a short presentation on the main elements of the consultation document that was published in late March.
- 8.2 **RP** asked whether each Authority would be expected to produce an individual economic analysis under the new proposals. **JL** replied that he assumed that this would not be the case for the Tees Valley.
- 8.3 **PS** added that the new duty is likely to operate on two levels – the City Region assessment that has already been undertaken, with the opportunity for each Authority to strengthen the economic assessment at a local level.
- 8.4 **JI** expressed the view that the private sector craves stability in terms of its contributory investment plans, and the SNR consultation document appeared, at first, to be yet more instability.

---

Action

8.5 **Councillor Williams** stated that he felt that there was sufficient goodwill within the Tees Valley for joint working even if any statutory duties did not apply.

**9 TEES VALLEY UNLIMITED WORK PROGRAMME 2008/09**

9.1 **JL** presented a paper outlining the anticipated future work programme for the Board, and the other elements of Tees Valley Unlimited.

9.2 **CH** pointed out that there were some issues being dealt with primarily at other meetings (such as the A66/A19/A174 Area Action Plan) that would be of interest to this Board.

9.3 Resolved that the report be noted and the work programme be reviewed at an appropriate time later in the year.

**JSU**

**10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

10.1 None noted.

**11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING(S)**

- 11.1
- Tuesday 15 July 2008
  - Tuesday 14 October 2008
  - Tuesday 13 January 2009
  - Tuesday 21 April 2009

Meetings to commence at 2pm, venues to be confirmed.

---