

Attending	
Chris Brodie	Chairman
Geoff Miles	Vice Chairman for Kent and Medway
Graham Peters	Vice Chairman for East Sussex
Adam Bryan	SELEP Managing Director
David Burch	Essex Chamber of Commerce
Cllr Graham Butland	Leader of Braintree Council
Cllr Paul Carter	Leader of Kent County Council
<i>Miranda Chapman for Nick Sandford</i>	<i>Pillory Barn</i>
Christina Ewbank	Alliance of Chambers in East Sussex and Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce
Anthony Forster	University of Essex
Cllr Keith Glazier	Leader of East Sussex County Council
Cllr Rob Gledhill	Leader of Thurrock Council
Jo James	Kent Invicta Chambers
<i>Cllr Alan Jarrett for Cllr Rodney Chambers</i>	<i>Medway Council</i>
Cllr John Lamb	Deputy Leader of Southend Borough Council
<i>Andrew Metcalf for Paul Thomas</i>	<i>Maxin PR</i>
<i>Cllr Gagan Mohindra for Cllr Kevin Bentley</i>	Deputy for Economic Growth, Skills, Infrastructure and the Digital Economy, Essex County Council
David Rayner	Birkett Long
Graham Razey	East Kent College
Clive Soper	East Sussex FSB
Cllr Paul Watkins	Leader of Dover District Council
Hayden Yates	Essex Chamber of Commerce

Apologies

George Keiffer, Cllr Peter Chowney, Simon Hubbard, Julian Drury, Cllr Kevin Bentley, Cllr Bob Standley, Cllr Peter Fleming, Cllr Chris Whitbread

1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1. Chris welcomed the board members and observers to the meeting.

2. Minutes and Actions from 9th June 2017 meeting, Matters Arising and Declarations of Interest

2.1. The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

2.2. Adam Bryan noted matters arising, SELEP have been invited to have representation on the Transport for the South East advisory forum.

2.3. Adam confirmed the boundary of the advisory forum, which includes a further 4 LEP areas, the importance of having SELEP representation was reiterated by Keith Glazier.

2.4. Cllr Paul Carter commented on the impact of further meetings requiring board member attendance, particularly for the business community. Paul requested coherence from central government.

2.5. Cllr Keith Glazier noted that as Transport for the North is formulated and confirmed funding delegation will be coming through STB's. Because of this it is important SELEP's voice is heard.

If any board members would like to express their interest to the post, this should be directed to Adam in the next few days.

Chris Brodie left the room.

2.6. Geoff Miles reminded the board of the appraisal that was undertaken of Chris' progress to date as the SELEP Chairman. As a result of the positive appraisal, Chris has been asked to continue as the chairman for a further term.

2.7. A number of board members noted the strong working partnership they have with Chris and businesses on the board also endorsed the continuation of Chris' term.

2.8. Adam confirmed that the LEP secretariat will carry out the process to request a further term.
Chris Brodie returned to the room.

2.9. Chris asked if there were any declarations of interest; Jo James advised the board that Kent Invicta Chambers hold the contract for the Kent and Medway Growth Hub, Miranda Chapman advised the board that her company carried out recent works on the Kent and Medway Growth Hub and Andrew Metcalf advised the board he is a board member of the Kent and Medway Growth Hub.

3. Strategic Economic Plan

3.1. Adam presented to the board an update on works carried out so far on the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) refresh and to receive endorsement to continue with the work as it is currently progressing.

3.2. Adam updated the board on the current policies that are being considered by Whitehall whilst the SEP is being refreshed. The Industrial Strategy white paper will be integral to the release of the final SEP. A draft or final version will be available at the December board meeting, dependant on the white paper release date.

- 3.3. Other considerations include sector deals; further information is still required on the geographies of the deals. SELEP are in conversation with a cohort of LEP's to ensure guidance is clear and transparent.
- 3.4. The LEP is currently seeking clarity from Government on the differences between a local industrial strategy and a SEP.
- 3.5. Government are currently completing a review of LEP's across the Country, this is seen as a positive move. Furthermore this will also look to consider the challenges post Brexit and how SELEP will manage additional responsibilities.
- 3.6. Adam confirmed to the board that core funding discussions will be separate to the LEP review.
- 3.7. Adam advised the board the National Infrastructure Commission interim report is due at the end of September. Adam confirmed we are currently awaiting the report from the Thames Estuary Growth Commission, which is still due to appoint a new Chair.
- 3.8. Adam confirmed that as the LEP we must be clear on what we require through the refreshed SEP and must not add to uncertainty, being clear in our aggregate position.
- 3.9. Adam reviewed the parameters of the SEP, as outlined in the March 2017 board meeting. These parameters are still true and the refresh will not deviate from this. The SEP refresh will still focus on attracting more investment to the area.
- 3.10. Since 2014 and the production of the first SEP there has been increased population growth, business growth and fewer unemployed in the LEP region. The current figures for the LEP, through NOMIS, highlight the need for productivity to be an existing issue.
- 3.11. Adam confirmed the SEP and the Skills Strategy will sit alongside one another. The Infrastructure and Investment plan is now scheduled, post SEP. This will enable SELEP to be on the front foot of competitive opportunities and will be clearly aligned with federated areas. The proposed Infrastructure and Investment plan will enable the LEP to feedback that competitive bidding processes are not the best way to support economic growth across the Country.
- 3.12. The department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) have awarded £40,000 grant to support with a LEP Energy strategy. SELEP are working with the federated areas to confirm what the strategy looks like and how it will sit alongside the SEP.
- 3.13. The LEP secretariat has been holding conversations with working groups and there is evidence to support the need for themed issue papers; this will offer a greater layer of detail of how to support our economies. By supporting the working groups through the themed papers this will allow the groups to get attention of decision makers in Whitehall.
- 3.14. To date, three core questions have been asked with a further 9 supplementary questions. The answers will help form the evidence base, which will be circulated to board members by the end of September.
- 3.15. Adam advised the board the SEP would be used to manage perceptions from Whitehall of the area, dispelling the myth of no deprivation in the South East LEP area. Further to this, the refreshed SEP will also cover the opportunities of investment for the area.
- 3.16. Within the SEP we will also advise how the South East will support London's growth in a way that benefits our area.
- 3.17. A decision needs to be made as to how the SEP will be presented; this is a consideration for LEP's across the Country. Past Government indications have advised theme based SEP's would be useful; however with a new Government in place, a sector

