



SOUTH EAST
LOCAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIP

Strategic Board Meeting Agenda Pack

Friday 9th June 2017, 10:00am – 12:00pm
High House Production Park, Purfleet, RM19 1RJ





10.00	1	Welcome and introductions	Chris Brodie
10.05	2	Minutes and actions from 3 rd March 2017 meeting page 3 Matters arising page 9 Declarations of interest	Chris Brodie
10.10	3	Lower Thames Crossing presentation - Reflections on route announcement - Our ongoing role; engagement; positioning; and next steps	Mike Brown, Project Director, LTC, Highways England
10.40	4	Forming the SEP: emergent themes, wider policy page 11 Sub-national Transport Bodies presentation - Progress to date on TfSE (Transport for the South East) Innovation presentation - Science and Innovation Audits, Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund and the contribution of LEPs	Adam Bryan Rupert Clubb, East Sussex CC Howard Partridge, Regional Manager, Innovate UK
11.10	5	ESIF update presentation - Project approvals and progress - Future information requirements for Strategic Board	Lorraine George
11.20	6	Growing Places Fund 2 page 16 - Including Capital Programme update - <u>Decision</u> on prioritising projects for recyclable Growing Places Fund investment	Rhiannon Mort
11.35	7	Working Groups page 22 - Including <u>decision</u> on approach to supporting sectors and <u>decision</u> on nomination of board champions a. South East Creative Economy Network: <i>Culture Coasting p26</i> b. Tourism Working Group: <i>Colours and Flavours p30</i> c. North Kent Enterprise Zone : <i>SELEP support p33</i>	Adam Bryan
11.55	8	AOB , including - Update on Strategic Economic Plan a. Statement of Accounts page 39/attachments b. National Productivity Investment Fund page 40	Chris Brodie Adam Bryan
12.00	9	Close & Thanks	Chris Brodie

Attached for information only:

- a. Material from 26th May 2017 [Accountability Board](#)
- b. Team Plan 2017/18 **page 47**

Future Meeting Dates

1. 7th July, AGM and Skills and Social Inclusion Showcase, Harlow
2. 22nd September 2017
3. 15th December 2017, Ashford College
4. 16th March 2018

Attending	
Chris Brodie	Chairman
George Kieffer	Vice Chairman for Essex and South Essex
Geoff Miles	Vice Chairman for Kent and Medway
Graham Peters	Vice Chairman for East Sussex
Cllr Kevin Bentley	Deputy Leader of Essex County Council
David Burch	Essex Chamber of Commerce
Cllr Paul Carter	Leader of Kent County Council
Cllr Rodney Chambers	Portfolio Holder for Inward Investment, Strategic Regeneration and Partnerships, Medway Council
Cllr Peter Chowney	Leader of Hastings Borough Council
Julian Drury	C2C National Express
Christina Ewbank	Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce
Cllr Peter Fleming	Leader of Sevenoaks District Council
Cllr Keith Glazier	Leader of East Sussex County Council
Cllr Rob Gledhill	Leader of Thurrock Council
Cllr Ann Holland <i>for John Lamb</i>	Deputy Leader of Southend Borough Council
Jo James	Kent Invicta Chambers
Cllr Martin Kenward <i>for Cllr Carl Maynard</i>	Deputy Leader of Rother District Council
Iain Martin <i>for Prof Anthony Forster</i>	Anglia Ruskin University
Andrew Metcalf	Maxim PR
Cllr Gagan Mohindra <i>for Cllr Chris Whitbread</i>	Epping Forest District Council, Finance Portfolio Holder
Marc Myers <i>supported by Gloria Ighodaro</i>	Intu Group
David Rayner	Birkett Long
Clive Soper	East Sussex FSB
Paul Thomas	Development Land Services Ltd

Also in Attendance:

Iain McNab, BEIS

Apologies

Prof Anthony Forster, Cllr John Lamb, Graham Razey, Nick Sandford, Cllr Paul Watkins and Cllr Chris Whitbread

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1. Chris welcomed the board members and observers to the meeting.
- 1.2. Chris asked for declarations of interests; none were made.

2. Minutes and Actions from 9th December 2016 meeting, Matters Arising and Declarations of Interest

- 2.1. Jo James requested additional information on point 4.7, Urban Growth Group. Adam advised Jo there was not sufficient appetite for an Urban Growth Group; following a conversation with the Senior Officer Group it was confirmed federated areas and SELEP will look for an alternative route to addressing the agenda of growth in our larger settlements.
- 2.2. Rob Gledhill noted the minutes did not represent Thurrock's opposition to the Lower Thames Crossing consultation options. **Action:** the minutes will be revised to reflect Thurrock's opposition to the options presented by the Highways England consultation.

Noting the change in 2.2 above, the minutes from the previous meeting were agreed.

- 2.3. No matters arising were noted.
- 2.4. David Burch declared an interest in Get Exporting 2, listed under the EU update, as the Essex Chambers of Commerce are involved in the delivery of the project.
- 2.5. George Kieffer declared an interest in the Haven Gateway Transport Logistics Park relevant to Growth Deal Round 3.
- 2.6. Jo James declared an interest as Kent Invicta Chambers are the providers of the Kent and Medway Growth Hub.
- 2.7. Cllr Gagan Mohindra declared an interest with his involvement in the Epping Forest local strategic partnership and with Epping College
- 2.8. Chris thanked the group for the declarations and reiterated the importance of this agenda item, particularly in the wake of the press other Local Enterprise Partnerships received in December 2016.

3. General Update

Growth Deal Round Three

- 3.1. Chris thanked the board for their lobbying efforts regarding SELEP's Local Growth Fund 3 allocation and the joined up approach across federated areas, their MPs and other partners. Through these efforts the indicative number received initially was doubled.
- 3.2. Government have advised SELEP there will be no further round of Local Growth Funding this Parliament, the LEP will continue to look at and apply for other streams of funding and take a more proactive approach to defining its requirements.
- 3.3. We are still awaiting confirmation of flexibility over the deployment of the existing LGF Capital Programme.

Lower Thames Crossing Update

- 3.4. There is anticipation an announcement of the Lower Thames Crossing will be received by the end of March 2017.
- 3.5. George advised the board a meeting with John Hayes MP, Minister of State, Department for Transport, recently took place, in which a number of key businesses from the LEP area attended. The feedback received from the meeting was that direction involvement from businesses is welcomed.

- 3.6. Chris Brodie advised the group that lobbying for the Lower Thames Crossing is continuing and that he is meeting with John Hayes MP during March.
- 3.7. Rob Gledhill advised the board Thurrock still oppose the building of a Lower Thames Crossing at the locations currently defined by Government agencies.

NKEZ Implementation Plan progress and sign off

- 3.8. Adam updated the board regarding the North Kent Enterprise Zone; the implementation plan is to be submitted to Government by the end of the month. He requested approval to sign this off.

This was agreed.

- 3.9. Adam asked the board if there was interest in holding the three remaining board meetings in 2017 in different parts of the SELEP area; if this was to be confirmed the federated areas would each need to continue good representation.

This to be taken forward and agreed by the SELEP team, Chairman and Vice Chairman as and when suggestions arise

4. Assurance Framework

- 4.1. Adam advised the board the information available is to reflect on the Assurance Framework sent to Government at the end of February 2017.
- 4.2. Adam reiterated to the board the LEP already had a strong Assurance Framework in place and the changes gave the LEP an even stronger alignment with the National Assurance Framework; a number of these changes were to further improve SELEP's transparency.
- 4.3. There were minor changes made to the wording, as requested by a federated area. These changes can be found [here](#).
- 4.4. The update Assurance Framework was approved via electronic procedure by 19 board members and is available to view on SELEP's website.
- 4.5. SELEP's secretariat will be working towards a timetable to implement all changes, this will be monitored by the Accountability Board and updates will be received regularly by the Strategic Board.
- 4.6. Paul Carter requested clarification on the Value for Money officer; this was confirmed as the Accountability Board Chair, Geoff Miles.

5. Approach to Growing Places Fund Investment

- 5.1. Rhiannon gave a presentation to the board, outlining the approach to Growth Places Fund (GPF) reinvestment. This can be found [here](#).
- 5.2. The approach to GPF re-investment is a three-stage approach, the hope with this approach is for the investment process to be as simple as possible.
- 5.3. There will be a process to identify priorities for investment of funding; all decisions following this must follow the Independent Technical Evaluator (ITE) process and seek approval of the Accountability Board.
- 5.4. Timescales must be timely for the investment and repayment in the round of GPF investment to ensure further projects can continue to utilise the funds.
- 5.5. Rhiannon confirmed whilst it is planned for GPF to be proportionate to each area, where schemes are able to re-pay and be implemented within quick succession new projects from the specified area will be taken under consideration.
- 5.6. The Strategic Board debated whether interest should be charged on future GPF loans. Different views were expressed. Charging interest would serve two purposes; (i) incentivise the early repayment of the

loan and (ii) reduce the depreciation of the GPF through time as a result of inflation, however conversely it could be detrimental as GPF was established to support schemes that had no other route to access finance. If interest were to be applied, the process shouldn't be overcomplicated. The Board deferred making a decision on charging interest to the June Strategic Board meeting.

- 5.7. Requests were received for full updates on previous Growing Places Fund; Rhiannon confirmed moving forward Accountability Board Papers will be sent to the Strategic Board for information.

The approach to GPF investment was agreed.

6. Responding to the Industrial Strategy Green Paper

- 6.1. Adam advised the board of the two stage response SELEP will be taking to respond to the Industrial Strategy Green Paper, a formal, written response by 17/04/2017 to stakeholders@beis.gov.uk and the Strategic Economic Plan refresh.

Formal Consultation Response

- 6.2. Whilst the formal response offers 38 questions to respond to, they may not all be appropriate for SELEP to respond to, the LEP may be better placed to offer a narrative response.
- 6.3. A Task and Finish Group will be arranged, with representation from each federated area and key working groups, such as the U9 group. The LEP response will be presented to the board by 3rd April for approval.
- 6.4. Any members of the board who wish to be part of the Task and Finish group should advise Adam.

Strategic Economic Plan

- 6.5. The refresh of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) is an opportunity for SELEP to advocate to Government for additional funding opportunities, to be more proactive in communicating its requirements and to take full advantage of the LEP's combined power and its proximity to London. The presentation on the SEP Refresh can be found [here](#).
- 6.6. The refreshed SEP will be a combined voice and will align with key areas of policy such as the Industrial Strategy.
- 6.7. The current SEP is a bidding document and is aligned to schemes such as SEFUND which are no longer active.
- 6.8. Adam reiterated to the board the submission SELEP made to the Local Growth Funding Round Three was done so with a cohesive voice, received well by Government and we will continue to progress in this manner.
- 6.9. SELEP's response to the Green Paper Consultation and the SEP refresh will be a business led process. Both the response to the Industrial Strategy Green Paper and the SEP refresh will be our local vision for the delivery of the Industrial Strategy.
- 6.10. It is currently conceived that the SEP will be supported by a series of themes Issues Papers, reflecting more detail of the needs of key elements of our economy. Adam has already had conversations about undertaking one such paper for the Coastal Communities Group.
- 6.11. Adam advised the board Louise Aitken is moving the Skills Strategy forward; there is a survey available on the LEP website which can be found [here](#).
- 6.12. The Investment and Infrastructure Strategy will be owned by the Accountability Board. This place-based document will identify our pipeline of projects and will enable the SEP to remain as a strategic plan.
- 6.13. Adam advised the board, last week BEIS notified LEPs of funding up to £50,000.00 available to support with the implementation of an Energy Strategy. An application form was sent to BEIS and the secretariat will update the board on the process of this. **Post meeting note: this application was not successful. We are continuing conversations with the Energy Team in BEIS (20/3/17)**

- 6.14. A number of board members agreed that with changes such as Brexit it is an opportunity to increase our scale of ambition and statement of intent.
- 6.15. Chris Brodie requested Iain McNab confirms with Greg Clark he is able to meet with the Universities. Iain confirmed he will follow this up.
- 6.16. Kevin Bentley commented that there is a wealth of experience within each Local Authority that could be utilised by the LEP secretariat whilst the SEP is being refreshed. (This will be utilised, but the Vice Chairmen subsequently agreed to pursue the assistance of consultants as planned.)
- 6.17. Peter Chowney asked how Sub National Transport Bodies (STB) sit within the plans. It was confirmed the secretariat are aware of developments and are working closely with both STB's to ensure that the LEP is played in to discussions strongly, not least around the Lower Thames Crossing.
- 6.18. Keith Glazier requested a meeting with Transport for London, Network Rail and Highways England in the same room to discuss the future planning of transport. **Action:** SELEP team to take forward.
- 6.19. Kevin Bentley requested there is an update at future board meetings on Sub National Transport Bodies.

