



SOUTH EAST
LOCAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIP

Strategic Board Draft Minutes

10am Friday 31st January 2020

High House Production Park, Purfleet, RM19 1RJ



Agenda

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction	4
Item 2: Minutes of last meeting, Declarations of Interest and Matters Arising	4
Item 3: Local Industrial Strategy	4
Item 4: Communication Strategy and Protocols	6
Item 5: Local Growth Fund Spend Beyond 31 March 2021	7
Item 6: SELEP Local Assurance Framework 2020/21.....	9
Item 7: Chair Term Extension.....	9
Item 8: Deputy Chair Recruitment	9
Item 9: Board Membership.....	10
Item 10: AOB	10

Future Strategic Board meeting dates:

20th March; 12th June; (24th June AGM); 2nd October; 11th December; and 19th March 2021.

Attendees

Chair	Chris Brodie	
Chief Executive Officer	Adam Bryan	SELEP
EBB and OSE business representatives	Colette Bailey	Metal
	David Rayner	Birkett Long
	George Kieffer	Vice Chair
	Miles Adcock	Teledyne e2v
	Perry Glading	Chair of the Thurrock Business Board
EBB and OSE local government representatives	Cllr Tony Ball	Essex County Council
	Cllr Martin Bracken	Chelmsford City Council
	Cllr Ron Woodley	Southend on Sea Borough Council
KMEP business representatives	Andrew Metcalf	Maxim PR
	Geoff Miles	Vice Chair
	Miranda Chapman	Pillary Barn
	Jo James	Kent Invicta Chambers of Commerce
KMEP local government representatives	Cllr Adrian Gulvin	Medway Council
	Cllr Mike Whiting	Kent County Council
	Cllr Peter Fleming	Sevenoaks District Council
	Cllr David Monk	Folkestone and Hythe District Council
TES business representatives	Ana Christie	Sussex Chamber of Commerce
	Clive Soper	FSB
	Graham Peters	Vice Chair
TES local government representatives	Cllr Peter Chowney	Hastings Borough Council
Higher education representative	Dr Carole Barron	University of Kent

Apologies: Cllr Rob Gledhill, Cllr David Finch, Cllr Graham Butland, Cllr Roger Gough, Cllr Rodney Chambers, Prof Karen Cox, Angela O'Donoghue and Penny Shimmin.

Other attendees:

Alex Riley	SELEP Secretariat	Lorna Norris	Essex County Council
Amy Bernardo	Essex County Council	Peter Shakespeare	Essex County Council
Amy Ferraro	SELEP Secretariat	Rhiannon Mort	SELEP Secretariat
Charlotte Moody	Essex County Council (ELS)	Richard Dawson	East Sussex County Council
Claudia McKibbin	Essex County Council	Richard Longman	Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
Dawn Hudd	Medway Council	Sharon Spicer	SELEP Secretariat
Helen Dyer	SELEP Secretariat	Simon Hubbard	Hastings Council
Helen Russell	SELEP Secretariat	Stephanie Mitchener	Essex County Council (S151)
Howard Davies	SELEP Secretariat	Stephen Taylor	Thurrock Council
Iain McNab	MHCLG/BEIS	Suzanne Bennett	SELEP Secretariat
Ian Lewis	Opportunity South Essex	Tim Rignall	Southend Borough Council
Jo Simmons	SELEP Secretariat	Tristan Smith	Essex County Council
Lee Burchill	Kent County Council	Zoe Gordon	SELEP Secretariat

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1. Chris Brodie opened the meeting.

Item 2: Minutes of last meeting, Declarations of Interest and Matters Arising

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were **agreed**.
- 2.2. There were no interests declared in relation to this agenda.
- 2.3. The Board was updated regarding the Annual Performance Review that was conducted on the 27th of January; it went well, and final marks will be good, provided that all the LEP review requirements are met as previously agreed.
- 2.4. George Kieffer updated the Board regarding the ESIF meeting mentioned at 11.9 in the previous minutes. This meeting was unfortunately cancelled but resulted in the SELEP area receiving more money than originally allocated.
- 2.5. Adam Bryan informed the Board that the Lower Thames Crossing Supplementary Consultation is now open, and a response to this will be considered at the March Strategic Board meeting.
- 2.6. Adam Bryan also explained to the Board that there will be an induction session scheduled on the 20th of March before the Board meeting for all Board members, with more details to follow.

