

LEP Directors present :

Ursula Lidbetter (UL – Chair), David Dexter (DD – Deputy Chair), Richard Wills (RW), Herman Kok (HK), Dr Tony Hill (TH), Andy Orrey (AO), Mark Tinsley (MT), Cllr Ray Oxby (RO), Cllr Colin Davie (CD), Chris Baron (CB).

Apologies from Directors:

Neil Corner, Ian Munnery , Cllr Liz Redfern - Cllr Neil Poole attended for NLC

Observers:

Pete Holmes, BIS

LEP

Ruth Carver (RC) and Eve Bakewell (EB) Note Taker

In Attendance for specific items:

Cathy Jones (CJ) LEP, Andy Gutherson (AG) – LCC, Halina Davies (HD) LEP, Samantha Harrison (LCC), Andrew Stevenson (University of Lincoln)

Officers:

Angela Blake (North East Lincolnshire Council)

Actions

Welcome by the Chair – Ursula Lidbetter

The Chair welcomed everyone to Grantham College, and Halina Davies informed the Board about the proposed growth deal scheme at Grantham College to deliver business, computing and technology skills.

Declarations, Minutes and Matters Arising

Ursula Lidbetter declared an interest in Boole Technology and Lincoln Transport Hub.

The Chair explained that we need to be clear on the strict policy that if a person declares an interest at the start of a meeting, then they are to leave the room should any discussions follow relating to their declared interest. All Director agreed

Directors Business

North Lincolnshire has yet to sign the Members Agreement. Cllr Neil Poole (attending on behalf of Cllr Stephenson) advising that the paperwork was with their legal team but he would send a chasing email now to try and move this along.

<p><u>Board Meeting</u></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 22nd January 2015 were agreed as drafted. Both these and the agenda are to be published on the LEP website – all present agreed they were happy for these to be published.</p> <p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>RW advising that the transport and infrastructure paper has been drafted and would be available for a future meeting. It would go to the JSU and the Leaders board for a wider discussion.</p> <p>TH confirming that funding formula for health hasn't been actioned yet although discussions have taken place. This is a complicated piece of work and will be a continuing matter arising.</p> <p>RW confirming he had met with John Hayes MP. It appears we have lost our trunk road status. He is sympathetic to the idea of strategically important roads and designating more specific routes although this is difficult to write into legislation. Chair's view is that road infrastructure has to be a big focus for us, a separate focus.</p> <p>CD reporting that there are some really positive comments surrounding LEP especially in relation to transport. Further monies from the Department of Transport are to be put into LEP.</p> <p>Discussing the importance of ports/coastal/food sectors. There will be more incentive if these areas are pushed more; this was agreed by all.</p>	<p>RC/EB</p>
<p><u>Operational Report</u></p> <p>RC updated the board on operational issues. It was agreed on page 5 it should read "Lincolnshire Growth Hub"</p> <p>The European Funding Programme has been delayed until possible June/July time.</p> <p>The ESIF Committee has been briefed and the first calls for European Programme money are starting to come in. A session on LEP strategy and sectors plans has been arranged for the next ESIF committee to bring committee members up to speed. Herman Kok and Ruth Carver, as well as officers from LCC, NL, and NEL sit on the ESIF Committee.</p> <p>There was a detailed discussion about communication of the European programme, and ensuring utilisation of existing comms channels used by the LEP and other partners. All have a role to play in this.</p> <p>RW feedback from Midlands Connect initiative. LEP view that there needs to be more focus on Food Hub and the coast. RW confirming that he is attending the Midlands Connect LEP Chairs dinner at the end of March.</p>	
<p><u>Finance Report</u></p> <p>The report was discussed in some detail and noted. There were questions around the profile</p>	