**The approach to the response to the Industrial Strategy Green Paper was approved.
The approach to the Strategic Economic Plan refresh was approved.**

7. Logo and Branding

- 7.1. After a conversation in the summer with the LEP chair and vice-chairs, SELEP are currently undertaking a re-branding process. The re-branding exercise is being carried out in partnership with universities and colleges as a competition for students; the award for the chosen logo is £1000. It is anticipated in total the re-branding will cost £3000, which has been budgeted for
- 7.2. Zoe advised the board that the re-branding is being carried out as the roles and responsibilities of the LEP has changed since the logo was designed in 2010. The re-branding is being supported by a design consultant to ensure the students are offered a formal process and a genuine learning experience
- 7.3. Twenty-four submissions were received, 7 of which met the requirements; these were further narrowed down to the strongest 4 submissions.
- 7.4. It was confirmed the final submissions could accommodate a name change, if required at a later date.
- 7.5. Zoe confirmed the timescale for the brand roll out, a decision will be made next week with the final branding package rolled out in the Spring/Summer.
- 7.6. Zoe confirmed that all students will receive feedback on their submissions.

It was agreed the decision will on the logo will be made by Chris Brodie, Chairman.

8. Capital Programme Update

- 8.1. Rhiannon offered a high level summary of the Capital Programme
- 8.2. Across the projects live in 16/17, three projects currently have slippage; detailed information on all projects will be provided separately.
- 8.3. Where possible, projects will be asked to accelerate delivery to support reduce slippage of spend.
- 8.4. Rhiannon confirmed once the funding profile for Local Growth Fund Round Three has been received from Government, projects will be given the opportunity to start delivery.

Growing Places Fund Update

- 8.5. Rhiannon confirmed the majority of projects are underway and started; projects that are currently not-started will be pushed to confirm a start date and information as to when they will be drawing Growing Places Fund (GPF) down.
- 8.6. Rhiannon advised the board the larger re-payments of GPF will be received in the years 2020/21.

- 8.7. David Burch requested a written report of fund updates, Rhiannon confirmed the Accountability Board reports will be shared with the Strategic Board also.

9. Working Group Highlights

- 9.1. Adam advised the board that a vision for the 'Thames Estuary Production Corridor', produced by the GLA and SELEP partners has been published - it is available [here](#). The content is reflective of a shared agenda and speaks of the ambition of SECEN.
- 9.2. George Kieffer thanked all who attended the recent ESIF committee.
- 9.3. Iain McNab advised the board that the interim report for the Thames Estuary 2050 Commission should be available by June 2017.

10. Any Other Business

- 10.1. Adam advised the board the Department of International Trade (DIT) are currently working on information packs and promotional materials on projects seeking £100million of investment.
- 10.2. Each federated area has met with DIT and are working with them to put together promotional material for each area. This will be communicated in due course.
- 10.3. Christina Ewbank thanked Chris Brodie for his support with Southern Rail.

11. Close

- 11.1 Chris thanked participants and closed the meeting at 12.01

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to make the Board aware of the review of LEPs currently being undertaken by DCLG and led by Mary Ney, former CEO of Greenwich and Rotherham Councils and now non-Executive Director at DCLG.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to note the report.

3. Background

- 3.1 DCLG are undertaking a review of governance and transparency arrangements around LEPs with a report due from Mary Ney just ahead of the General Election.
- 3.2 Mary has been drafted in to lead the work and talk to LEPs in the process.
- 3.3 A small group of 10 LEPs met Mary at DCLG on 17th May to emphasise how seriously LEPs are taking this and how much work has gone in to reflecting the National Assurance Framework in local arrangements.
- 3.4 Adam was able to talk about SELEP's Assurance Framework and the Accountability Board specifically, and this was very well received as a best practice example of how LEPs should operate in bringing democratic legitimacy to business-led decisions around strategy and scheme prioritisation.
- 3.5 We provided a case study to Mary's report team as follows:

The South East LEP deals with its large geography by operating a federal model which allows for project prioritisation and the devolution of approved project funding at a local 'federated board' level, thereby ensuring local ownership. The outputs of the local boards are combined at the South East LEP level to form the basis of the South East LEP Strategic Board discussions, where real aggregate influence is generated, and where decisions befitting of the size of the LEP are taken according to the direction set out by the Strategic Economic Plan, for which the Board are custodians. Additionally, the LEP's interests are furthered by pan-SELEP working groups which are formed on a sectoral basis to advance specific elements of the SEP while spreading best practice and achieving economies of scale.

This is all underpinned by the South East LEP Accountability Board which is formally formed as a S101 committee of Local Government and operates in accordance with a Joint Committee Agreement, supported by the Accountable Body and independently by its Member Support and Governance team specifically. The Accountability Board is formed of the six constituent upper tier authority Leaders, who have voting rights; a HE and a FE rep, who do not; and a business Chair. The democratically elected members on the Accountability Board are mandated with making the final funding approvals for all projects which pass through SELEP – most of which will have seen their business cases subjected to Independent Technical Evaluation and a rigorous five gate process – and all of which will have been previously endorsed by the Strategic Board, either through an LGF prioritisation process or otherwise. All matters pertaining to the finances of the LEP are material to the Accountability Board discussions, as is performance of the secretariat team both in general terms and in terms of how the Assurance Framework is being



adhered to. Both the Accountability Board and Strategic Board meetings are held in public.

For full details on all aspects of the SELEP Assurance Framework, please visit <http://www.southeastlep.com/about-us/assurance-framework> or contact: Adam Bryan, Managing Director at Adam.Bryan@essex.gov.uk

- 3.6 It is clear that SELEP is one of the strongest, if not the strongest LEP in terms of its assurance arrangements, this reflects the very effective relationship we now have with the Accountable Body and the engagement of partners on this agenda. However, we are certainly not complacent and we are going above and beyond in implementing the changes agreed in December and February (ToR December, Assurance Framework February). This remains a top priority for the LEP team. We are arguably deficient in some areas (such as how we report Declarations of Interest on the website) and we are working to address these areas urgently.
- 3.7 At the time of writing, the proposed second and follow up meeting with Mary Ney has not yet happened, though I will be able to report back to the Strategic Board on 9th June if there have been further conversations.
- 3.8 The Accountability Board receive a formal report on the implementation of the Assurance Framework changes at every meeting.

4. Next steps

- 4.1 None.

Author: Adam Bryan
Position: Managing Director
Contact details: adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk, 07884 475191
Date: 2nd June 2017

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to update the Board on progress on the refresh of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and developments in the wider policy environment that are impacting both the South East LEP and influencing how the SEP will be shaped.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to note the report.

3. Background

- 3.1 Following approval by Strategic Board in September, the Secretariat has been working closely with partners to agree the best approach and delivery methods for the refresh of the SEP. This has included ensuring the timing of the refresh fits within the political calendar and local elections that were held in May of this year.
- 3.2 Due to lack of capacity within the Secretariat; a requirement for a strong independent perspective; and increasing calls on a reduced resource in Local Authority partner organisations it has been recognised that the Secretariat will need to buy in additional support. To that end, a competitive tendering exercise has been undertaken to ensure the best value and quality resource is selected. The contract is due to be awarded imminently and this tender award has purposely been timed to coincide with the snap General Election and the establishment of a new Government.
- 3.3 Whilst there will naturally be a period of time during which the new Government formulates its policy agenda, the timing of the SEP refresh will allow it to develop alongside the newly emergent policies and ensure that the SEP is shaped in such a way that it can maximise the benefits to our area.
- 3.4 There are current policy themes that sit outside of the remit of Local Enterprise Partnerships but have a clear impact on the economic growth agenda, both at a local and a regional level. This includes the Sub-national Transport Bodies (STB) and the work being done to take forward the innovation agenda. We have two presentations today to update the Board on those key pieces of work.

Sub-national Transport Bodies (STB)

- 3.5 As Board members may be aware, the STB geography does not fit with the borders of the South East LEP. Transport for the South East covers the area of the South East LEP south of the river. We have played a very active role in helping establish it.
- 3.6 The structure and geography of the STB for those authorities north of the river is under discussion.
- 3.7 We all recognise the role that good transport links can play in driving forward economic growth and the cross working between the South East LEP and these regional bodies will both be reflected in and shape the Strategic Economic Plan. However, transport is only one element and the wider remit of the LEP means that we can ensure coherence between the transport developments planned and prioritised by the STBs and the other interventions needed to capitalise on economic potential across the South East LEP area.
- 3.8 Rupert Clubb from East Sussex CC has been the officer lead for the establishment of the STB for the South East and will bring the concept to us today.

Innovation Agenda

- 3.9 The importance of science and innovation within the confines of a global economy cannot be understated and Government has recognised that through a number of policy strands. The first is the



roll-out of the Science and Innovation Audits (SIA) across the country. The Audits are designed to map out and local research, innovation and infrastructure strengths and to identify and build on that potential.

- 3.10 Again the geography of the audits does not neatly correlate with the South East LEP; the Innovation South Consortium covers East Sussex, Kent and Medway and greater Essex has formed part of the East of England Science Innovation Audit. The universities and local authorities across the region have been engaged in these audits and final submissions have been made to BEIS. We have been engaged with both SIAs and have made small financial contributions accordingly.
- 3.11 In addition to the SIAs, Government launched the £1 billion Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund (ISCF) in April of this year. The fund focuses on 6 key areas, including healthcare and medicine; robotics and AI and, manufacturing and materials of the future and is focussed upon turning strengths in research into commercialised products. Innovate UK will manage the fund.
- 3.12 Innovate UK has appointed regional managers whose remit will include working with the LEPs within their regions. Howard Partridge is with us today to reflect on SELEP's part in the innovation agenda and help us understand the opportunities to get involved for the benefit of all our business communities.
- 3.13 As we move to develop the SEP, our plan is to develop a Science and Innovation Audit on our own terms – to use the raw material from the two separate audits in our patch and help plot a course for the future.

Author: Adam Bryan
Position: Managing Director
Contact details: adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk, 07884 475191
Date: 2nd June 2017

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To provide the Board with key information about the progress towards the delivery of the ESIF Strategy.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to note the report.

3. Introduction

- 3.1 LEPs were required by Government to produce an ESIF strategy for the Structural Funds period 2014-20, aligned to their Strategic Economic Plans. The SELEP area was given an indicative allocation of €200 million funding across the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), European Social Fund (ESF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).
- 3.2 These funds are closely managed by Government Departments: ERDF by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), ESF by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and EAFRD by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). Each LEP area has been required by Government to form an ESIF sub-committee to act as the local steering group for the funds. The committee reports to the National Growth Board which is the National Monitoring Committee for the three programmes and this in turn reports regarding national performance of the programmes directly to the European Commission. The ESIF Sub- Committees follow national Terms of Reference and membership is required from across a range of sectors including business, local politicians, VCSO, environment, rural, skills and HEI. The SELEP ESIF sub-committee is chaired by Strategic Board member George Kieffer. It meets quarterly and members are asked to comment on the strategic fit and value for money of expressions of interest and full applications from the three programmes.
- 3.3 In the SELEP area good progress has been made towards allocating the funds to projects, commitment and funding and achievement of targets. This can be seen below by fund.

4. European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

- 4.1 Good progress is being made in the allocation of European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) to projects that will support SME growth and a shift to a low carbon economy, and research and innovation (including knowledge exchange). Over £28 million (38%) of SELEP's notional ERDF allocation of £74.1 million has now been contracted, which represents 10 fully up-and-running projects. These include the enhanced business support service South East Business Boost, the Manufacturing Growth Programme, South East Invest and the Essex Grant Scheme. (annexe1)
- 4.2 A further £7.6 million (10%) is potentially committed to three LEP-wide projects currently in full appraisal with DCLG. These projects are sector specific, supporting the cultural, creative and digital sector, the logistics and the preventative health care sectors. If these projects are successfully awarded, SELEP will be ahead of the curve in the contracting of ERDF nationally.
- 4.3 Currently, SELEP has three rolling calls for applications open against our priority themes: research and innovation, SME support and Low Carbon. These will remain open until January 2018 and make a total of £34 million available for further investment. Four promising outline applications have already been received in response to these calls, which went live in March.
- 4.4 This calendar year, SELEP will be encouraging the development of projects that will promote research and innovation, through business investment in knowledge exchange to help develop new products, and by enhancing R&I infrastructure, capacities and centres of excellence. A SELEP-wide Research and Innovation Workshop is being held on 15 June to share information, understand our priorities

and discuss project concepts. Direction of travel will be informed, in part, by the findings of the East of England and Innovation South Science and Innovation Audits due to conclude in late-May.

Anyone interested in finding out more should contact our ERDF Technical facilitator Jo Simmons (jo.simmons@eastsussex.gov.uk).