Item 3: Local Industrial Strategy

- 3.1. Carole Barron commented regarding the Government timetable delays slipping from March to the Summer that the political landscape has changed since December, and that an even bigger case for investment given the focus on investment in the north and that our area will be at the sharp point of Brexit.
- 3.2. Adam Bryan responded that the LISs remain part of Government plans, although possibly re-packaged. He continued that feedback has suggested the SELEP's LIS is stronger than many others and this may facilitate faster working with the Government, and emphasised that this meeting presents another chance to give feedback and comments to be taken into consideration in the final drafting of the LIS.
- 3.3. Helen Russell and Sharon Spicer presented to the Board.



3 310120 LEP Board
Meeting LIS PP_FINA

- 3.4.
- 3.5. Jo James expressed concern around adding more outcomes to the evidence base that this would add too much length to the document. She added her thanks to Helen and Sharon for the work they have done.
- 3.6. Jo James continued by suggesting that there needs to be a greater mention of the benefits of the Lower Thames Crossing, and that any opportunity where investing in the SELEP actually also helps the north will be important.
- 3.7. Peter Fleming expressed thanks regarding the engagement and attendance with KMEP. He added that he wished to emphasise to the new Board the scale of the challenge of covering the whole SELEP area, and that

he doesn't think there is clear single message in the LIS, but he does not think this is possible given this challenge.

- 3.8. Ana Christie commented that Government will be focusing on net-zero carbon economy and that she thinks this needs to come out more. She asked whether a task group could be formed regarding engagement with utility companies.
- 3.9. Miranda Chapman suggested that the LIS needs a couple of sentences as an "elevator pitch".
- 3.10. Perry Glading stated that he would like a better understanding of the calculation of the figure of 28 billion. He also asked how this document could work alongside a good communications strategy throughout all the federated areas, adding that there is a need for a concise "front end" that can be promoted locally.
- 3.11. Graham Peters commented that he thinks the document needs to be more impactful for ministers.
- 3.12. Carole Barron commented that there needs to be more emphasis, regarding ageing society/new communities, around helping people to stay in their homes longer. She added that momentum needs to be maintained around Clean Growth, and that the U9 group may be able to add to the evidence base.
- 3.13. Carole Barron continued, adding that the word "security" is key in the section around the ports.
- 3.14. Andrew Metcalf stated that the detail of the document will be less important for ministers, and that a short pithy narrative would be useful for this.
- 3.15. Adrian Gulvin suggested encouraging utility companies to invest in infrastructure, as infrastructure needs to be green going forward to align with Government aims.
- 3.16. It was also suggested that the references to the coastal prospectus could be made clearer.
- 3.17. Graham Peters commented that the feedback from the rural group working group was positive, however most information relating to rural is found under the Coastal Catalyst strategic opportunity, and he asked whether this could be changed.
- 3.18. Jo James stated that the executive summary is too repetitive of content already in the document, and that it needs to be something more enticing to the reader.
- 3.19. Helen Russell clarified that there is a three-page summary produced which was not circulated as it will be finalised during the next stage.
- 3.20. Colette Bailey commented that she likes how the document describes what unites the area. The Skills Advisory Panel asked whether there could also be acknowledgement of the challenge of close proximity to London, rather than just the opportunities. More information and detail around the creative sector would also improve the document, particularly around the attraction strategy. She emphasised the available resources of copywriters available within this sector while finalising the document.
- 3.21. Graham Peters emphasised that some areas of the SELEP themselves require levelling with the rest of the South East, as there is some deprivation and particular issues within our own areas.
- 3.22. Carole Barron added that within Research and Development the language needs strengthening, that there is not a lack of spending but a disproportionately low amount of funding allocated to the area.

- 3.23. Chris Brodie concluded the item by summarising that these comments will be taken into consideration, a further update will be provided at the next meeting and that hopefully Government timetables will be clearer by this time.
- 3.24. The Board **noted** the progress made in drafting the LIS following feedback from the Board meeting on 6 December.