<p>of spend, particularly on the staffing costs from the Board. RC advise that two consultancy contracts are billing at the end of march, thus skewing the figures towards the year end.</p> <p>There is to be a Finance and Audit Committee meeting to be arranged for April/May – there role will be too consider the year end accounts and recommend an external auditor.</p>	RC/EB
<p><u>Growth Deal</u></p> <p>HD referring the board to paper 5 and paper 5.1. Confirming that 4 of the schemes under the Growth Deal are at contracting points. The money has been approved and we are just waiting to sign contracts. The Skegness Countryside Business Park – due diligence will be dealt with at the end of March at the Investment Board meeting (27th March).</p> <p>There is a lot of work still to be done. We need to provide the Government with documents by 31st March including a detailed assurance framework agreed with the Accountable Body.</p> <p>We have funding agreed for the first year. We are yet to get confirmed funding for 2016/17 so we can only contract for 2015/16.</p> <p>We need to produce an operating plan and think of other ways in which we can work with the Accountable Body. Information to be brought to the May Board meeting.</p>	<p>HC/RC</p> <p>RC</p>
<p><u>Enterprise and Innovation/Growth Hub update</u></p> <p>Item was presented by Andrew Stevenson from the University of Lincoln and Samantha Harrison, LCC.</p> <p>The Growth Hub is being marketed as a "one stop growth shop". In 2012 a web portal "Business Lincolnshire" was established. In 2014 £300,000 was received from BIS to further develop the web portal and an enhanced service for 2015/16. The Hub's Governance Board (chaired by Professor Mary Stuart) is currently being developed.</p> <p>The main remit is a coordinated approach so that businesses know where to go to get help and support.</p> <p>There will be provision for web chat opposed to people going out and about to meet with businesses. Businesses/individuals will be able to have an initial chat to outline what advice and assistance they need. A bespoke plan will then be drawn up for them.</p> <p>There is more information in relation to this on the website www.businesslincolnshire.com</p> <p>Marketing of the Growth Hub is to be stepped up and will be linked to social networking. CB pointing out that both the twitter and facebook feeds need attention. LCC to action</p> <p>There could be more funding put into innovation and we need to support companies to get funding in place. We need to raise awareness of innovation.</p> <p>The Growth Hubs belong to everyone. We need to develop the programme to increase ambition. Discussion over whether we need to establish an Innovation Board for LEP, do we</p>	

<p>need to bring in an outside body to help focus us on outward thinking.</p> <p>MT conscious that new businesses will have different requirements to mature, established businesses. This is where the bespoke aspect of the Hub will be crucial, however, we need to be careful to support and sustain ongoing business.</p> <p>We need to make a projection of how many new businesses we are looking at, but bearing in mind we need to be realistic that not all new businesses survive. The University maybe need to look at running a course designed to help/encourage people to get into self-employment. Collectively in SEP we have a target of 22,000 new businesses.</p> <p>TH pointing out that within the care sector there are a variety of education establishments and it is important to utilise these to increase skills.</p> <p>Chair enquiring whether this will be seen as a LEP led Growth Hub and RC confirming that it is felt that it should have a prominent LEP connection. The Chair discussing the need to have the LEP colours and branding; this is not so important to the public perception but it will be for businesses. Samantha confirmed that she will look at the colours/branding aspect of the Hub.</p> <p>The LEP need to collate information about performance against the SEP as well as the growth deal. LEP to develop a scope and what can be commissioned. How and who we target</p>	
<p><u>Financial Instruments Update</u></p> <p>Barry Egan and Anthony Barber joined the meeting at this point to go through the proposed financial instrument arrangements.</p> <p>The five LEP's across the East/South East Midlands have been working together since 2013 to consider the need and demand for access to finance products. Mazars LLP were commissioned to undertake a market assessment. Their key findings and key conclusions were outlined to the Board. The market analysis was limited and there is an additional piece of work being carried out – this is ongoing and should be available the end of march beginning of April.</p> <p>The European Commission want more use made of financial instruments. Outlining the benefits of this and the notion of legacy funds which produce money to re-invest in the region.</p> <p>RW querying how the emda legacy fund can be used. It was confirmed that once the legacy fund has been returned it is held in a holding account and can be used as it sees fit. For example North East use it to meet ongoing management funds, marketing etc. However, the European Investment Bank (who invest half of the money) have first rights to any returns, i.e. it owns 50% of the investment. These funds are designed to take a higher risk which the banks are declining. There is a 50/50 share in risk.</p> <p>Discussion followed on the technicalities of ERDF FI's. Samantha is to send out examples of how this all works together with the figures. Regeneris report to be circulated.</p>	<p>LCC</p> <p>Samantha Harrison</p>