5. European Social Fund (ESF)

- 5.1 The SELEP area has a total ESF allocation of c£71 million. SELEP's total committed spend to date stands at c£51 million. This reflects a good level of progress in the 2014-2020 timeframe.
- 5.2 The focus for funding and allocations to different ESF priority areas were outlined in the ESIF Strategy and agreed by the ESIF Sub-Committee. Funding enables an 'Escalator of Opportunity' whereby individuals furthest from and nearest to the labour market receive support which is additional to mainstream activity.
- 5.3 ESF funds have to be equally matched. In the SELEP area, for the first tenders the ESIF sub-committee endorsed working with three Opt-in agencies which provide the match funding required by the ESF rules. These are: Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), the Skills Funding Agency (SFA, now Education and Skills Funding Agency or ESFA) and the Big Lottery. Activity includes supporting apprenticeships, in work training and supporting unemployed people into employment. There is a strong alignment to LEP priority sectors. All funding is overseen by the DWP in a Managing Authority capacity.
- 5.4 The DWP, Big Lottery and ESFA activity is underway. A slide pack with background to the programmes, escalator of opportunity and where programmes are delivering is provided on the SELEP website at <http://www.southeastlep.com/skills/esf>
- 5.5 There is approximately £20m funds left of the SELEP indicative allocation, which will require 50% match funding. Some of these funds (£5 million) have been ring-fenced for Community Led Local Development (CLLD), which is matched.
- 5.6 A call for tender to support young people into the labour market is now live, with further information at <http://www.southeastlep.com/skills/esf>.
- 5.7 The LEP Skills Showcase on 7th July will include presentations, stands and information (brochure) on ESF funded programmes.
- 5.8 A workshop is planned for September (date tbc), to enable partner input to priorities for remaining ESF. The SELEP team will draft further calls with DWP with a view to tenders being published later this year, dependent upon government confirmation. This will require 50% match funding.

6. European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)

- 6.1 The SELEP area has a total indicative EAFRD allocation of £14.5. SELEP committed spend is very low to date with just £214,000 contracted to two projects to date. This is due to a number of Defra enforced halts to the programme linked to the general elections and also the EU Referendum.
- 6.2 In January Defra announced a call for applications endorsed by the ESIF sub-committee. SELEP secretariat organised a series of workshops across the SELEP area to promote the opportunities. These were well attended with close to 300 rural businesses attending the events.
- 6.3 The response to the January calls for applications has been very positive with 24 Expressions of Interest (EOIs) submitted to date, worth over £5.5 million. The working group of the ESIF sub-committee meets on a monthly basis to consider the strategic fit of the EOIs. All of them, except one, have been found to be eligible by Defra and invited to full application but this is not a guarantee that they will reach the contracting stage. These projects are regarded as confidential until they are formally contracted with Defra/RPA. This can take 4 months. The Board will be updated regarding their progress.

Annex 1: Contracted ERDF projects

Project	ERDF value	Coverage	Lead Organisation	Beneficiaries
Better off in Business	£368,410	SELEP	The Prince's Trust	Unemployed young people interested in self-employment and with a business idea they want to explore.
Essex Growth Programme	£1,631,708	Essex, Thurrock and Southend	NWES	Pre-start individuals and SMEs <36 months old
Foreign Inward Investment Kent	£1,744,391	Kent and Medway	Kent County Council	UK and foreign SMEs looking to relocate and/or expand operations into Kent and Medway
Get Exporting 2	£2,041,000	SELEP	Exemplas	SMEs looking to sell overseas or develop internationally
KEEP+	£3,296,204	SELEP	Anglia Ruskin University	SMEs looking to connect with academic expertise and talent, and R&D facilities, to help them develop new products and services
Low Carbon across the South East	£8,858,923	SELEP	Kent County Council	SMEs looking to improve business performance using energy efficiency measures, and LCEGS SMEs looking to grow
Manufacturing Growth Programme	£1,400,000	SELEP	WMMBF Ltd	SMEs in the manufacturing sector who are looking to grow
South East Business Boost	£6,116,639	SELEP	Southend Borough Council	An enhanced service to SELEP's core Growth Hubs to support SMEs, including pre and small start-ups, looking to grow and increase employment
South East Invest	£2,246,516	Essex, Thurrock, Southend, East Sussex	Essex County Council	SMEs looking to relocate and/or expand operations into Essex, South Essex and East Sussex
Supply Chain innovation for Offshore Renewable Energy	£510,000	Essex	NWES	SMEs looking to develop new and innovative technologies in offshore renewable energy
Hastings CLLD strategy	£9,875	Hastings	Hastings BC	Strategies to seek further funding to deliver local projects overseen by Local Action Groups
Folkestone CLLD strategy	£10,000	Folkestone	Folkestone BC	
Tilbury CLLD strategy	£9,893	Tilbury	Thurrock BC	

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Strategic Board (the Board) on the investment of Growing Places Fund (GPF) to date and agree the detail of the approach for the re-investment of GPF as a recyclable loan scheme.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to:
- 2.1.1 **Note** the Growing Places Fund project delivery to date
 - 2.1.2 **Agree** the methodology and eligibility criteria for Growing Places Fund re-investment, as set out in Appendix 4.
 - 2.1.3 **Agree** the timescales for Growing Places Fund re-investment, as set out in Table 2.
 - 2.1.4 **Agree** the approach to the charging of interest from the following four options noting the merit and constraints of each option:
 - **Option A:** Charging of interest at market rate
 - **Option B:** Charging of interest at two percent below the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) Fixed Maturity Rate (recommended option).
 - **Option C:** No charging of interest but a late repayment fine is applied where projects fail to meet their agreed re-payment schedule.
 - **Option D:** No charging of interest
 - 2.1.5 **Agree** to the establishment of a SELEP Investment Panel
 - 2.1.6 **Agree** to the delegation of investment decision making to the Investment Panel

3. Growing Places Fund investment to date

- 3.1 In total, £49.210m GPF was made available to SELEP, of which £48.705m GPF has been allocated to date through previous rounds of investment.
- 3.2 An update on the 13 capital infrastructure projects supported through previous rounds of GPF investment is provided in Appendix 1 and 2. In addition, a proportion of GPF revenue funding was allocated to Harlow Enterprise Zone (£1.244m) and the remaining proportion has been ring-fenced to support the activities of SELEP's Sector Groups; to be discussed under Agenda Item 7.
- 3.3 Of the 13 capital infrastructure projects allocated GPF funding, GPF has now been drawn down and invested in 10 of these projects. Of the three remaining projects, the credit agreement has now been signed for one of these projects (Live Margate) and the credit agreements for the remaining two projects are due to be signed imminently.
- 3.4 The schedule of repayments for GPF projects is agreed within each credit agreement between Essex County Council, as Accountable Body, and the lead County/ Unitary Authority. A copy of the expected repayment schedule is set out in Appendix 3.
- 3.5 Since the last Board meeting, the re-profiling of GPF repayments has been agreed by the Accountability Board for North Queensway and Priory Quarter in East Sussex, and Chatham Waterfront in Medway. The detailed reports to support these decisions can be found in the Accountability Board Agenda Packs for the 31st March and the 26th May.
- 3.6 Based on the adjusted repayment schedules agreed by the Accountability Board and updated cash flow position, the amount of GPF available for re-investment has been updated, Table 1 below.

Table 1 Amount of GPF available for reinvestment - £000's

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
GPF available	2,673	3,190	3,454	9,317

3.7 A 15% discount had been applied to the availability of GPF, to help reduce the risk to the availability of this funding should GPF repayment not be made as profiled within credit agreements. The risk presented by potential default on future repayments has not been fully mitigated however and the amount of GPF available will be adversely impacted by further requests for the re-profiling of GPF repayments for existing projects.

4. Context to the re-investment of GPF

4.1 GPF was established by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department for Transport in 2011, as a recycled loan scheme, with the aim of providing targeted investment in infrastructure to unlock development, particularly to 'kick-start' development at stalled sites.

4.2 At the last Board meeting it was agreed that GPF should continue to operate as a recyclable loan scheme to support investment in capital infrastructure projects. A broad approach was set out to the Board which has now been further developed, including the detail of the prioritisation approach and the eligibility criteria.

4.3 It was initially intended that priorities for GPF re-investment would be identified following the preparation of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), however, in light of the amended timescale for the development of the SEP it is proposed that the investment of GPF should progress in advance of the SEP being finalised.

5. Approach to the re-investment of GPF

5.1 At the last Board meeting, a process was set out for the re-investment of GPF following an open and transparent approach, ensuring business and federated board engagement and that the pipeline of projects identified support local priorities.

5.2 Appendix 4 provides detail of the proposed approach for nominating and prioritising projects for GPF investment, to support decision making by the Investment Panel as set out in paragraph 6 below.

5.3 The proposed approach aims to support projects which:

5.3.1 are most closely aligned with SELEP's strategic objectives,

5.3.2 can quickly move to delivery and benefit realisation, and

5.3.3 can make repayments on the loan with a five year period, to support the continued and successful operation of GPF as a recyclable loan fund.

5.4 It is proposed that an initial sift of projects which submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) form will be led by Federated Areas to identify projects which meet the key criteria for GPF investment. For potential GPF projects which are nominated by Federated Areas to progress to Stage 2, a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) will then be developed, which will be assessed by SELEP Independent Technical Evaluator (ITE). The outcome of this prioritisation exercise will be presented to an Investment Panel, to support their decision making in defining the pipeline of GPF projects.

6. Investment Panel

- 6.1 It is proposed that an Investment Panel should be convened to agree the prioritised list of GPF projects. The Panel will be comprised of the 6 County Council/Unitary Authority SELEP Accountability Board members, SELEP Accountability Board Further Education and Skills Representative, SELEP Accountability Board Higher Education (HE) representatives, the Strategic Board Chair, Strategic Board Vice-Chairs, to ensure the business voice is represented and considered as part of the decision making.
- 6.2 The establishing of this Panel will enable decisions in relation to GPF to be made more quickly, as the meeting can be convened alongside either a Strategic or Accountability Board meeting.
- 6.3 The Investment Panel's role will be to agree the pipeline of GPF projects, based on the methodology and eligibility criteria, set out in Appendix 4, following agreement with the Strategic Board.
- 6.4 The final funding decision for the award of GPF to each individual project which has been prioritised for funding by the Investment Panel will be taken by the SELEP Accountability Board. This decision will be based on the ITE review of an Outline Business Case, as required under the SELEP Assurance Framework.
- 6.5 The Investment Panel Terms of Reference (ToR) will be agreed at the first meeting of the Panel. This will include setting out the Panel's remit, as stated in paragraph 6.3 above.
- 6.6 The ToR will include terms to enable Investment Panel members to be substituted with another representative with the appropriate authority to do so.

7. Timescales for GPF re-investment

- 7.1 Table 2 below sets out the proposed timescale for the GPF re-investment prioritisation.
- 7.2 Whilst shorter timescales were considered, this would substantially reduce the amount of time available to publicise this funding opportunity and for scheme promoters to complete the EoI and SOBC documents.
- 7.3 The proposed meeting of the Investment Panel coincides with a planned Accountability Board meeting, whilst the extra Accountability Board meeting required at stage 3 coincides with a planned Strategic Board meeting.
- 7.4 To meet the timescales for the SELEP Accountability Board in December 2017, scheme promoters will be required to develop an outline business case 'at risk' of the project not being allocated funding by the Investment Panel. Alternatively scheme promoters may choose for the funding decision to be taken at a future Accountability Board, as the GPF is required and available to draw down.
- 7.5 It is proposed that the Investment Panel should allocate the full £9.3m during the meeting on the 17th November. However, should additional GPF become available through early repayment or projects failing to draw down their allocation within a 12 month period from when investment is expected to take place, the Panel will be convened to consider further allocations.
- 7.6 The proposed approach to the re-investment of GPF should be reviewed after a four year period, or as otherwise required, such as due any changes to SELEP governance arrangements.

Table 2 Timescales for GPF re-investment

Stage 1	Eol development	June/ July*
	Review of Eol SELEP ITE support available	August*
	Federated Board decision on schemes to be nominated to SELEP for SOBC development	8 th September **
Stage 2	Development of SOBC	4 th – 28 th September
	SOBC submission to SELEP	29 th September
	SELEP ITE review (allowing time for clarification questions to scheme promoters)	2 nd - 27 th October
	Investment Panel meeting to agree GPF pipeline	17 th November
Stage 3	Accountability Board meeting to sign off Outline Business Case and take final funding decision.	15 th December (extra Accountability Board meeting)

*Federated Areas to determine the exact timescales

**Recommendation only. The earlier the Federated Board agrees the schemes to be nominated the more time which will be available to develop the SOBC.

8. Charging of Interest

- 8.1 Whilst no interest is charged on existing loans or can be introduced in retrospect, the Board are asked to consider options for the charging of interest on future GPF investments.
- 8.2 The potential charging of interest serves two purposes; (i) incentivise the early repayment of the loan and (ii) reduce the depreciation of the GPF through time as a result of inflation.
- 8.3 Whilst no interest is charged on existing loans or can be introduced in retrospect, the Board are asked to consider options for the charging of interest on re-invested GPF. These options include:
- **Option A:** Charging of interest at market rate
 - **Option B:** Charging of interest at two percent below the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) Fixed Maturity Rate (preferred option).
 - **Option C:** No charging of interest but a late repayment fine is applied where projects fail to meet their agreed re-payment schedule.
 - **Option D:** No charging of interest.
- 8.4 The preferred option is for the charging of interest at two percent below the PWLB Fixed Loan Maturity Rate (Option B), or zero percentage interest - whichever is higher. The rate of interest based on Option B would be fixed at the point of the credit agreement being signed.
- 8.5 During this period of low interest rates, in practice the charging of interest at two points below the PWLB Fixed Maturity Rate would in effect mean that zero percentage interest is charged on investments made at this point in time. However, the charging of interest at two percent below the PWLB rate would help protect the longevity of the fund should interest rates rise substantially.

