

ITEM 3A

Subject: DRAFT MINUTES of the Kent & Medway Economic Partnership (KMEP) meeting held at the Village Hotel, Maidstone on Monday 26 November 2018.

Attendees:

KMEP Board Members

Geoff Miles (Chair | The Maidstone Studios)
Bob Bayford (Thanet District Council)
James Beatton (Cripps LLP)
Andrew Bowles (Swale Borough Council)
Paul Carter (Kent County Council)
Rodney Chambers (Medway Council)
Miranda Chapman (Pillory Barn Design Ltd),
Gavin Cleary (Locate in Kent)
Simon Cook (Mid Kent College)
Martin Cox (Maidstone Borough Council)
Sarah Dance (Sarah Dance Associates)
Richard Finn (Richard Finn Ltd)

Peter Fleming (Sevenoaks District Council)
Nicolas Heslop (Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council)
Douglas Horner (Kent Ambassador)
David Jukes (Tonbridge Wells Borough Council)
Keith Morris (Dover District Council)
Prof. Rama Thirunamachandran (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Paul Thomas (Dev. Land Services Ltd)
David Turner (Gravesham Borough Council)
Paul Winter (Wire Belt Company Limited)

Observers & Presenters in attendance

Allan Baillie (KCC), Kevin Burbridge (GBC), Prof. Mario Caccamo (NIAB EMR), David Candlin (TWBC), Nicholas Churchill (CCC), William Cornall (MBC), Barbara Cooper (KCC), John Farmer (KCC), John Foster (MBC), Sarah Gardner (Highways England), Ross Gill (SQW), Katharine Harvey (FHDC), Richard Hicks (MC), Alan Hodson (Hodson Developments), Dave Hughes (KCC), Tim Ingleton (DDC), Tracey Kerly (ABC), David Manning (Highways England), Matthew Norwell (TGKP), Sarah Nurden (KMEP), Andrew Osborne (ABC), Karla Philips (KCC), Joe Ratcliffe (KCC), David Smith (KCC), Bartholomew Wren (TMBC), Mike Whiting (KCC), Emma Wiggins (SBC).

Apologies:

KMEP Board Members

Gerry Clarkson (Ashford Borough Council), Simon Cook (Canterbury City Council), Nick Fenton (Hodson Developments & Kent Developers' Group), Jo James (Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce), Jeremy Kite (Dartford Borough Council), Andrew Metcalf (Maxim PR), David Monk (Folkestone & Hythe District Council), Jane Ollis (IOD), Jon Reagan (Hugh Lowe Farms Ltd & Weald Granary Ltd).

Item 1 – Welcome, introduction and apologies.

- 1.1 Mr Geoff Miles (the KMEP Chairman) welcomed attendees to the meeting, and accepted the apologies as listed above.

Item 2 – Declarations of interest

- 2.1 The following declarations of interests were received:

- Prof. Rama Thirunamachandran declared an interest: Canterbury Christ Church University has submitted a joint bid with the University of Kent seeking LGF funding for the Kent and Medway Medical School. This is covered under the LGF3b agenda item.
- Simon Cook of Mid-Kent College declared an interest: MKC Training Services Limited (MKCTS), a subsidiary of MidKent College, is seeking LGF investment to expand the provision of scaffolding apprenticeships in the SELEP region. This is covered under LGF3b agenda item.
- Miranda Chapman declared that her company provides website support services to SELEP.