Item 4: Communication Strategy and Protocols

- 4.1. Zoe Gordon presented to the Board.



4 Board Meeting -
CommsStrategy_Pre:

- 4.2.
- 4.3. Peter Fleming commented that he does not understand what the “brand” of the SELEP is, and that the tag line is too generic. He added that there are other bodies with “South East” in the title which risk confusion.
- 4.4. Zoe Gordon clarified that the LIS will provide more detail around the brand identity of the SELEP.
- 4.5. Clive Soper added that the LIS contains the “Global Gateway” branding, which is an important strength for the country and differentiates the SELEP from other regions.
- 4.6. Peter Chowney said that the target audience ought to include the utility companies. He also commented that the word “coalition” is not as strong as partnership .
- 4.7. Andrew Metcalf emphasised that putting this strategy into practice will require many other people, including local authorities and other communications teams for example, and that partnership working will be crucial.
- 4.8. Miranda Chapman clarified that this item was asking to sign off the broad premise of the strategy. She reemphasised the need for more impactful language, and that there is talent available to assist.
- 4.9. Ana Christie reiterated Peter Chowney’s point around the word “coalition” and suggested “partnership” instead. She raised the question of how SELEP sees their role in connecting the federated areas.
- 4.10. Colette Bailey commented that she likes how the strategy includes behaviours and values, and that this would be helpful to include in the induction of the new Board. She continued by agreeing with Miranda Chapman’s point about increasing the impact of the document, and suggested a series of pictures or a 30 second film.
- 4.11. Martin Bracken added that the strategy should build-in the strategic opportunities from the LIS.
- 4.12. Carole Barron suggested looking at Medway as an example of good practice.
- 4.13. The Board **agreed**, subject to comments being considered, the Communication Strategy and Protocols.
- 4.14. The Board **noted** the communications narrative and key messages set out in the Communication Strategy and Protocols.
- 4.15. The Board **noted** the responsibilities of SELEP Members and partners when communication the work of SELEP and its projects.

Item 5: Local Growth Fund Spend Beyond 31 March 2021

5.1. Rhiannon Mort presented to the Board.



5 LGF spend
beyond 31 March 20

- 5.2.
- 5.3. The Board considered each project in turn. It was agreed that **all endorsements would be subject to review if there were any significant changes regarding planning approval, project deliverability or the availability of other funding towards the project.**
- 5.4. A127 Fairglen Interchange Junction Improvements and New Link Road project:
- a) Geoff Miles explained that the Accountability Board considered this project as a priority;
 - b) the Board **endorsed** this project.
- 5.5. Thanet Parkway project:
- a) David Rayner commented on the positive news that Kent County Council will be putting money into this project to bridge the funding gap. He asked whether the work on this project will have started before the deadline;
 - b) Mike Whiting responded that he is confident that there will be good headway by March 2021 with an expected opening of Spring 2022;
 - c) the Board **endorsed** this project.
- 5.6. A28 Sturry Link Road project:
- a) Jo James explained that she considers this project to be a priority and would like to see some flexibility;
 - b) Geoff Miles explained that this project would be following a similar approvals timeline as the Thanet Parkway project;
 - c) The Board **endorsed** this project.
- 5.7. George Kieffer expressed the need to prove that the LEP can deliver in order to retain future funding for our area;
- 5.8. There was a discussion regarding project pipelines, and the importance of using any money that may become available towards these projects, taking available time into consideration.
- 5.9. Exceat Bridge project:
- a) the Board **endorsed** this project.