8.6 Table 3 below sets out the relative merits and constraints for each of these options.

Table 3 Options for the charging of interest on GPF

Option	Pros	Cons
Option A: Charging of interest at market rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real term value and longevity of the fund is maintained • Reduces the risk of state aid issues for the loan • Risk status/length of borrowing period reflected in rates set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity in trying to establish market rates for projects that can't get funding on the open market • Likely to restrict the numbers of projects coming forward
Option B: Charging of interest at two percent below the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) rate (SELEP recommended option).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would mean that no interest is charged in low interest periods but protects value of fund in higher interest markets • Interest rates increase to reflect increased borrowing periods • Encourages more projects to come forward than option A. • Less complex than a market rate charging mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund would continue to be eroded in value during periods of low interest but higher inflation • More complex Credit Agreement required than a no interest regime • May be some restriction in projects coming forward as opposed to zero rate • May be State Aid implications for some projects
Option C: No charging of interest, but a late repayment fine is applied where projects fail to meet their agreed re-payment schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dis-incentivises delayed re-payment of GPF to the agreed repayment schedule • Encourages high numbers of projects to come forward • More difficult/complex projects may be able to secure funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longevity of the fund is undermined and the cash value will continue to erode
Option D: No charging of interest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages high numbers of projects to come forward • More difficult/complex projects may be able to secure funding • Easy to administer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longevity of the fund is undermined and the cash value will continue to erode • Potential State Aid issues • No reflection of the cost of risk on the fund

9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1 – Update on GPF delivery

9.2 Appendix 2 – Update on GPF benefits realised to date

- 9.3 Appendix 3 – Repayment schedule
- 9.4 Appendix 4 - Detail of GPF re-investment approach
- 9.5 Appendix 5 – Expressions of Interest Template

10. Background documents

- 10.1 Accountability Board Agenda Pack 31st March 2017
- 10.2 Accountability Board Agenda Pack 26th May 2017

Author: Rhiannon Mort
Position: Capital Programme Manager, SELEP
Contact details: rhiannon.mort@essex.gov.uk , 07917 650933

Author: Suzanne Bennett
Position: Finance Business Partner
Contact details: suzanne.bennett@essex.gov.uk , 033301 30823

Date: 30th May 2017

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from the Strategic Board (the Board) to allocate Growing Places Fund (GPF) *revenue* monies to the support of pan-LEP sector based activities endorsed by the Working Groups.
- 1.2 The report is also intended to establish a mechanism to nominate Board Champions for each of the Working Groups.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to:
 - 2.1.1 Agree the process, criteria and ground rules for awarding small revenue allocations of 'Sector Support Funding' to projects and initiatives emanating from the SELEP Working Groups (both existing and emerging)
 - 2.1.2 Agree that 'champions' for the Working Groups are identified and are enabled to act in support of their Working Groups at forthcoming Strategic Board meetings
 - 2.1.3 Note that a Social Enterprise Working Group, as per the Terms of Reference (December 2016) is being taken forward and that plans are underway to establish a way to support Highways England's engagement phase of the Lower Thames Crossing work.

3. Background

Growing Places Fund Revenue (as reported to Accountability Board on 26th May) – Sector Support Funding

- 3.1 When the original GPF award was made in 2011/12 by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), an element of revenue was included alongside the capital grant. The total original revenue award was £3.7 million.
- 3.2 In the intervening period an award of £1.245 million revenue was made by the then SELEP Board to Harlow District Council to support the Harlow Enterprise Zone. This was made up of a grant of £245,000 to cover set up costs and £200,000 per year for five years to support administrative costs in the early years of the functioning of the Enterprise Zone.
- 3.3 2017/18 is the final year that Harlow District Council is able to access this funding. There is £239,000 remaining funding available to be drawdown in the year. Harlow District Council claim the funding retrospectively and provides evidence to ensure only those costs agreed by the Board in the original approval are claimed.
- 3.4 At the start of 2017/18 the balance of the GPF revenue grant was still remaining. In previous years it was assumed that this remaining revenue element of the grant, less any outstanding amounts committed to Harlow District Council, would transfer to the SEFUND vehicle. Given that SEFUND is no longer being taken forward, a proposal was made to, and agreed by, the Strategic Board that this funding would be used to support specific sectoral bids from across the SELEP.
- 3.5 It is proposed that this finite pot of funding is made available to the SELEP working groups as a 'Sector Support Fund' (SSF) with a maximum value of support offered within a given financial year capped at £500,000; this will allow the fund to perpetuate for up to four years and to effectively support the roll out of work aligned with the new SEP – and also to support new working groups should the new SEP identify a new set of priority work areas.
- 3.6 There are currently two legitimate calls on the funding:

- 3.6.1 Proposals to support the establishment of Enterprise Zones, given the precedent set by the support previously provided to Harlow Enterprise Zone; and
- 3.6.2 Proposals from the operative pan-LEP working groups and other sub-Strategic Board structures which will support work consistent with the aims of the extant Strategic Economic Plan.
- 3.7 Given that we are not going through the Accountability Board to make these funding decisions, we have to be clear that the formal funding decision is made by the Accountable Officer (Managing Director) with delegated responsibility following endorsement by the Strategic Board.
- 3.8 The process for agreeing funding will take the form of a normal board paper and endorsement. The addition to the Board Paper Template is the insertion of a summary table* which requires the applicant to satisfy a simple set of criteria:

Criterion	Comments
The project/initiative is pan-SELEP in scope and will have an impact across all federal areas.	
The project/initiative can demonstrate that it will contribute to SELEP's mission to create the conditions for increased numbers of jobs and homes , safeguard existing jobs and raise skills levels across the area.	
The project/initiative is consistent with SELEP's priorities as defined in the Strategic Economic Plan and can demonstrate a positive impact on other parts of the SELEP agenda.	
The project/initiative is also supported by at least a 30% local funding contribution, which will be available to spend alongside the GPF revenue investment **	
The project/initiative provides high Value for Money and will stand up to the monitoring and evaluation requirements of the SELEP Assurance Framework when presented to Strategic Board.	
The project/initiative can be delivered following the legal requirements for investment of public funds .	
The project/initiative is supported by a lead County Council/ Unitary Authority. This authority will be required to provide £151 or equivalent sign off .	

*note that projects seeking funding on 9th June have used an earlier iteration of this table

**exceptions may be made where evidence is provided of substantial follow on investment

- 3.9 To ensure that the funding is used to best possible effect, the following rules should be applied in addition:
 - 3.9.1 That SSF is used for project related revenue spend, not business as usual or operational costs
 - 3.9.2 That bids adhere to a minimum threshold of £5,000 and a maximum of 40% of the total in-year pot (i.e. £200k or £200k pa)
 - 3.9.3 That initiatives are focused and time limited, and that progress updates re spend and deliverables are reported at subsequent Board meetings on a biannual basis until the project/initiative is complete.

- 3.9.4 That all bids are considered by the Board unless an urgent decision is required outside of this cycle (see 3.7 above)
- 3.10 As described later in the agenda pack, the SELEP Strategy Manager is starting in post and will have responsibility for supporting the Working Groups and encouraging the types of initiatives which could call on the funding during future Board meetings.
- 3.11 It is recommended that the Board quickly moves to agree this and that we assume the process of considering bids for funding.

Board Champions

- 3.12 We have variously discussed nominating 'board champions' for each of the sector-led Working Groups, to ensure that discussions are played strongly into the Strategic Board. We have standing items on each agenda for Working Group updates, but these are provided, by design, on an ad hoc basis. Instating 'champions' for each working group should ensure that the interests of the working groups are represented on a more consistent basis at the Strategic Board. Also, it will ensure a greater level of accountability and transparency for any funding invested in those particular groups. It need not be the case that the board champions also chair the Working Group which they represent.
- 3.13 In some instances, board champions are already in place, as below. We should now seek to fill the gaps in the table below in the next meetings of the Working Groups with a view to confirming the outcome with a paper to the next Strategic Board meeting.

Working Group	Board Champion
Coastal (inc CORE)	
South East Creative Economy Network	
Growth Hub	
Housing and Development	Paul Thomas
Rural	
Skills Advisory Group	Graham Razey (FE rep)
Social Enterprise	<i>Group to be established</i>
Tourism	<i>Group to be established</i>
U9	Prof Anthony Forster (HE rep)

Social Enterprise

- 3.14 SELEP has recently presented to a large audience of Social Enterprises to discuss its previous work on social enterprise generally and the planned approach to lead an effort to support Social Enterprise across the LEP. This was particularly well received and the team is now committed to taking the agenda forward by working with local groups, forming a SELEP wide working group and then establishing a Chair, terms of reference and overall aims for our involvement in this area. It is then expected that a commitment to supporting Social Enterprise will follow in the new SEP.

- 3.15 It should be noted that the board agreed at the December 2016 meeting that a 27th board member, representing Social Enterprise, should be invited to join the board. We propose that the Chair of the Working Group, when fully established, should take the seat on the board.

Lower Thames Crossing

- 3.16 Recent conversations with Highways England have established that they are looking to engage with a mixed group of stakeholders in establishing and subsequently amplifying the wider economic benefits of the Lower Thames Crossing.
- 3.17 We have suggested that we could support this under the SELEP aegis by establishing a working group or another kind of forum which could plug directly in to the appropriate point in Highways England or Department for Transport. These conversations are ongoing and will be further informed by the presentation from Highways England during today's agenda. We will also link the production of the SELEP LTC prospectus in here with a view to reporting back to the next Strategic Board meeting.

4. Next steps

- 4.1 That the process for the award of Growing Places Fund revenue monies takes immediate effect.
- 4.2 That work continues to establish the Working Group Champions and develop the Social Enterprise Working Group in itself.
- 4.3 That conversations continue around how we support Highways England's requirements to engage with businesses and other stakeholders on next steps for the Lower Thames Crossing with a view to inaugurating an additional forum of businesses, Government departments, local authorities and other interest groups.

Author: Adam Bryan
Position: Managing Director
Contact details: adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk, 07884 475191
Date: 2nd June 2017

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to:

- 1.1.1 provide an update on the work of the South East Creative Economy Network (SECEN)
- 1.1.2 seek financial support for SECEN’s major cultural tourism programme Culture Coasting.

2. SELEP Sector Support summary checklist

Criterion	Comments
The project/initiative is pan-SELEP in scope and will have an impact across all federal areas.	Culture Coasting delivers in East Sussex, Kent and the Essex Thames Estuary building on Culture Kent, the Estuary Festival and the East Sussex Coastal Cultural Trail. Along with its sister project Colours and Flavours it delivers pan-LEP, coastal and rural.
The project/initiative can demonstrate that it will contribute to SELEP’s mission to create the conditions for increased numbers of jobs and homes across the area.	The two projects aim to grow the visitor economy by 3% over 3 years, creating 4,700 new jobs.
The project/initiative is consistent with SELEP’s priorities as defined in the Strategic Economic Plan and can demonstrate a positive impact on other parts of the SELEP agenda.	The SEP is committed to supporting the creative, cultural and media and visitor economy and this project supports all of these sectors.
The project/initiative is also funded from other sources and/or SELEP support will help unlock further funding.	The overall budget is £1.37m. Other sources of funding include Arts Council England (£500k secured subject to match); Visit England £350k (pending), £170k local authority and Destination Management Organisations and £110k sponsorship.
The project/initiative provides good Value for Money and will stand up to monitoring and evaluation which SELEP will undertake as part of its normal business processes.	The investment match is SELEP £1:£9 additional funding. The return on jobs is SELEP £1 job:£32

3. Recommendations

3.1 The board is asked to:

- 3.1.1 note the work of SECEN
- 3.1.2 approve a financial investment of £150k (£50k per year for three years), subject to SECEN securing Arts Council England Cultural Destinations funding and Discover England funding This investment of £50k per annum is essential to unlock other funding of £1.22m for an overall project value of £1.37m generating 4,700 new jobs.