Item 3 – Minutes of previous meeting, matters arising and action tracker

- 3.1 The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the discussion.
- 3.2 Under matters arising, Paul Thomas raised concern over the delayed introduction of the new Thameslink train service between Cambridge and Maidstone East, via the London Thameslink termini. Peter Fleming echoed the need to lobby for the Thameslink services which have not been delivered yet. These train services are:
- Sevenoaks to Welwyn Garden City – Due to commence in May 2019.
 - Maidstone East to Cambridge – Due to commence in December 2019.
- 3.3 Paul Carter confirmed that he had written recently to the Transport Secretary on this matter. Also, Sarah Nurden had spoken with the Network Rail Route Director, John Halsall, at an event on 23 November. He confirmed that introducing these Thameslink Services was a priority for Network Rail, and he was aware of the significant passenger demand for these services, however conflicting messages had been received from the DfT. John Halsall has agreed to come and present to a future KMEP meeting.
- 3.4 Geoff Miles referred to the meeting that he had with Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) in January 2018. In this meeting, GTR described their significant investment in the depot facilities and staff recruitment, which showed their commitment to rolling out the new train services.

Item 4 – Lower Thames Crossing

- 4.1 The KMEP Chairman welcomed David Manning (Lower Thames Crossing Project Development Director at Highways England) to the meeting.
- 4.2 David Manning gave a presentation about the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) Project. Comments he made included:
- The LTC consultation is live currently. It closes on 20 December and can be accessed at: <https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/ltc/consultation/> A strong message on the

need for the LTC would be welcomed. There is committed funding for the LTC project only until the Development Consent Order is submitted.

- Unaccepted levels of congestion at the Dartford Crossing occur regularly, causing tailbacks across the region. Most days the Dartford Crossing is performing in excess of its design capacity of 135,000 vehicles. On Friday nights in school holiday periods, Highways England has counted 190,000 vehicles using the crossing.
- Highways England undertook a survey between September 2016 and 2017. The survey showed that there were 1,500 accidents per annum which caused at least one lane to be closed in the tunnel, on the bridge, or on the approach to the Dartford Crossing.
- Highway England's proposed solution is the construction of a new Lower Thames Crossing, which will be a 14.5 mile motorway, with 3 lanes in both directions, and a 70mph speed limit.
- When constructed, the LTC will be UK's longest road tunnel and largest bored tunnel.
- The LTC is designed to accommodate the free-flow of freight traffic and fuel tankers. The Dartford Tunnel is not: road vehicles must stop at the red lights every 15 minutes or so, while fuel tankers are escorted through the Dartford Tunnel.
- Highway England has modelled traffic movements up to 2051.
- Highways England listened to concerns raised during the original consultation. In Kent, they have removed the proposed junction with the A226, extended the length of the tunnel, lowered the tunnel to better manage noise and air issues, and increased the size of the tunnel so there are 3 lanes in each direction.
- The new LTC should reduce traffic at Dartford by 22%, and importantly should increase the reliability of journey times.
- Highways England is mindful that the LTC will have an impact on journeys across the wider Kent and Essex network. LTC ought to be the starting point for a conversation about a major investment programme in that network. Highways England is committed to looking at the wider network, and would welcome stakeholders giving their opinions in the consultation about future investment priorities.
- The LTC will increase traffic on the M2, and is expected to increase traffic on Bluebell Hill by 3-5%. However, Bluebell Hill is expected to increase in traffic by 10% before the LTC opens.
- Environmental mitigation is a key priority for Highways England.
- The LTC will require a significant workforce (circa 3,000 - 5,000 people). Highways England has already started talking to universities and schools about apprenticeships.
- The Development Consent Order could be granted in early 2021, and the LTC could be completed by 2027.

4.3 The Chairman thanked David Manning for his presentation, and invited questions and comments from the KMEP board members. These included:

- Andrew Bowles stressed the importance of investment along the M2/A2 corridor, and in particular at junction 5 of the M2 (with the A249). Without additional investment in the wider highway network, he reserved his right to withdraw his support for the project, and asked his fellow board members for their views.
- Paul Thomas echoed the need for infrastructure investments along the two highway corridors of the M2 and M20. He would like to see SELEP prioritise LGF3b funding to projects that were necessary for the LTC to be a success. He also wishes to see the LTC designed so that other modes of transport (e.g. light railway, cycle, etc) could use any spare headroom in the tunnel.