<p><u>North East Lincolnshire – Local Plan</u></p> <p>Angela Blake referring the board to the summary document provided for the meeting. Confirming that the full document (albeit draft) is available on the website. Asking for the board to note the consultation and direct any questions/comments/feedback following the meeting to newlocalplan@nelincs.gov.uk</p> <p>RC querying whether a letter of support from LEP would be beneficial and Anglea confirming that yes it would and she would contact RC at the time of submission.</p>	
<p><u>The Role of LEP in Housing</u></p> <p>The chair thanked Cathy Jones, Herman Kok and Andy Orrey for all their hard work on the Housing agenda in Greater Lincolnshire. AO confirming that he met with HCA recently; they recognise that GLLEP is at the top of the tree in relation to housing.</p> <p>The paper focussed on the issues, and in particular the role that the lep could have in housing. Areas such as key workers and elderly housing provision were mooted as suggested areas of focus. After much discussion it was felt that we need the right ingredients to deliver a sector based approach .</p> <p>Subsidised housing is relatively cheap to provide and would support growth in other sectors. There are significant issues in relation to the coastal area. The Government needs to address the issue of us being allowed to build social housing in flood zones but we are not able to market housing in these areas. Various key sectors identified for growth; we need an action plan for delivery of housing. Cathy is to develop proposals in relation to this.</p> <p>Asking the board to consider what the main priorities are in relation to housing. Aware this will be different in different parts of the patch.</p> <p>Discussion in relation to LEP's priorities and what helps fill our agenda. Housing affects so many different aspects of living. Housing, particularly whilst it is being built is good for the economy (construction pound equates to £2.84).</p> <p>The HCA have indicated that they would be happy to provide a specific report to LEP.</p> <p>Cathy is to take forward the recommendation on page 3, endorsed by the Chair. A Task and Finish Group will be set up. This will address many issues but we need direction on how to organise ourselves in relation to the housing agenda.</p>	<p>Cathy Jones</p> <p>Cathy Jones to progress</p> <p>Cathy Jones</p>
<p><u>Peer Review – Open for Growth</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed Andy Gutherson to the meeting. Commenting that the Peer Review is a good piece of work; the significant issue appears to be that we need to promote ourselves more.</p> <p>The key recommendations are set out on pages 11-13 and we need to look at how to endorse these.</p>	

<p>R1, R2, R3 to be dealt with by working groups and brought back to the board in May</p> <p>R4, R5, R6 to be raised and debated at the JSU/Leaders Board.</p> <p>R7-R11 to be brought back to the July board for discussions</p> <p>All commented that there was a lot of positivity in the report; perhaps we need to focus on the recommendations that we don't agree with. Ready for step-change/re-think and a need to look at how we structure ourselves.</p>	<p>AG</p> <p>AG – JSU/Leaders AG</p>
<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>There was a discussion in relation to the emerging policy on fewer LEPs in the future; we need to emphasise that one solution doesn't fit all. There will no doubt be a debate post May elections on how we move forward. Clarity is needed in relation to the merging of LEPs. PH advising that this is not clear at the present time.</p> <p>Some directors were concerned that reducing the number of LEPs would be disastrous and we need to make this view heard loud and clear. Some of the bigger LEPs are in disarray. The chair invited NE and NEL to comment. Both felt the synergy and economic benefit of being into 2 leps.</p> <p>Secretariat asked to develop a paper on emerging views from the political manifestos. And case studies from other areas on devolution for a discussion at the next LEP Board on 12th May,</p> <p>The Chair is meeting with other LEP Chairs on the 25th March; RC to prepare a brief setting out our argument to remain as GLLEP and not reduce the number of LEPs round the country.</p> <p>RC will prepare letters to the future BIS Minister giving views on the status quo in terms of LEP Geography. PH will feed back to Whitehall.</p>	<p>Secretariat</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
<p><u>The meeting was closed</u></p>	