4. Background

South East Creative Economy Network

- 4.1 The South East Creative Economy Network works to accelerate growth in the digital, creative and cultural sector. SECEN was established in summer 2013 to work with SELEP to identify barriers to growth for the Creative Economy in the South East.
- 4.2 The creative industries are worth more than £87.4bn in GVA to the UK and the creative economy employs one in every 11 working people (approx 24% of the workforce), with 87% of highly creative occupations at low risk of being automated in the future. Between 2009 and 2013 exports of services by UK creative industries grew by 34.2% whilst in the same period UK services exports grew by just 20.6%. Since 2010, the number of creative businesses in the SELEP area has grown by 30.5% (recent figures indicate that in some areas this growth is closer to 150%). The proportion of creative industries in the total SELEP business base is growing as well, accounting for 9.6% of total businesses in 2015, compared to 8.5% in 2010. When comparing the region with other LEPs, SELEP is above average regarding its share of creative enterprises, ranking 13th of all 39 LEPs. However, growth is below the national average, suggesting that the SELEP region is failing to maximise its obvious potential given its proximity and connectivity to London, and risks losing out to other LEPs.
- 4.3 SECEN implements practical and scalable initiatives to overcome barriers to growth by aligning the efforts of businesses, education providers, strategic organisations and local authorities to ensure that SECEN will lead one of Europe's most diverse, integrated and productive creative regions.
- 4.4 The Network has a Prospectus which was launched at the House of Commons in 2016 and SECEN commissioned detailed research into the current state of the sector to inform priorities, produced by Shared Intelligence and available on the SELEP website.
- 4.5 SECEN was directly approached to contribute to the Creative Industries Federation response to the Industrial Strategy and has attracted the interest of the DCMS as an example of best practice in LEP regions.

South East Creative Economy Network work programmes

4.6 Sector Specific Business support (led by Thurrock Council)

SECEN is pursuing ERDF investment to enable the South East Creative, Cultural, and Digital Support programme (SECCADs) to be delivered. With the creative sector being one of the fastest growing sectors in the country, this programme is about enabling the sector to continue to flourish and grow in the SELEP area. The Shared Intelligence research confirmed that over 90% of people working in creative careers are freelance and this programme is particularly designed to suit the needs of freelancers and micro businesses.

4.7 Workspace Development (led by ESCC)

SECEN is developing a work space strategy to ensure that fit for purpose workspace is available SELEP-wide to enable scaling up and fostering of creative enterprise zones based on existing creative hubs.

4.8 Talent Accelerator (led by Creative and Cultural Skills & KCC)

Supporting the overall SELEP Skills agenda, SECEN is working with Creative and Cultural Skills (the National Academy for Skills and Training for the UK's Creative and Cultural industries) to develop a work programme to support the talent pipeline for creative industries, addressing the need for a STEAM education (ie the need for Arts and other creative subjects to be encouraged in schools),

matching training to skills gaps in the industry and developing clearer training pathways. The programme also aims to highlight existing good practice.

4.9 Thames Gateway Production Corridor (led by Thurrock and KCC/Kent Cultural Transformation Board) SECEN is working with the GLA to support the concept of a Thames Gateway Production Corridor facilitating complementary creative business clusters and facilities to ensure the opportunities for the creative sector are fully developed and contribute to on-going creative business growth.

4.10 Cultural Tourism (led by Culture Kent and ESCC)

Tourism generates £106 billion a year to the British economy, employing over 2m people and supporting thousands of businesses. The current value of tourism to the SELEP area is as follows:

Indicator	Essex (per capita)	Kent and Medway (per capita)	East Sussex (per capita)	Totals (per capita)
Total number of trips – including overnight stays and day trips	41.5m	60m	24m	126.5m
Total tourism value	£2.9bn	£3.6bn	£1.42bn	£7.92bn
Actual jobs	55,400	72,000	30,000	157,400

5. Culture Coasting

- 5.1 Recognising the volume and value of Cultural Tourism in the SELEP region, the potential for growth and acknowledging the co-dependencies across the tourism and cultural sectors, SECEN supports the development of Cultural Tourism initiatives. This report seeks financial support for SECEN’s flagship tourism project: Culture Coasting. SECEN, led by Turner Contemporary and Visit Kent, has secured an offer of £500k investment from Arts Council England for Culture Coasting – an immersive visitor experience driven by world class art.
- 5.2 Building on the Estuary Festival, Culture Kent and the East Sussex Coastal Culture Trail, Culture Kent and Essex’s Cultural Destinations programme; Culture Coasting aims to grow the visitor economy by 3% in East Sussex, Kent and the Thames Estuary, generating 4,700 new jobs over a three year period. A bid for essential match funding to Visit England’s Discover England fund has been submitted by Visit Kent and the project will use Visit Kent’s Colours and Flavours bookable platform for visitors to plan their visit, making the two projects interdependent.
- 5.3 The project is Pan-LEP and the partnership includes (but is not limited to) Metal (Southend) and Estuary Festival, Turner Contemporary (Margate), Creative Foundation (Folkestone), Whitstable Biennale, Visit Kent, South Eastern Trains and the East Sussex Coastal Cultural Trail galleries (Towner, De La Warr Pavilion and Jerwood).
- 5.4 Culture Coasting is designed to respond to current visitor behaviour trends, tap into new markets and will create a step change for the galleries and the tourism sector across the area. It addresses the challenges of the South East as a destination with no one major urban centre and builds practical and scalable initiatives and interconnections across the South East and beyond. The project will continue to stimulate further innovation and growth beyond the lifetime of this project by delivering:
 - 5.4.1 World class art featuring a minimum of 9 artist designed caches as a coherent and connected south east coastal trail incentivising visitors to join up destinations
 - 5.4.2 Bookable related products and bookable platform which increases income opportunities for the Delivery and Associate partners
 - 5.4.3 A multifaceted world class international and national tourism marketing campaign

- 5.4.4 Local engagement programmes capturing “sense of place”
 - 5.4.5 Artists’ “Airbnb” pilot in Folkestone
 - 5.4.6 Maximising the value of new visitors attracted to the new National Coast Path and the Turner Prize (which Turner Contemporary is hosting in 2019)
 - 5.4.7 Accessible and eco-friendly travel options including bicycle hire and train travel
 - 5.4.8 A south east wide up-to-date event data pool linked to a range of digital and print channels for comprehensive marketing
 - 5.4.9 An iterative learning programme, knowledge sharing events, training and development
 - 5.4.10 Research (quantitative and qualitative)
 - 5.4.11 Scalable options for Associate Partners to utilise such as the bookable platform and geocaching
- 5.5 SECEN is requesting £150k contribution from SELEP (£50k per annum from 2017/18 to 2019/20) to support the project. The overall budget for Culture Coasting is £1.37m.

Author: Sally Staples
Position: East Sussex Cultural Strategy Manager
Contact details: sally.staples@eastsussex.gov.uk
Date: 25.05.17

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide information to the South East LEP Board on Visit Kent's bid to the Discover England Fund (2): The Colours and Flavours of England – your key to England's Secret Gardens - to enable the Board to make a final decision on whether to provide match funding for the project. The bid will be led by Visit Kent's trading company Go To Places.
- 1.2 This project should be considered alongside Culture Coasting, which is being presented by the South East Creative Economy Network. Visit Kent has been involved in the development of Culture Coasting and has prepared a separate bid to the Discover England Fund (£350k) to support Culture Coasting.
- 1.3 Both bids, if the Board is supportive, will deliver value to the visitor economy across the whole of the SELEP region, covering all aspects of tourism: cultural, rural, coastal, active, and food and drink.

2. SELEP Sector Support summary checklist

Criterion	Comments
The project/initiative is pan-SELEP in scope and will have an impact across all federal areas.	Colours and Flavours is being led by Go To Places, in partnership with Visit Essex and a number of other Destination Management Organisations. National in scope, the SELEP region is fully covered as we are in dialogue with key District Councils in East Sussex who are supportive of the project. East Sussex County Council have yet to sign up (the deadline for the bid's submission was too tight for the County Council's sign-off processes), but representatives have indicated their ongoing interest and willingness to engage if the bid is successful.
The project/initiative can demonstrate that it will contribute to SELEP's mission to create the conditions for increased numbers of jobs and homes across the area.	Colours and Flavours is a key strand of Visit Kent's work to develop the visitor economy in the SELEP region. The 5/5/5 Strategy aims to grow the visitor economy by a further 5 million visitors to Kent in the next 5 years and create an additional 5,000 jobs in the county.
The project/initiative is consistent with SELEP's priorities as defined in the Strategic Economic Plan and can demonstrate a positive impact on other parts of the SELEP agenda.	Colours and Flavours, along with Culture Coasting, aligns with the SELEP's priorities for the tourism, creative, cultural and media sectors. In addition, the project will support the wider skills agenda, support for businesses, particularly SMEs, and attracting inward investment through the development and support for public realm and infrastructure improvements.
The project/initiative is also funded from other sources and/or SELEP support will help unlock further funding.	The funding pot for Colours and Flavours is £1.5m, of which at least 20% has to be cash match funding (another 20% is in-kind). We have received pledges of financial and other support from a wide range of partners, including leading transport, DMO, tour and cross channel operators,

	<p>attractions, and national organisations such as the Caravanning and Motorhome Club, the British Beer and Pubs Association, the National Garden Scheme and English Heritage (this list is not exhaustive).</p>
<p>The project/initiative provides good Value for Money and will stand up to monitoring and evaluation which SELEP will undertake as part of its normal business processes.</p>	<p>An investment of £60k from the LEP will contribute to an overall funding pot of £1.5m. The project, while it has national partners, has a strong South East focus, and it is expected that the SELEP region will see significant benefits in each county. The project has stringent monitoring and evaluation requirements - there will be a project management team, overseen by Go To Places/Visit Kent. The regular reporting (including financial and wider project objectives) can be made available to SELEP. We will discuss SELEP monitoring and evaluation requirements where these are not already delivered through the robust management of the project.</p>

3. Recommendation

3.1 The Board is asked to agree financial support - £60k for Discover England 2: The Colours and Flavours of England: your key to England's Secret Gardens.

4. Background

4.1 England's Colours and Flavours will create perfect trips to England that take in the best country gardens, along with authentic English food and dining, to create a unique holiday. This will be through a unique database of beautiful gardens, high quality boutique hotels and B&Bs, as well as a rich, authentic English dining experience in an easy to use bespoke online and mobile planning tool and service.

4.2 The thematic, national bookable product will be curated, providing unique and high quality content around great gardens and food and drink venues and experiences. This will be achieved through business clusters and existing digital platforms, and distributed through established international channels and partners.

4.3 The target markets are the Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden: the market segments are mature experience seekers and conservative retirees.

4.4 Activity will include:

- Content curation
- Developing digital technology from the current DEF1 project: Gardens and Gourmet
- Product and concept testing and refinement
- Training webinars and e-conferences for partners
- Distribution through VisitBritain shop and travel trade partners
- Distribution through preferred online tour operators such as Expedia
- In-territory sales missions and fam trips
- Presence at major trade events
- Presence and product launch at major international garden shows (e.g. Chelsea Flower Show)

- Press trips
- Digital marketing campaign
- Media partnership with international guide/channel (e.g. Lonely Planet, Michelin)

4.5 Board members will wish to note the following strategic issues:

A key aim of the Discover England Fund is to develop a functioning sub-national framework for tourism. This is in line with broader governmental aims identified in the Industrial Strategy, which is seeking specific sector deals, including tourism. Due to its position as a leading, successful and strategic Destination Management Organisation, Visit Kent/Go To Places is working closely with DCMS to flesh out what that will mean in practice. Further engagement on DEF2 next steps and the Industrial Strategy is ongoing. It is clear from early discussions that the LEP network is considered an integral part of this process. Government will be looking to LEPs to provide more support, both practical and strategic, to the visitor economy.

Although SELEP does not currently have a formal sub-group working on the visitor economy that matches the work of the SECEN, we would point to the close working relationships we have with Visit Essex and East Sussex County Council. This has borne fruit over many years through successful funding bids to deliver cross-county projects, both domestic (Discover England Fund: Gardens and Gourmet) and international (Interreg projects: the current one – PROFIT – aims to raise the profitability of the tourism entrepreneurs in the 2 Seas coastal economies by developing a strategy for innovation, developing a new, creative and technological approach to support innovation in tourism SMEs).

We are currently working on a pan-LEP visitor economy prospectus, designed to outline the value of the visitor economy and highlight where value can be added by the Destination Management Organisations working with the SELEP. Should the Board feel that a key component of this would be to create a formal reporting structure, we would be happy to lead that process.

5. Next steps

- 5.1 We will be meeting partners to talk through the project, including governance, in-kind support and wider resource implications on 14 June. A decision by the SELEP Board in advance of that meeting would be extremely helpful.
- 5.2 VisitEngland have advised we will be notified of the success of both bids by the end of June. We are already working on a resource plan to ensure we can begin to deliver the project (which runs to March 2019).
- 5.3 At the same time, we will be working with colleagues on the Culture Coasting bid. A meeting is planned for 20 June to identify key actions to begin to deliver as soon as the announcement has been made.

Author: Jackie Westlake OBE
Position: Visit Kent, Operations Director
Contact details: Jackie.westlake@visitkent.co.uk; 01227 812 909
Date: 30 May 2017

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to seek the Strategic Board’s agreement to the SELEP Managing Director, under the terms of his financial delegation, to negotiate and agree a package of financial support from [the Secretariat’s Sector Support Budget] towards development of the North Kent Enterprise Zone.