- Nicolas Heslop urged Highways England (HE) to look at Bluebell Hill and Junction 4 of the M20. New roads attract new traffic, as users change their travel patterns. Appropriate mitigation ought to be put in place to ensure Bluebell Hill and Junction 4 of the M20 continue to flow freely and residents are not disadvantaged. A request was made for greater collective responsibility by Highways England, with all HE teams working holistically across the network to plan and respond to traffic movements. An example was given which showed a lack of co-ordination by the different HE teams working on the M2 and M20.
- Keith Morris urged HE to at least dual the single A2 carriageway by Lydden. This is an existing pinch point under current traffic conditions, and it will become a greater constraint as traffic volumes increase along the M2/A2.
- David Jukes asked about the use of spoil produced by boring the tunnel. David Manning said HE will try to reuse as much of the spoil on site as possible in tasks such as road construction, building noise barriers, landscaping, etc. HE is also in contact with local developers who may wish to use it on their local building sites.
- Douglas Horner referred to the previous traffic models used in the original HE consultation. He had been told that this data understated the impact of the changes in behavioural use of vehicles. David Manning explained that previous traffic models had used M25 traffic flow data and road side interviews, however the latest traffic model is based on mobile phone data supplied by the DfT resulting in more accurate forecasting. The traffic model takes into consideration the behavioural shift of users, for example the growing number of users of electric vehicles. The expansion plans of the local ports and the local housing plans for the next 10 years are all factored into the models as well.
- In response to Douglas Horner's question about further uses for the headroom of the tunnel, David Manning confirmed that the headroom will be used for the ventilation system. HE is also talking to third parties (e.g. private tram provider, utility companies), etc) about their potential use of surplus space in the tunnel.
- David Manning said HE wants to hear stakeholders' views on the investment priorities across the wider Kent and Medway highway network, alongside showing their support for the LTC. The LTC could act as a stepping stone for whole corridor upgrade.
- David Turner explained that Gravesham Borough Council had been in close dialogue with HE, and HE had been very responsive and co-operative in mitigating the impact of the LTC. David Turner explained that there were four concerns remaining: Firstly, in the interest of balance, the marketing materials should point out that traffic will increase in Gravesham, not only mention the decrease in congestion in Dartford. Secondly, the design of the LTC junction with the M2 is similar to spaghetti junction; David Turner would welcome HE refining the junction to make it less complex. Thirdly, David Turner was concerned about the impact on the A228 and A227; these are local roads that should not accommodate additional traffic generated by the LTC. David Turner would welcome hearing from LTC which solutions it can implement to prevent through-traffic (rather than local residents) using these roads. Fourthly, Gravesham Borough Council would like to work alongside HE as it develops environmental mitigation solutions. In response to David Turner's third point, David Manning explained HE is investigating intelligent systems that will inform motorists on the appropriate routes to use.
- Andrew Bowles commented that a further investment priority is for improvements to be made at Medway Services.
- Peter Fleming commented on the support from local communities and businesses located near the M25 for the LTC development. The LTC will reduce the volume of traffic on M25

that queues routinely for Dartford Crossing. The economy will benefit, as new markets and supply chains are opened. Sevenoaks District Council is supportive of the LTC.

- Richard Finn commented on the business community's desire for the LTC to be delivered in the shortest possible timeframe. The two-year delay until the Development Consent Order is submitted is less than ideal.
- Rodney Chambers said he appreciated the changes that HE had made to the original design, and welcomed HE listening to local stakeholders about the pressures on junction 3 of the M2/A2 corridor. Medway Council is supportive of the LTC.
- Paul Carter explained that Kent County Council had consistently campaigned for a new crossing, and warmly welcomed the decision to construct a new LTC. He appreciated that the LTC is not a fait accompli, and that there is a need to continue to lobby for the Crossing so that its construction can proceed. Kent County Council's position is that the LTC cannot be viewed in isolation: In addition to campaigning for the LTC, stakeholders need to campaign for future rounds of investment across the wider Kent highway network.
- Sarah Nurden showed the KMEP board members the following slide of investment priorities and asked them to confirm if these were correct:

KMEP urges Highways England and the Government to deliver a package of funded investments concurrently to the construction of the LTC, so congestion is not pushed to the next weakest part of the network. The investment locations identified by KMEP are:

Linkage between M20 and M2

- *KMEP requests that a pragmatic and affordable proposal is created and funded to **upgrade the A229 and A249, accompanied by improvements to junctions 3 and 5 on the M2, and junctions 4 to 7 on the M20** to allow free flow between the two motorways without impeding local traffic.*
- *Adequate measures are put in place to prevent traffic using the A228 and A227 inappropriately. These roads are designed to serve the local community and residents.*

Improvements to the M2 / A2 corridor

- *Upgrading **M2 Junction 7 at Brenley Corner** to improve flows between the A2 and M2. Junction 7 marks the end of the M2. Traffic wishing to continue on the A2 towards Dover must exist on the slip road, navigate a roundabout which connects with the local traffic network serving the businesses and residents of Faversham. It is a location that is well-known for its congestion, particularly at peak times.*
- *Dualling the single carriageway on the **A2 north of Dover along Jubilee Way to Whitfield and near Lydden**. Near Dover, parts of the A2 revert back to single carriageway. Highways England's modelling says 7 million vehicles would use a new crossing at Gravesend. If a sizeable proportion of these were to continue to Dover on the M2/A2 without any upgrade or investment, this will cause significant congestion in Dover district.*
- *In addition to dualling sections of the A2, Highways England should consider upgrading the **A260** route from Lydden on the A2 to Hawkinge, which can therefore act as the most easterly rung in the ladder between the M20/A20 and M2/A2.*
- *The M2 is still only two-lanes for much of its length; consideration should be given to expanding this motorway. In particular, junctions 4 to 7 of the M2 ought to be widened.*
- *Improvements are required at the Medway Services, and lorry parking facilities are needed.*

- It was agreed that these appeared to be broadly correct, although some refinement may be required. Sarah Nurden was asked to send the list to KMEP board members and to invite their comments on the LTC. A KMEP consultation response could then be drafted using the comments received.
- Nicolas Heslop spoke of his support for the LTC scheme. He was aware of the very strong support from the local business and education community for the Crossing.
- With regard to the provisional KMEP response, Nicolas Heslop thought it should reference that HE needs to take a strategic approach looking across the whole network, rather than selecting schemes in isolation. His strong preference was for the infrastructure investment across the network to come before rather than after the opening of the LTC, and would appreciate this being emphasised in the consultation response.
- Douglas Horner said the LTC is one of the most crucial elements of infrastructure for the local business community. While the LTC is a large part of the solution, Douglas Horner suggested making clear the necessity of getting it right further down the line.
- The KMEP Chairman concluded the debate by expressing his opinion that he warmly welcomed the opportunity for LTC, and sought to encourage the LTC to deliver it in the shortest practical timeframe for the greater good. Alongside this, he felt KMEP should campaign for the additional investment across the network that is required.

4.4 The opinion of KMEP board members was canvassed. The overwhelming majority of KMEP board members strongly supported the LTC, and, in particular, the business community were ardent advocates for the LTC. One local authority member reserved his right to withdraw support if additional investment was not forthcoming for the wider road network.

Item 5 – SELEP’s Economic Strategy Statement

5.1 Ross Gill (SQW consultancy) attended KMEP to present the draft SELEP Economic Strategy Statement. His key comments included:

- The aim of the draft statement is to present a compelling case to Government for greater investment in the South East.
- The draft statement concisely sets out the shared priorities across the South East LEP, recognising each local area will have their own unique priorities and reflections.
- Much consultation and engagement with local stakeholders took place in 2017 and 2018.
- The policy landscape is changing with the *Local Industrial Strategy Green Paper* published last year; this was reinforced by the *Local Industrial Strategies: Policy Prospectus* produced two months ago.
- Within the policy prospectus, there is an emerging definition of what a Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) should be, with much emphasis placed on it being a heavily evidence-led document. All LEPs are expected to produce a LIS by 2020, which should align with the priorities in the national industrial strategy.
- The draft SELEP Economic Strategy Statement is intended to act as a bridge between the 2014 Strategic Economic Plan (which has become outdated in parts) and the future LIS.
- The Economic Strategy Statement (ESS) is written at a time of extraordinary housing growth; Forecasts predict that housing in the SELEP area will be built out at a faster rate than the national average over the next 25 years. Also, it is a time of relatively weak productivity in the SELEP region compared to national average.
- The draft ESS has been sent to all SELEP and federated board members for comment. The comments received in response have been broadly supportive. They include requests to: strengthened the language and have a stronger focus on business voice; to comment on

improving the skills of the existing workforce; to focus more on digital infrastructure; to make the link between economic growth and benefits to the wider community; and to clarify more the asks of government.

- These comments have been incorporated into the draft ESS. Subject to any further comments that KMEP make, the draft ESS be taken to the SELEP Strategic Board meeting for final approval on 7 December.

5.2 The Chairman thanked Ross Gill for his presentation, and invited questions and comments from KMEP board members. These included:

- Gavin Cleary requested an additional reference to the changes in working patterns, particularly in creative in the digital sector.
- Douglas Horner said there was a numerical error in paragraphs 1.1 and 2.9. He would welcome greater emphasis in the document on the innovative work that universities and further education colleges are undertaking. Shortage in commercial workspace should also be referenced, along with the need to increase the uptake of apprenticeships.
- Richard Finn welcomed the helpful document but felt it could be more assertive. He requested a reference be added on leadership quality, which is one of the three pillars of productivity (alongside infrastructure and product quality). The ESS should also say that a critical part of growth is understanding supply chains.
- Paul Carter spoke of the need for infrastructure investment in skills and physical assets. While businesses create growth, the government can create the conditions conducive to growth through infrastructure. He welcomed the indications that the skills agenda may be devolved to LEPs rather than held centrally.
- There was a discussion of the Oliver Letwin's recommendation regarding land value capture measures, with contrasting opinions expressed on its appropriateness. While a unanimous opinion was not given, it was agreed by all that more assertive solutions for funding infrastructure are needed, because infrastructure should be built out with developments, and housing delivery should be accelerated. A fundamental review of the CPO powers and costs associated would be welcomed. Developer need to build out the land with planning permissions.
- Miranda Chapman spoke of creating places. She encouraged SELEP to include case studies of previous placemaking success stories, such as the regeneration of Margate and Folkestone.
- Paul Thomas echoed the need to reform the apprenticeship levy system, given the drop in applications.
- Simon Cook of Mid-Kent College said colleges have built up their leadership over time and are now working in collaboration not competition. The Colleges have reached a point where they have specific asks and solutions that can resolve those issues that are frustrating businesses.
- Paul Winter would welcome peer-to-peer activity to tackle skills issues in the sectors.
- Sarah Dance referred to the changing habits of consumers, driving the need for technological solutions in business. She echoed the concerns about the apprenticeship levy: Research by ScreenSkills (the industry-led skills body for UK screen, creative and cultural skills) shows that it is unlikely creative industry companies will spend more than 27% of the £75m apprenticeship levy contribution even once the new apprenticeship system is fully embedded.

5.3 It was agreed that the points above would be incorporated into the draft Economic Strategy Statement, which will be taken to the SELEP Strategic Board on 7th December for approval. Details of the launch event will be circulated to KMEP members once they're available.

