

**Minutes of Panel Meeting**  
**Monday 8<sup>th</sup> May 2006**  
**British Waterways, 1 Sheldon Square,**  
**Paddington Central, London W2 6TT**

Present:

Prof. Stephen Crow

Chris Collison

James Froomberg

Neil Mundy

Deep Sagar

Jane Bransby

Gavin Fleming

### **Further evaluation and examination of proposals**

The Panel discussed, bearing in mind conflicts of interest, whether, all Panel members having further examined the proposed 8 shortlisted regional proposals, were content with the previous decision.

The Panel agreed that there was no basis to cut the shortlist further on the evidence submitted in the proposals alone. The 8 shortlisted proposals had been agreed to have submitted the strongest and most compelling evidence. It would not be easy or defensible to cut further at this stage. It was agreed that it was possible to examine all eight in the time allotted and that, unless there were any adverse evidence submitted in the consultation period to seriously damage this view, all eight should be kept on the shortlist. However, the Panel should remain alert to any information which was of significance to the evidence submitted – particularly with regards to the validity of data supplied.

It was agreed that the secretariat would collate and report on the submissions made in the consultation period but would alert Panel members on an ongoing basis if there were any significant material pertaining to the validity of the shortlist. Until that was completed the Panel agreed, therefore, that the list should be published as provisional until all further submissions had been examined.

### **Announcement of shortlist**

It was agreed that the local authorities should be notified of the Panel's decision prior to the issue of any press notice. However there was a limit to how early we could release this information to them without the results 'leaking'. It was agreed that the Secretary would write to the local authorities and/or email them on the day of the announcement.

## **Shortlisting of Large and Small**

Having previously agreed on 28<sup>th</sup> April that the initial evaluation process needed no further moderation, the Panel discussed, how many should be taken through to the next stage of evaluation. It was agreed that, as with the regional proposals, they would shortlist those which had clearly submitted the strongest and most compelling evidence.

The Panel also agreed that regional proposals with a fall-back position should be looked at with equal weighting against the large and small and not 'automatically' granted their fallback position.

The Panel further agreed there should be sufficient shortlisted proposals in each category to allow for more detailed examination. The Panel noted that some of the proposals were for large *and* small or large *or* small and that some doubling up was inevitable. They would therefore announce large and small together on the press announcement. In addition it was agreed that the secretariat would check by telephone the status of the proposals in cases of doubt and notify the Panel of any changes.

The Panel discussed the proposals at length and agreed that, as with the regional proposals, it was clear those which had submitted strong and compelling evidence and those which hadn't. Having come up with a list, the Panel further discussed whether those selected represented a 'range of types of area' and a 'geographical spread' which needed to be considered as one of the remitted criteria for the Large and Small categories. The Panel was content that the proposals shortlisted addressed these criteria.

The Panel then once again went through a rigorous process to determine that no good quality proposal had been left out, particularly those which had been on the margins of the shortlist. Each was addressed in turn with opportunities for Panel members to suggest inclusion in the shortlist if they felt there was compelling evidence or any other reason to do so. The Panel was mindful of the need to ensure an adequate field for both the large and small categories. It was agreed that 31 proposals should be shortlisted.

The 31 shortlisted were: Bath & NE Somerset; Bournemouth; Brighton; Canterbury; Chelmsford; Dartford; Dudley; Dumfries and Galloway; East Lindsey; Gt Yarmouth; Hastings; Hull; Leeds; Leicester; Luton; Mansfield; Middlesbrough; Milton Keynes; Newham; N E Lincs; Peterborough; Restormel; Scarborough; Sefton; Solihull; Southampton; South Tyneside; Swansea; Thurrock; Torbay; Wolverhampton

## **AOB**

Visits

The Panel discussed visits to the shortlisted regional areas. It was agreed that all those shortlisted should be visited. It was agreed that the Panel should ensure that all shortlisted areas were treated equally, regardless of whether they were visited at the time of the EiP or at a separate time. It was also agreed that the Panel would visit unaccompanied by local authority officials but that they reserved the right to request guidance from LAs as to the areas they should visit if not clear from the proposals themselves.

#### Casino visit

It was discussed whether there would be merit in visiting one of the largest British casinos in order to determine the validity of some of the proposal claims, such as predicted employee numbers. It was agreed that a visit should be arranged to Star City in Birmingham as this was not only one of the largest but also was in an area which hadn't submitted a proposal. It was agreed that the Chair would attend and any other Panel members who were able to do so. It was also agreed that those Panel members should be accompanied by at least one of the secretariat and that careful notes should be taken and distributed amongst the rest of the Panel unable to attend.

#### Panel meetings

It was agreed that the next Panel meeting (5 July) should be arranged, if possible in or near Sheffield with the following (11 August) in one of the other shortlisted areas.