2. SELEP Sector Support summary checklist

Criterion	Comments
The project/initiative is pan-SELEP in scope and will have an impact across all federal areas.	The North Kent Enterprise Zone operates within a specific sub-regional geography, but its impact will potentially benefit SELEP as a whole.
The project/initiative can demonstrate that it will contribute to SELEP’s mission to create the conditions for increased numbers of jobs and homes across the area.	The prime objective of the NKEZ is to generate jobs growth (9,900 new jobs by 2026) with an emphasis on higher-skilled, higher value jobs that will sustain significant GVA growth.
The project/initiative is consistent with SELEP’s priorities as defined in the Strategic Economic Plan and can demonstrate a positive impact on other parts of the SELEP agenda.	Supporting economic-led regeneration and growth in the Thames Gateway is a priority in the existing SEP and is consistent with ambitions for the new SEP. The sector focus of the NKEZ schemes, including medical and life sciences and technologies, advanced manufacturing and engineering and digital and creative industries, is also well aligned with priorities set out in the Government’s Industrial Strategy Green Paper.
The project/initiative is also funded from other sources and/or SELEP support will help unlock further funding.	The NKEZ is supported in kind through dedicated officer time and direct / contract spending on various components. The proposals in this paper give details of proposed partner commitments.
The project/initiative provides good Value for Money and will stand up to monitoring and evaluation which SELEP will undertake as part of its normal business processes.	

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Board is asked to **endorse** the allocation of £161,000 from the Sector Support Budget to support the development of the North Kent Enterprise Zone.

4. Background

- 4.1 SELEP Board Members will be aware that the **North Kent Enterprise Zone (NKEZ)**, which was announced in the 2015 Autumn Statement, formally commenced on 1 April 2017. The Zone comprises three schemes - Ebbsfleet Garden City (three sites), Kent Medical Campus and Rochester Airport Technology Park (two sites) – spanning five local authority areas in Kent. The Board received a presentation about NKEZ at its meeting on 24 June 2016 which referenced bringing proposals to SELEP in due course for financial support.

- 4.2 The Board will wish to note progress to date on the development of the NKEZ, including:
- Establishment of the **NKEZ Strategic Board**, which first met in September 2016, to provide light-touch overall governance for the Zone. Maidstone Borough Council is acting as Accountable Body for the NKEZ Strategic Board, and Bernard Spring was welcomed as Chairman in March 2017;
 - Conclusion of the **Memorandum of Understanding** with DCLG (the arrangements for which were endorsed by the SELEP Accountability Board and Strategic Board in September 2016);
 - Launch of the dedicated NKEZ and Kent Medical Campus **websites** on 2 March;
 - Renewal of the outline planning permission for **Kent Medical Campus**, completion of the internal access road and commencement of construction of the first NKEZ Cygnet Mental Health Facility (expected to open Q2 2018);
 - Completion and submission of the **Implementation Plan**, 31 March 2017;
 - Award of £27k **grant** by DCLG for commercial advice;
 - Detailed planning consent for stage 1 of redevelopment at **Rochester Airport**;
 - Outline planning consent for commercial development at **Northfleet East** (one of the Ebbsfleet enterprise zone sites).
- 4.3 Implementation activity is stepping up across the three schemes. To assist with development of the NKEZ, there are three areas where SELEP support would be particularly helpful:
- (i) Contribution towards the up-front costs of preparing Local Development Orders for Rochester Airport Technology Park;
 - (ii) Production of marketing collateral; and
 - (iii) Formative evaluation.
- 4.4 The costs of these three strands would fall mainly, but not exclusively, in 2017/18. The purpose in seeking support for a package of activity is on the basis that it covers one-off costs and some longer-term activity (evaluation) and to cover these in one bid rather than bring successive piecemeal proposals to SELEP.

5. Consideration

(i) Local Development Orders – Rochester Airport Technology Park

- 5.1 The boundary of Rochester Airport Technology Park includes land in both Medway (18.2ha) and Tonbridge & Malling (3.9ha). Following discussion and consideration of the options for securing a robust and efficient planning regime for the Park, the two Councils have agreed that Local Development Orders (LDOs) offer the best solution for establishing a strong planning framework and fast-track processing of proposals to accelerate delivery of appropriate type and quality of development on the site. We have had regard for experience with LDOs on other enterprise zone sites including Harlow.
- 5.2 It is recognised that developing LDOs is a lengthy process (6-9 months) involving significant up-front cost. In effect, an LDO has to cover a comparable level of detail to relevant Local Plan policies and reserved matters planning approval rolled into one. This therefore involves preparing a robust evidence base, detailed policies, design codes and guidance and public consultation to ensure the Orders are sound and can be confirmed. Once in place, the LDO establishes a prior approval process whereby provided development proposals are in conformity with the LDO they can proceed without requiring specific planning permission (other consents, e.g. under building and other regulations, may still be required).

5.3 The potential *advantages* of an LDO are:

- Whilst complex to develop, an LDO would help speed up long term delivery and thereby support the Local Plan objectives for delivery of employment land ¹;
- An LDO can strengthen developer confidence. PAS identifies that *"Most Councils are clear that potential developers see LDOs as positive statements of intent and are confident they will play a part in securing development in the future"*;
- Fast-track planning through the LDO process will speed up subsequent development timetables and help secure earlier delivery of premises and business occupation. This in turn will mean earlier delivery of new jobs and productivity for the sites, and generation of business rates to invest in the enterprise zone and in support for enterprise and growth more generally in the area;
- An LDO offers the opportunity to manage/control how the site will come forward comprehensively instead of piecemeal – e.g. considerations of design and landscaping will be agreed through the LDO and can result in a better quality environment;
- An LDO, and the planning certainty and transparency it provides, can be used as a marketing tool to:
 - Secure further high end value businesses, which would help bolster the economy – beneficial for the employment ambitions locally, the wider Thames Gateway and for SELEP;
 - Improve perceptions – an opportunity for the public sector to demonstrate positive action to encourage business investment and growth and cutting through red tape to increase the pace and cut down the cost of development;
 - Set a clear framework and ambitions – establishing clear design and other criteria to secure high quality developments in keeping with the iconic status of the location;
 - Support wider local ambitions (e.g. the 'Medway on the Map' initiative).
- The LDO preparation process can help build public engagement and involvement in shaping the proposals for the site, and reduce the risk of development delays arising from objections to specific schemes;
- The key ambitions of the LDO can be embedded in, and reinforced by, other strategies;
- The LDO can provide a firm foundation for attracting high quality development partner interest;
- Less officer time will be spent on each development application – conditions, principles and parameters are established through the LDO. In the longer term, therefore, administration costs may be reduced as well as processing expedited.

5.4 The potential *disadvantages* of an LDO are:

- The lengthy preparation time involved (although in the case of Rochester Airport the envisaged timetable would synchronise with other steps involved in physical preparation of the site);
- The up-front cost and resource required to prepare the LDO;
- Forgoing future planning-related income (arising from the normal application process) and thus revenue to offset against the costs of LDO preparation;

¹ A National Planning Advisory Service (PAS) study (*Report into the use, value for money and effectiveness of Local Development Orders in implementing Local Authority objectives – January 2014, revision 3 - authored by Envision*) confirmed, based on feedback from participating Local Authorities, that an LDO does speed up delivery.



- LDO preparation is a relatively specialist piece of work which cannot be resourced – except with negative consequences for other planning services – from within existing local authority planning teams;
- LDOs are governed by local authority boundaries rather than site boundaries. Therefore separate LDOs would be needed by both Medway Council and Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council. Whilst every effort would be made to share the preparatory work (e.g. joint commissioning) in a proportionate manner, there are some process costs that are inevitably duplicated to fulfil the requirements placed on each Council.

5.5 On balance, the considered view of partners is proceeding with LDOs would be the best approach for the EZ site at Rochester Airport.

Funding proposal and approach

5.6 In view of the need to progress LDOs in an integrated manner in parallel in the two authorities, our conclusion is that the best approach is to commission expert consultancy support through a multi-disciplinary team external to either Council.

5.7 There is already an adopted Masterplan (January 2014) for Rochester Airport. Whilst this provides the current framework for the development of the site, preparation of LDOs provides a suitable opportunity to refresh and update the Masterplan to reflect the evolution in thinking about the site and to ensure consistency with the provisions of the LDOs. The appointment of a multi-disciplinary team of planners and designers (at Director, Associate and Senior levels across disciplines) would enable the LDOs and Masterplan to be commissioned through a single procurement, delivering overall economies of scale. The necessary procedural and legislative requirements will be undertaken by Councils with the consultants providing support.

5.8 The anticipated phased approach, would be:

- Stage 1a - Undertaking a range of studies to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) standard, to provide the requisite evidence base. We envisage that the studies required will include:

Transport	Ecology	Contamination
Air Quality	Heritage	Landscape and Visual
Noise	Archaeology	Flood risk and drainage
Market testing	Viability	Topographic survey

- Stage 1b – Preparation of the masterplan and detailed design codes taking account of the outcomes from the studies.
- Stage 2a – Public consultation on the draft masterplan, modification and adoption.
- Stage 2b – In parallel with the masterplan adoption process, preparation of the LDOs (with detailed design codes, informatives, statement of reasons, etc) and the EIA.
- Stage 3a – Public Consultation on the draft LDOs and EIA. This is likely to include events and exhibitions to engage the wider community (including business community) as well as statutory consultees.
- Stage 3b – Modification of the LDOs in light of consultation, followed by adoption.

5.9 Estimating the costs is not a precise science. In scoping the work programme, attention is being given to whether other studies carried out are sufficiently up to date and matched in scope to meet the standards required, e.g. for components of the EIA. We estimate that total costs for stages 1 and 2b are likely to be in the range £135,000 to £175,000.

- 5.10 The costs of stages 2a and 3 are estimated to be in the range of £20,000 to £30,000, which would include in-house additional costs in planning departments and the statutory processes that each authority would have to undertake, where certain costs are unavoidably duplicated.
- 5.11 Overall we therefore estimate the cost of LDO and Masterplan preparation could be in the range £155,000 to £205,000.
- 5.12 **Our request is that SELEP should provide 70% funding based on the mid-range point = £126,000** (£180,000 x 0.7). Medway Council and Tonbridge & Malling Council will fund the balance of 30%, with a bilateral agreement as to the amount each should contribute taking into account the proportion of the site within their boundary. The Councils also undertake to fund any cost overrun on the project without further recourse to SELEP.
- 5.13 The Councils will inevitably also be making a substantial contribution in kind, in terms of officer time across departments (including economic development, regeneration, highways, environment etc) in support of the LDO preparation work.

(ii) Marketing

- 5.14 Marketing for NKEZ is being led by Locate in Kent and their appointed agents ZEST. In consultation with a sub-group of communications and marketing leads for each scheme, LIK and ZEST have developed a marketing plan for NKEZ, most elements of which will – subject to agreement by the NKEZ Strategic Board – be funded from budget allocated for this purpose under the LIK's contract with its sponsors (Kent CC and Medway Council, with ERDF support). The plan includes added-value options that are outside the existing budgetary envelope. These include:
- Marketing collateral (exhibition materials, display stands etc) for use at events such as MIPIM UK;
 - Advertising campaign in targeted property and sector media;
 - Promotional video giving a virtual tour of the sites and articulating the vision and ambition for the enterprise zone;
 - At the appropriate stage, increasing the social media presence and profile of the NKEZ, buying in expert support.
- 5.15 ZEST have prepared a more detailed costed proposal, but the overall added-value elements would total around £18,000-£20,000. The marketing plan is predicated on some elements of match-funding from NKEZ partners of around £8,000-£10,000 in addition to the LIK commitment – again subject to agreement by the NKEZ Strategic Board.
- 5.16 Our ask of SELEP is therefore to support the added-value package to increase the impact of the NKEZ marketing activity to the value of **£20,000**.

(iii) Evaluation

- 5.17 Ideally evaluation would have been designed into the development of the NKEZ from the outset. But we are keen to examine, beyond the monitoring metrics required by central Government, the impact of the NKEZ as it evolves and the effectiveness of different interventions (including marketing) in helping to bring forward commercial development, jobs growth and wealth creation.
- 5.18 Summative evaluation – looking back on an intervention and assessing its impact – has its own value, but often the lessons come too late to have the impact they might have done or may have reduced relevance in the policy and institutional landscape in which they finally emerge. Formative evaluation, identifying lessons and their application as an initiative evolves, provide a greater opportunity for timely knowledge transfer and for responsive action to keep the initiative on track and continually improving. We would therefore like formative evaluation to be integrated as far as possible into the development of NKEZ.