5.10. Innovation Park Medway project:

- a) Tony Ball requested more information around the delay with the Local Development Order (LDO);
- b) Rhiannon Mort explained that in order to approve the LDO, Medway needs to understand the impact on the Highways England network. This could then raise the need for mitigating works which will need to be addressed. The project is dependent on this timeline;
- c) Adrian Gulvin added that Medway is committed to this project and is working with Highways England, and that they have invested in the project and are sponsoring one of the buildings. He emphasised that work is ongoing with the LDO and archaeological works and that the project is ready to start as soon as the LDO is received;
- d) David Rayner stated that Success Essex considered at their meeting that time has run out for this project;
- e) Jo James asked if Dawn Hudd, Assistance Director- Physical and Cultural Regeneration at Medway Council, could address the Board;
- f) Dawn Hudd explained that Geoff Miles wrote to Highways England regarding this project, which was useful and demonstrates the influence of the SELEP. She added that Medway is engaged with Highways England and is committed to finding solutions, and that this project has been decoupled from the Local Plan which was causing a delay, to be re-linked if timescales around traffic modelling match up. She continued that Highways England will be writing to the Accountability Board to state that they are working with Medway and are confident in finding solutions. She summarised that traffic modelling will be finalised, and Highways England will inform Medway of the required mitigations by July 2020, there will then be further discussions regarding funding and it is possible that the project could start before October 2020, but a Cabinet meeting date has been identified in October 2020 for the potential approval of the Local Development Order;
- g) the Board **did not endorse** this project. This project will be reviewed by the Accountability Board in February 2020, to return to the March 2020 Strategic Board meeting.

5.11. David Rayner emphasised the importance of providing the Secretariat with up-to-date information.

5.12. Rhiannon Mort commented that relevant projects on the pipeline will be contacted to prepare business cases in advance after the February Accountability Board meeting.

5.13. Rhiannon Mort commented that there are a further ten LGF projects with a risk of LGF spend beyond 31 March 2021.

5.14. Geoff Miles comments that Kent County Council has handed back around £15m LGF from certain LGF projects which could not progress. The question around deliverability should be put to other local authorities to ensure that the high-risk projects and those projects at risk of spending LGF beyond 31 March 2021 are deliverable and where they are not, this funding should be handed back.

- 5.15. Graham Peters suggested that the SELEP Secretariat should formally write to local areas on the point raised by Geoff above.
- 5.16. Ron Woodley commented that it would be useful to understand the threshold of success according to Government.
- 5.17. Adam Bryan reassured the Board that the SELEP maintains good delivery, and that a sensible approach will help to keep this trajectory.

Item 6: SELEP Local Assurance Framework 2020/21

- 6.1. Suzanne Bennett presented to the Board.



6 AF SlidesV2.pptx

- 6.2.
- 6.3. The Board **agreed** the SELEP Assurance Framework 2020/21, to be formally adopted on incorporation of the South East LEP Ltd.
- 6.4. The Board **agreed** the revised Board Recruitment Policy, to be formally adopted on incorporation of the South East LEP Ltd.
- 6.5. The Board **noted** the revised Terms of Reference, to be reconsidered at the March Strategic Board meeting.

Item 7: Chair Term Extension

- 7.1. Chris Brodie left the room for this item; Adam Bryan chaired this item.
- 7.2. It was agreed that the allowance for this position will be given further consideration at the appropriate moment.
- 7.3. The Board **agreed** to extend the term of the current Chair by a further two years.
- 7.4. The Board **noted** that this extension would take the term served to a full six years which is the maximum term for the position, after which an open and transparent recruitment in line with the agreed process as set out in the Board Recruitment Policy would be required.
- 7.5. Chris Brodie returned to the room, and added that he has been nominated to be the representative for the Southern LEPs on the LEP network board.

Item 8: Deputy Chair Recruitment

- 8.1. George Kieffer, Chair of the Selection Panel, provided the Board with background information.
- 8.2. The Board **agreed** to appoint Sarah Dance as the Deputy Chair.

Item 9: Board Membership

9.1. Chris Brodie expressed a series of messages of thanks on behalf of the rest of the board and the SELEP Secretariat to the Board members who have recently left or for whom this will definitely be their last meeting. These members were:

- a) David Burch
- b) David Tutt
- c) Douglas Horner
- d) George Kieffer
- e) Paul Thomas
- f) Peter Chowney
- g) Peter Fleming

Item 10: AOB

10.1. Success Essex will be reconsidering their representatives in order to achieve the gender balance necessary to meet the requirements of the LEP Review.

10.2. George Kieffer added that the LEP was invited to the hearing before the Stansted Airport planning application but was unfortunately not called, about which George Kieffer has expressed disappointment to Uttlesford District Council.

Chris Brodie closed the meeting.