Item 6 – A28 Chart Road

- 6.1 Sarah Nurden (KMEP Strategic Programme Manager) presented the report on the A28 Chart Road. She explained that Local Growth Funding (LGF) of £10.2m had been secured for the project, which would see the A28 being expanded from a single to a dual carriageway between the 'Tank' and 'Matalan' roundabout in Ashford. This road widening is essential to relieve existing congestion, and to allow the Chilmington Green development (of over 5,000 homes) to be built out.
- 6.2 A developer contribution is required alongside the LGF allocation to fund the scheme's development and construction work. The agreed funding arrangement with the Developer is that Kent County Council forward fund their contribution to the Project which is then paid back to KCC by the Developer over a ten-year period. To safeguard Kent County Council of any risk of non-payment and to recover interest charges, the agreement included a provision for the Developer to provide a security bond (the Bond) prior to awarding the construction contract.
- 6.3 A clause is included within the Section 106 agreement, restricting the Developer from occupying more than 400 dwellings until the Bond is provided.
- 6.4 The 6-week security bond notice was issued to the Developer on 14 December 2017, requiring the bond to be provided by 26 January 2018. Discussions have been continuing since that date, but no bond or adequate security has been forthcoming.
- 6.5 Sarah Nurden explained that the South East LEP is seeking the view of the local federated board on how to progress with the project, given that LGF must be spent by March 2021.
- 6.6 The preference of Ashford Borough Council was for the A28 Chart Road project to be put on hold but the LGF to remain allocated to the Project until 15th February 2019. If, at this time, no bond or adequate security has been forthcoming, then the LGF should be reallocated through the LGF3b process, and the A28 Chart Road Project should be prioritised for future funding opportunities, such as the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. This proposal was put to the KMEP Board for their consideration.
- 6.7 Tracey Kerly commented on the discussions that had taken place to date with Homes England. She felt that Homes England could be a helpful partner in coming forward with a solution. She explained that Alan Hodson (the developer, who was present for the KMEP discussion) is on site at Chilmington, building out the first batch of houses. His second reserve matters application is now submitted. The other two developers' applications are pending as well. The A28 Chart Road infrastructure will need to be in place after the 400th occupation, and it looks like that will not happen until after the LGF funding period comes to an end.
- 6.8 Paul Carter and Barbara Cooper recapped on the work that had been undertaken with the Developer and Homes England to try and find a solution. Barbara Cooper spoke of the deadlines that had been set, but not met.
- 6.9 Douglas Horner asked the developer for the cost of obtaining the bond. Alan Hodson replied this would depend on the market.

- 6.10 Paul Thomas proposed that the LGF should remain allocated to the Project until 31st January 2019, not 15th February 2019.
- 6.11 The KMEP Board voted and decided its preference to submit to SELEP is:
“The A28 Chart Road project to be put on hold but the LGF to remain allocated to the Project until 31st January 2019. If, at this time, no bond or adequate security has been forthcoming, then the LGF should be reallocated through the LGF3b process, and the A28 Chart Road Project should be prioritised for future funding opportunities, such as the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.”

Item 7 - Local Growth Fund (LGF) 3b Process

- 7.1 Sarah Nurden (KMEP Strategic Programme Manager) presented an item on the LGF3b process. The ‘LGF 3b process’ relates to the SELEP Strategic Board’s decision to reallocate local growth funding (which cannot be spent by March 2021) to new projects.
- 7.2 Sarah Nurden reiterated the LGF3b timeline and steps which had been set by the SELEP Strategic Board:
- Applicants wishing to bid for capital grant funding were asked to complete the expression of interest template by **31st August 2018**.
 - KMEP sifted the expressions of interest at its board meeting on Monday **24th September 2018**.
 - For projects endorsed by KMEP, applicants were asked to complete a Strategic Outline Business Case by **26th October 2018**. This business case was sent to SELEP for assessment by its independent technical experts (ITE).
 - The SELEP Investment Panel was due to meet on **7th December 2018** to receive the ITE’s feedback and to then create the ranked pipeline of projects.
- 7.3 Sarah Nurden explained that the KMEP Chairman had been provided with the draft ITE feedback on 23rd November 2018. Due to the high volume of business cases received in a short period of time, it was felt by the KMEP Chairman and officers that the ITE had only been given enough time to conduct a high-level desktop assessment, not an in-depth review. Clarification with each project promoter of any issues had not been undertaken due to the time constraints. An example of an inconsistency within the report was provided. Given the concerns about the quality of the information provided, and that KMEP has always taken very seriously the need to ensure that taxpayers’ money is invested wisely, Sarah Nurden explained that the KMEP Chairman wished to propose to SELEP that the SELEP Investment Panel was deferred from 7th December to allow the ITE sufficient time to review each business case.
- 7.4 Andrew Bowles agreed that the SELEP Investment Panel ought to be deferred. He raised his great concern that projects, such as the M2 Junction 5 (which has been a KMEP priority for several years), were not appropriately assessed as important. This junction improvement is required: it is a known accident hot-spot with a high death rate; there is a time-limited opportunity to ensure that Highways England deliver the junction improvement in RIS1; and there is a high level of match funding which could be removed if the scheme does not proceed. Crucially, no house building can take place until 2022 across the borough of Swale until this junction is improved: There is a holding objection on every single site. The ITE ought to speak to the project promoters to understand the implications of each scheme.