- 5.19 Part of our vision for NKEZ is as a catalyst for innovation and enterprise more generally across North Kent, and particularly contributing towards hub-and-spoke models of seeding innovation, incubating innovative businesses and encouraging growth and investment in the wider economy. Knowledge transfer will be key to identifying lessons (both positive and negative) and helping to spread better practice both among and beyond NKEZ partners. Engagement with the wider enterprise zone community, using networks effectively and informing public and private sector practice in providing the most useful forms of support to business occupiers will also help in spreading outputs from the evaluation as it proceeds. Equally, learning lessons from existing enterprise zones and comparable initiatives elsewhere can feed into the ongoing development of NKEZ.
- 5.20 Long-term evaluation can be a costly business and we therefore need a proportionate approach that generates meaningful substance whilst remaining light-touch. We need to explore what contributions in cash or in kind that partners might commit, and this is likely to depend on further scoping work on the parameters of any evaluation. Our ask of SELEP is to commit **£15,000** on an in-principle basis towards evaluation of NKEZ, to be confirmed in light of further scoping work. It may be that SELEP would wish to consider a wider piece of evaluation looking at all the enterprise zones in the SELEP area and their place in the overall Strategic Economic Plan.

6. Next steps

- 6.1 The total value of these three funding components is **£161,000**. The Strategic Board is asked to mandate the Managing Director, under the terms of his financial delegation, to approve the allocation of this sum from the SELEP Sector Support budget for the purposes described. Arrangements for drawing down the funding would be agreed with the Accountable Body and monitored by the Accountability Board.

Author: Richard Longman
Position: Head of Policy, Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
Contact details: Richard.longman@thamesgateway-kent.org.uk; 01634 337270
Date: 1 June 2017



This is available in the zip folder which has been sent separately.

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to note the following prospective bids for support from the Government's National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF). While SELEP has no formal role in the process, the seeking of our endorsement as bids are finalised is a pre-requisite of a successful application. It is therefore important that the board has some cognisance of what support is being sought.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to note the report and to flag up any material comments to their appropriate federal area board after the Strategic Board meeting.

3. Background

Medway

- 3.1 Smart technology infrastructure east-west across Medway's key A2 road will reduce journey times and congestion. Investment will greatly enhance our current traffic management systems including SCOOT, invest in vehicle recognition technology, smart traffic lighting, lane controls and variable speed limits, increasing road network capacity
- 3.2 Forecast population growth, housing demand and development pressure will increase the number of journeys based on current car use.
- 3.3 Improvements will ensure a coherent and functional urban conurbation throughout the realisation of the Local Plan (to 2035). Improved roads will help to unlock developments, particularly through the planning application process.
- 3.4 Air quality will improve due to enhanced traffic flows. Consequently, the Air Quality Management Area in Rainham could be removed. The journey time from Rainham to Strood will improve, making it easier for residents in Rainham and Strood to access public services.
- 3.5 Our bid complements other projects, particularly Local Growth Fund in Strood Town Centre and Civic Site, and Rochester Riverside.

Southend on Sea Borough Council: Southend Town Centre Redevelopment Improvement Scheme (STCRIS)

- 3.6 The scheme will enhance travel chain access to Southend town centre via public realm and highway improvements to the bus interchange and car parks. The scheme will facilitate a wider redistribution of traffic, directing traffic around, as opposed to straight through, the town centre. It will provide improved access to key travel destinations enhancing the attractiveness of several potential town centre development sites.
- 3.7 The proposed works will actively move traffic flows from busy pedestrian areas to main traffic routes, thus reducing pollution and improving air quality in the town centre. Furthermore, the development of a transport hub will reduce vehicle movements resulting in further reductions in pollution and average journey times. The bid seeks approximately £2.5million of DfT funds, to match £750k of SBC match contribution (2018-20).

Essex

3.8 ECC is currently considering submitting two bids for NPIF funding. The projects are Millennium Way Slips and M11 Junction 8. Bids are required to be submitted by June 30th. These projects were also submitted to SELEP as part of LGF3. Of the two only M11 J8 received financial support via LGF3 and not to the amount required.

Millennium Way Slips - Project in Brief

3.9 The A120 is the strategic east-west route linking the M11 and Stansted Airport with the A12, Colchester and the port of Harwich. Braintree is located at the approximate half way point of this corridor. The district will be a location for several developments including: Braintree Town Centre Regeneration, Witham Enterprise Centre, Skyline 120, Panfield Lane Innovation and Enterprise Business Park. The new expanded Ignite Enterprise Centre, which opened in 2015 is forecast to deliver 30 new jobs per year, and provide business start-up advice to 300 clients annually. The development of a STEM Training Centre will help raise local skills to support priority sectors in Braintree

3.10 The grade separated section of the A120, leading from the M11 eastbound, passes under Millennium Way and terminates at Galley’s Corner Roundabout. At present there is no direct access from the A120 to Millennium Way, with all traffic to Freeport Braintree shopping village (Freeport) and Retail Park, along with access into Braintree via the B1018 ‘Millennium Way’ being via Galley’s Corner Roundabout. Delays are regularly experienced at the roundabout, with substantial queuing on the A120 southbound in the morning peak and eastbound in the evening peak. It is recognised that growth potential is limited by capacity at Galley’s Corner Roundabout and on the A120 in general.



3.11 The proposed west facing slip roads connect the A120 eastbound carriageway to Millennium Way northbound and Millennium Way northbound to the A120 westbound and would significantly relieve pressure on Galley’s Corner by providing direct access on and off the A120 to / from the west to Freeport, the Retail Park and Braintree. The scheme has the support of Braintree District Council,

ECC, and Highways England. The scheme is identified in the SELEP SEP and SELEP supported a round 3 bid to Government for Local Growth Fund in 2016. A successful bid for National Productivity Investment Fund would secure the delivery of this much needed transport improvement. (Fig Below: Millennium Way – Braintree)

Funding Profile:

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms) £000s

	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>	<u>Total</u>	
DfT funding sought		£2,500	£2,400	£4,900
ECC contribution		£1,500	£1,500	£3,000
Braintree District Council contribution		£1,500	£1,500	£3,000
Highways England contribution (tbc)		£1,500	£1,500	£3,000


TOTAL **£7,000** **£6,900** **£13,900**

Anticipated Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR): 3.79

M11 Junction 8 – Project in Brief

- 3.12 M11 J8 is the interchange between the M11 and A120 trunk roads and the strategic road access to London Stansted Airport. The M11 is the key road corridor connecting London with west Essex, including Enterprise@Harlow and Stansted Airport, Cambridge, and on via the A14 to the Midlands and the North. The A120 is the only east-west strategic transport corridor linking north Essex, with its Garden Settlement proposals, the Haven Ports and Stansted Airport. M11 J8 is therefore an essential international trade hub. Ensuring the operational effectiveness of this key junction is essential to economic prosperity and the delivery of growth in the north and west of Essex.
- 3.13 Junction 8 of the M11 is currently operating at capacity and already experiences significant queuing on some arms at peak periods. Stansted Airport is growing at an unprecedented rate of 2mppa and has recently submitted a planning application for a new arrivals terminal to support growth to its permitted capacity of 34 million passengers per annum. Local Plans for East Herts and Uttlesford are being progressed and accommodating growth at this junction is key to these plans being found sound.
- 3.14 The proposed scheme involves changes to M11 Junction 8 in order to improve traffic flow across the junction, improve access to Stansted Airport, the Service Area and between the M11 and the A120. The scheme is supported by Highways England and Stansted Airport. The scheme has received backing from the Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (GC&GP LEP) in the form of round 1 LGF, and from SELEP as a successful recipient of round 3 LGF, backed up by committed ECC and private sector funding

3.15 The LGF 3 allocation, while very welcome, fell short of the funding requirement for the preferred scheme option, a successful bid for National Productivity Investment Fund would secure the delivery of this much needed transport improvement.



- Scheme Components:**
- Improved left turn approach from M11 north & south
 - Revised MSA access
 - New signals to replace intermediary roundabout
 - Traffic management changes

Fig above: M11 Junction 8 (courtesy Google Maps)

Funding Profile:

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms) £000s

	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2019-20</u>	<u>Total</u>
DfT funding sought	£2,500	£2,400	£4,900
Local Authority contribution	£1,100	£1,100	£2,200
Cambridge & Peterborough LEP		£1,000	£1,000
Stansted Airport (Manchester Airports Group)	£1,000		£1,000
SELEP – Growth Fund	£1,500	£1,200	£2,700
TOTAL	£6,100	£5,700	£11,800

Anticipated Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR): 10.47

Thurrock – Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS)

3.16 Thurrock is proposing to submit a bid for a package of intelligent transport systems (ITS) to tackle congestion, particularly those arising from incidents on the Dartford Crossing. This location has one of the worst resilience records on the Strategic Road Network, with incidents resulting in gridlock on Thurrock’s local roads on several occasions during the last 12 months, resulting in serious disruption to local businesses.

- 3.17 In response to this challenge, in April 2016, local businesses, together with Thurrock Council, Highways England, Essex County Council and Essex Police formed a Congestion Task Force to identify measures to mitigate this problem. The Intelligent Transport Systems package has been identified as part of this work.
- 3.18 ITS offers innovative and cost effective solutions for improved traffic management, enabling network users to be better informed and allowing 'smarter' user decisions to be made. The NPIF application would seek funding to enable a step change in Thurrock's approach to managing the local road network and trigger infrastructure and systems deployment to align Thurrock with its strategic partners. Funding would allow for the following measures which would be deployed and operated in an integrated approach:
- UTMC system utilising the latest open standards to promote data collection, co-ordinated interventions for network management and collaboration with Highways England and neighbouring authorities including J31, J1A / 1B of M25 (Dartford Crossing)
 - UTC Traffic Signals upgrades at key junctions enabling the use of MOVA and SCOOT to offer adaptive and proactive junction management
 - Traffic Detection measures (Bluetooth and Radar) to provide real time information to systems and network managers to enable timely interventions and improved incident and event management
 - CCTV monitoring to provide vital visibility of the network and verification of network conditions and impacts
 - VMS to offer front line information and notifications to road users, co-ordinating information on local and strategic road conditions
 - Traffic and Travel Information services to provide open web based services providing information to stakeholders and road users
 - Air Quality monitoring through the provision of sensors to inform traffic management decisions and longer term operational and investment processes
 - Data exchange with key partners and stakeholders and ability for Thurrock to become a partner in the regional network management activities
 - Improved evidence based understanding of the network and impact assessment
- 3.19 The anticipated value of the bid is between £2-4m.

Kent - M20 Junction 7 – Maidstone Medical Campus

- 3.20 The M20 J7 scheme involves the reconfiguration and enlargement of the A249 Bearsted Road roundabout junction and the A249 Bearsted Road/New Cut Road roundabout junction to improve junction capacity and traffic flow. This is to accommodate the traffic associated with the Kent Medical Campus (KMC) development and housing growth in the town centre and to the south of the town.
- 3.21 M20 J7 is also a key node for the link between the two motorway corridors (M20 and M2) via the A249 and enhancements will complement the planned upgrade to M2 J5 by Highways England in the current Road Investment Strategy (RIS). The A249 link between M2 J5 and M20 J7 will be of

increased significance with the delivery of the new Lower Thames Crossing as traffic bifurcates between the M2 and M20 corridors and enhances the resilience of the Strategic Road Network.

- 3.22 The scheme is both a local priority for Maidstone and part of the wider strategic priority to deliver bifurcation in Kent County Council's (KCC) new *Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock (2016 – 2031)*.

Kent - Fastrack – Southfleet Road Junction

- 3.23 The scheme will provide a key public transport link between two major commercial and residential development sites within the Ebbsfleet Garden City in north Kent - the Eastern Quarry (EQ) and Ebbsfleet Central Area (ECA).
- 3.24 In response to a public transport oriented development planning policy approach, developers will ultimately deliver comprehensive high quality local bus connections into Ebbsfleet International station. However, those links will only emerge over the medium to long term as these huge sites are built out. In the short term, residents of existing communities and the earliest new housing adjacent to the station have frustratingly poor public transport accessibility into the station. There is clear evidence that this acts as a constraint on economic activity. A new local bus service intended to link Swanscombe and early development within EQ has not had the desired impact of attracting use by residents of the new development due to the congested and circuitous route it has to follow.
- 3.25 The scheme will deliver a short but very effective bus-only link. Not only will it upon opening radically transform local bus accessibility into Ebbsfleet Station, it will also deliver a key building block of future long term high quality Fastrack public transport network that underpins the planned huge scale development in the area.
- 3.26 The scheme is both a local priority for Dartford and Gravesham and part of the wider strategic priority to enable growth in the Thames Gateway and deliver bus improvements in KCC's new *Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock (2016 – 2031)*.