based approach would be consistent with current policies. Finally the option of place-based themes, if managed well, can amplify the transformative work required in each area. The SEP cannot be a fragmented document and must be more than a local plan.

- 3.18. The next round of feedback will be very important in structuring the SEP. The next phase of conversation and details that will arise out of them will ensure that there is a productivity narrative and detail how we can make this tangible.
- 3.19. Adam presented the proposed next steps and layout of the SEP, seeking mandate from the board regarding the next steps.
- 3.20. Cllr Gagan Mohindra asked where the LEP review sits in regards to the SEP. Adam advised that the LEP review, which will take place this calendar year, will arm LEP's to manage additional responsibilities.
- 3.21. Jo James commented that the SEP refresh must have more life and aspiration than the current SEP, the wording we use must be aimed to the correct audience and if there will be a read across to further audiences.
- 3.22. Cllr Rob Gledhill noted that Thurrock remain opposed to the Lower Thames Crossing announcement.
- 3.23. Cllr Graham Butland noted there cannot be economic development without a strategic plan for housing; when creating the final version we must ensure there is a strong link between work carried out by both the department of BEIS and DCLG.
- 3.24. Andrew Metcalf commented there is a greater requirement of the SEP refresh to document jobs and economy growth.
- 3.25. Jo James requested if there can be an intranet system for board members to search papers that have been previously circulated. Adam advised the board we are currently completing an overview of the SELEP website and a technical rebuild will be carried out in the near future.

Agreed to move forward.

4. Growth Hub

- 4.1. Adam offered an overview of the inception of Growth Hubs, the hub and spoke model and the work they have completed to date.
- 4.2. SELEP Growth Hubs are working in partnership with 10 ERDF projects; each ERDF project must demonstrate how they work alongside the Growth Hubs to maximise business engagement.
- 4.3. Adam advised the board that case studies of each Growth Hub are available around the board table.
- 4.4. BEIS have reassured LEP's they are committed to Growth Hubs. There is currently an ongoing dialogue between BEIS and the Treasury to confirm funding for 2018/19 and beyond.
- 4.5. The LEP secretariat are currently in communication with BEIS, questioning the financial ask from Government. For SELEP to have a route to businesses, offering business support locally is paramount and is a key consideration within the SEP refresh.
- 4.6. In Decembers meeting the LEP secretariat will be asking the board to consider the delivery model of the Growth Hubs and agree next steps.
- 4.7. Graham Peters advised the board he fully supports the work the Growth Hubs are completing, and it is evident there is a need for a business support service. Graham requested a letter be sent to Whitehall requesting that they consider maintaining funding to Growth Hubs.

- 4.8. David Rayner commented on success of the Growth Hubs to date, he would like to see the model continue whilst looking at any revenue generation that may be possible.
- 4.9. Jo James commented that Government schemes need longevity to become embedded; SELEP's Growth Hubs now have reach across the area and it would be disadvantageous to remove funding.
- 4.10. Cllr Gagan Mohindra asked that realistic options such as match funding be considered.
- 4.11. Jo James advised the board that looking to make Growth Hubs commercially viable is very difficult. We must bear in mind there are so many different routes to make them self-sustaining you then compete with the businesses who are driving and supporting the growth hubs.

5. Capital Programme Update

- 5.1. Rhiannon updated the board on the delivery of the Growth Deal.
- 5.2. There have been a number of projects approved this financial year, including Local Growth Fund 3 projects.
- 5.3. Rhiannon offered a highlight of projects delivered to date.
- 5.4. Rhiannon advised the board there is more detail in the [Accountability Board papers](#).
- 5.5. David Rayner asked for a summary report re project delivery, Rhiannon confirmed this can be made available.

6. The Mayors Transport Strategy

- 6.1. Rhiannon advised the board the consultation is open until October to respond. SELEP will be responding to reinforce the information coming out of local areas.
- 6.2. The feedback received evidences the requirement for fit for purpose transport measures.
- 6.3. With substantial growth expected on the road networks, the roads must be able to manage the expected growth.
- 6.4. Rhiannon advised the board there are 24 questions to answer as part of the consultation.
- 6.5. David Rayner commented that with opposition to Heathrow's growth from the Mayor's Assembly, this gives opportunity for development at both Stansted and Southend airport.
- 6.6. Cllr Rob Gledhill commented that there should be focus on additional river crossings into London.

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1. Adam gave an overview of the emerging bids for Housing Infrastructure Funding, whilst the funding clearly states that government have recommended all areas talk to LEPs, there is no formal process for the board to follow.
- 7.2. Adam advised the board the secretariat will write letters of support for each bid.
- 7.3. The board will be made aware of the letters of support written as some schemes are no longer moving forward.

8. Close

- 8.1. Chris thanked participants and closed the meeting.