- 7.5 The KMEP Chairman was concerned about expectation management and pre-emptive decision making. The original LGF3b process would result in the prioritised list being agreed prior to the value of the funding pot being known. This may result in project applicants raising their hopes that funding will be allocated, only for them to be dashed later.
- 7.6 Paul Thomas said businesses need to be confident that they have been provided with correct information before making a decision.
- 7.7 Nicolas Heslop noticed that the RAG rating colours did not match the RAG rating description in some instances. This suggested the information had been pulled together in a short time period.
- 7.8 Peter Fleming asked how the project promoters' information will be communicated to the members of the SELEP Investment Panel. The LGF3b decision concerns millions of pounds of investment; it is imperative that the SELEP Investment Panel have detailed knowledge of the schemes they are making decisions about – a one-page summary of each scheme is inadequate.
- 7.9 Bob Bayford asked how the schemes were assessed, as the ITE information regarding Thanet Parkway was incorrect.
- 7.10 Paul Carter commented on the reliance of some existing LGF schemes on government agencies provide timely information. For example, the GRIP 4 costs for the Thanet Parkway scheme will be known in March, but once this information is known, it is expected that the project will be able to spend its LGF. Paul Carter expressed his desire for the cut-off date for existing LGF schemes to be pushed back to March 2019.
- 7.12 A concern was raised that the ITE had been asked to undertake an ITE review of each scheme and provide an overall RAG rating per project of green, amber or red. The ITE were not asked to create a draft prioritised list.
- 7.13 The Chairman sought the agreement of the KMEP Board to ask SELEP to postpone the SELEP Investment Panel, and ask the ITE to review each project and seek local clarifications; this agreement was given.

Item 8 - Local Growth Fund 1, 2 & 3: Delivery Progress Report

- 8.1 Sarah Nurden (KMEP Strategic Programme Manager) presented the LGF Delivery Progress Report. She explained that £1.597m of GPF loan funding was awarded to the Javelin Way Project at the last SELEP Accountability Board. The business cases for Thanet Parkway, A2 Wincheap off-slip, Rochester Airport, and Kent Sustainable Interventions Programme will be presented to the next SELEP Accountability Board on 15 February 2019.

Any Other Business

- 9.1 Paul Fleming requested that Highway England's plans for the M26 post Brexit are brought to a future KMEP board meeting. He requested that the Local Highway Authorities share the Brexit contingency plans for the roads with KMEP partners as soon as they are known. The KMEP Chairman reiterated that all board members are encouraged to propose future agenda items, and to email Sarah Nurden with any suggestions.

- 9.2 Sarah Nurden drew board members' attention to the new 2019 meeting dates for KMEP and SELEP, which could be found on last page of the board information pack.
- 9.3 The meeting drew to a close and the KMEP Chairman wished everyone a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

DRAFT MINUTES