A2500 Lower Road, Sheppey – Road Widening

- 3.27 The scheme will upgrade a section of existing highway which has significant safety issues, improve the local amenity, enhance connectivity and improve the journey reliability. The existing carriageway is narrow with no footway, the narrow verges not giving any protection to pedestrians or cyclists along this stretch of road. Due to the poor alignment of the road and tight hedgerows the road has poor forward visibility. The suggested highway improvement would be to provide a 7.3m carriageway and an alignment that meets current standards and to provide a footway/cycleway on one side.
- 3.28 Local Growth Fund (LGF) has been allocated for the improvement of the Lower Road and Barton Hill Drive junction. This was part of a wider package of improvements along the A2500 Lower Road including the widening and realignment of Lower Road from Cowstead Corner to Barton Hill Drive of which this scheme is the next phase. As part of an amendment to the Swale Draft Local Plan, a new site 'Policy AX1' has been identified adjacent to Lower Road that provides approximately 600 houses. The policy makes provision for a highway contribution to the improvement of Lower Road. This provides an opportunity to deliver the full range of improvements originally proposed.
- 3.29 The A2500 Lower Road is a key route to the east of the Isle of Sheppey and also serves to link the residential areas of minster to the business and retail areas at Neats Court. The scheme is both a local priority for Swale and part of the wider strategic priority to enable growth in the Thames Gateway in KCC's new *Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock (2016 – 2031)*.



4. Next steps

- 4.1 The SELEP team intends to write in support of the aforementioned bids, assuming endorsement from the Strategic Board.

Author: Adam Bryan
Position: Managing Director
Contact details: adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk, 07884 475191
Date: 2nd June 2017

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Strategic Board with the operating plan for the SELEP secretariat for the rest of this financial year.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to note the report.

3. Background

Introduction

- 3.1 This document details the planned, currently foreseen, activities for the central SELEP team for the period from 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018.
- 3.2 It is deliberately called a 'Team Plan' rather than a 'Business Plan' as its focus is that of the central operation of the small LEP team and *not* those activities which are undertaken by the Working Groups or by the Federated Board lead officers. Similarly, it is also a by-product of the LEP's existing and new Strategic Economic Plans and is, and will be, responsive to the requirements of the SEP as agreed by forthcoming Strategic Board meetings.
- 3.3 It should be noted that decisions around the team budget are made by the Accountability Board and that Team Plan operates within the budget agreed by the Accountability Board on 31st March 2017.

Overall aim and modus operandi

- 3.4 The SELEP Team discharges its functions according to the requirements of the SELEP Chairman and Vice-Chairmen and the overall direction provided by the SELEP Strategic Board. Under the leadership of the Managing Director, the team contributes to those areas where it has a unique role or strategic opportunity or where it can exert influence on others to the eventual benefit of the area, or part of the area. Additionally, the SELEP team is the custodian of the SELEP Assurance Framework which it delivers according to the requirements of HM Government. In turn, this is monitored by the SELEP Accountability Board.
- 3.5 The everyday approach to the team's work is to work in a fully transparent manner with all partners and external stakeholders and to act with precision – that is to avoid ambiguities in all areas of work, to add value and to operate in support of our local areas at all times.
- 3.6 Fundamentally, the SELEP team exists to ensure the delivery the Strategic Economic Plan. As this is updated during 2017, there are some ways of working which will continue to characterise the team:
 - To work increasingly across our boundaries, with neighbouring LEPs; with LEPs across the 'Greater Thames Valley' group; and with the London LEAP and the Mayor's office
 - To continue to simplify our agenda and to only focus on activities which are consistent with our shared mission to deliver economic growth in terms of jobs, homes and skills
 - To deliver our £590m Growth Deal programme and to quantify the impact made in the SELEP area (in terms of the SELEP programme and overall GVA contribution); make the strongest possible case to Government for increased investment generally and increased and continued support of SELEP specifically.

Strategic forward look

- 3.7 At the time of writing it seems that opportunities are opening up for LEPs. At a national level the Industrial Strategy provides a strong policy steer; funding opportunities such as the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund provide some focus; and the challenge of negotiating post-EU funding and post-LGF funding support for economic growth resides with LEPs the country over. A continued Conservative administration also promises strengthened authority for LEPs which is a great potential boost.
- 3.8 The new Strategic Economic Plan will harness all of the above. As previously discussed it will be written to pack an aggregate punch, will build on prior investments, align with policy and macroeconomic conditions (i.e. impact of Brexit) and will express its near and long term vision in concrete terms. We are working to a timeline which should see the Strategic Economic Plan agreed at the December 2017 board meeting.
- 3.9 Supporting all of this, there are seven discreet drivers of the team's activity for the year:
1. To heavily **influence Government's decisions** around funding
 2. To continually **counter the 'one size fits all' approach** and express the size and scale of the LEP using key facts which communicate our aggregate impact
 3. To develop **a set of key messages** to use across all literature for all SELEP board members and officers which describe the opportunities and challenges which sit across our area
 4. To take advantage of our position by extending our **sphere of influence** to the benefit of everyone across the area (e.g. using opportunities provided by wider geographic involvement in Sub-national Transport Boards, Science and Innovation Audits, etc)
 5. To **increase SELEP's influence**, and therefore the combined local influence, over the ongoing work of the Thames Estuary 2050 Commission
 6. To work locally and with other LEPs and departments nationally to help neutralise any negative impacts of **Brexit** and to help businesses maximise the opportunities that arise
 7. To start delivering a skills strategy which puts universities and colleges at its core; and works to support them to build **global centres of excellence** as defined by the Industrial Strategy.

Team roles and core areas of responsibility

Role & Incumbent	FTE	Core areas of responsibility	Group membership
Adam Bryan Managing Director	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall SELEP programme of work and its delivery - Development of strategy and the launch of the SEP - Support to Chairman and Vice-Chairmen - Ensure that all revised accountability and transparency arrangements according to the Assurance Framework are implemented - Broaden the LEP's strategic reach by extending its agenda to include tourism, innovation, energy and social enterprise - Liaison with MPs, Ministers and senior Civil Servants in BEIS, CLG and DfT - Liaison with other LEPs on shared strategic agendas and work to promote the collective South - Manage the effective operation of the LEP, maximising efficiencies, innovating and operating at the vanguard of policy - Lead the SELEP team, ensuring that the staff is empowered, supported and developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Senior Officer Group (Chair)* - Directors Group (Chair) - Kent and Medway Economic Partnership (Observer) - Greater Essex Business Board - Opportunity South Essex (Observer) - Team East Sussex** - All SELEP working groups where required - TGSG (observer) - Transport for the South East Shadow Board (observer)
Rhiannon Mort Capital Programme Manager	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsible Officer for the Accountability Board - Management of £590m LGF programme, in coordination with all local areas - Liaison with Government departments on LGF programme, including profiling, delivery and enacting flexibilities - Represent SELEP on the officer groups for Transport for the South East and undertake work in support of its development - Management of Independent Technical Evaluator – including core and additional work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SELEP Transport Officers' Group (Chair) - SELEP Programme Consideration Group (Chair) - Federated boards - Transport for the South East Transport Strategy Group

- Support Accountable Body in administration of Growing Places Fund
- Reinvestment of Growing Places Fund
- Delivery of Infrastructure and Investment Strategy aligned with SEP, supported by Strategy Manager

Georgina Button (from 8th June)
Strategy Manager
12 month FTC

1

- Support Director on Strategic Board preparation and engagement with SOG group
 - Project management of the new SEP
 - Liaison with Government on the Industrial Strategy and fit with new SEP
 - Ensure effective operation of working groups, leading/chairing meetings where possible
 - Ensure continued progress of Enterprise Zones
 - Provide overall lead role on the innovation agenda
 - Delivery of Infrastructure and Investment Strategy (supporting Rhiannon)
- South East Creative Economy Network
 - Coastal Working Group
 - Rural Working Group
 - Harlow Enterprise Zone board

Louise Aitken
Skills Lead
18 month FTC

1

- Deliver a new SELEP Skills Strategy, evidence base and consultation to cover the whole area
 - Support running of the Skills Advisory Group and resultant projects
 - Work closely with Skills Boards and training provider networks to further their agendas and to, for example, ensure maximum access to ESF funding
 - Deliver set piece events in support of education and employment such as the 7th July Skills Showcase
 - Continued monitoring and evaluation of projects which have accessed Skills Capital funding
 - Work with government departments to oversee and monitor SELEP allocation of ESF Funding
- Skills Advisory Group
 - Essex Employment and Skills Board
 - Skills East Sussex
 - Kent and Medway Skills Commission

Lead on the LEP role in the Careers Enterprise
Company network locally

Tristan Smith (from June 2017)
**Business Engagement and
Communications Manager**
*12 month Maternity Cover
for Zoe Gordon*

1

- Improve the website and increase the level of content, including changes necessitated by Assurance Framework update
- Increase communications activity through all, and new, electronic channels
- Implement new branding through all SELEP's work and ensure it is used by projects which have accessed LGF and other SELEP based funding
- Engaging business groups across the local areas
- Management of PR contract

- Local business forums within the federated areas

Amy Beckett
Programme Manager
FTC to June 2018

1

- Act as SELEP's first point of contact for all queries and handle appropriately
- Lead the implementation of the Assurance Framework across the team and federated areas
- Coordinate the launch of the tourism working group and its prospectus and project development
- Use previous experience to help ensure the smooth running of the Growth Hub Working Group
- Manage SELEP HQ and ensure that all sundry tasks are fulfilled (bookings, payments)
-

- Tourism Working Group***
- Growth Hub Working Group
- Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission (observer)

Lucy Spencer-Lawrence
Programme Manager
Back from 3rd July 2017

0.8

- Project manage work arising from the Housing and Development Working Group, supporting Housing Advisor on strategic matters and engaging with Developers Forums
- Support the Growth Hub Working Group
- Work to establish a new Social Enterprise Working Group for SELEP, building on previous work

- Growth Hub Working Group
- Housing and Development Working Group
- Establishment of Social Enterprise Working Group

<p>Lorraine George EU Funding Lead</p>	<p>0.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliver the ESIF Strategy in line with targets agreed with the sponsoring departments - Boost engagement of local areas in accessing funding prior to Brexit – e.g. EAFRD - Provide a step change in how we publicise the opportunities available in the short term - Lead a strategic piece of work around post-Brexit structural funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SELEP ESIF Sub-Committee - EU Working Group
<p>Jo Simmons ERDF Technical Assistance Facilitator</p>	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate the development of robust, eligible projects to ensure ERDF spend in our area that will deliver business support across our priority sectors - Work with sponsoring departments and federated areas to ensure that SELEP maximises the ERDF opportunity - Work with Science and Innovation Audit outputs from Innovation South and the East of England to establish a SELEP approach to this agenda - Work with the Director to support the development of an Energy Strategy for SELEP - Contribute to a network of ERDF facilitators and oversee an ERDF projects network to ensure that we understand best practice and improve accordingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SELEP ESIF Sub-Committee - EU Working Group - ERDF Projects Network (Chair) - Growth Hub Working Group - South East Creative Economy Network
<p>Suzanne Bennett (SELEP team-side work in addition to Accountable Body role) Finance Business Partner</p>	<p>0.25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the Director and Strategy Manager in leading work on the development of the SEP - Lead the Growth Hub Working Group, ensuring that it is delivering, is future-proofed and is responsive to the requirements of BEIS and local businesses – particularly in respect of sustainability - Advise the North Kent Enterprise Zone on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - U9 (Universities Group) - Growth Hub Working Group - North Kent Enterprise Zone Board

- development plans, using Accountable Body experience
- Support the activities of the U9 group

Total FTE 8.55

*all team members attend from time to time
**all team members are expected to liaise with federated boards
***currently establishing

I should add that the work of the team is supplemented significantly by the ad hoc expertise and advice of Essex County Council officers who perform the Accountable Body functions on a daily basis.

We are also supported by the consultancy work of Brian Horton as our Strategic Housing Advisor; Stuart Gibbons who offers advice around rural and EAFRD; and Andrew Metcalf and the team at Maxim PR who are procured as our support around PR and media engagement. Additionally, our contract with Steer Davies Gleave for the provision of the Independent Technical Evaluation of schemes also extends to a range of sundry items to support the smooth running of our work and the evolution of the LEP.

Working together

- 3.10 Moving forward, the SELEP team will be represented at all federated board meetings and working groups. Where appropriate, the team also represents SELEP at Enterprise Zone Board meetings and other sub-county level groups where invited. The table above is indicative of this approach.
- 3.11 In addition to this, the team manages its engagement with local areas through the SELEP **Senior Officer Group**, which maintains its long-term strategic advisory role, and the **Directors' Group**, which is an informal grouping of the Directors/lead administrators for each of the federated areas and the SELEP Managing Director. For transport specific matters, the **Transport Officers' Group**, chaired by the SELEP Capital Programme Manager, has quickly established itself as an important mechanism for connecting local areas and the LEP on that part of the agenda.

4. Next steps

- 4.1 The team are already operating to the plan as determined above. Should any timings change around the new Industrial Strategy and the revision of the SEP, the team's activities will change and adapt accordingly. Should any Board member want to see changes in the meantime, please contact Adam separately using the contact details below.

Author: Adam Bryan
Position: Managing Director
Contact details: adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk, 07884 475191
Date: 23rd May 2017