

<p><b><u>In attendance:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Board Members:</u></b> Ursula Lidbetter (UL); Cllr Colin Davie (CllrD); Cllr Rob Waltham (CllrW); Cllr Ray Oxby (CllrO); Herman Kok (HK); Chris Baron (CB)</p> <p><b><u>Board Support:</u></b> Pete Holmes –Cities &amp; Local Growth Team (PH), Ruth Carver - LEP (RC), Linsey Hill-Pritchard – Accountable Body (LHP), Cathy Jones – Item 3 (CJ), Halina Davies – Items 2, 4, 6 and 7 (HD)</p> <p><b><u>Observers:</u></b> Vicky Wheelwright (BIS Local), Scott Adcock (Cities and Local Growth Unit), Chris Duffill (North East Lincs Council)</p> <p><b><u>Apologies:</u></b> Cllr Redfern ; Richard Wills; Mark Tinsley</p>	<p><b>Actions</b></p>
<p><b><u>Welcome by the Chair – Ursula Lidbetter</u></b> The Chair welcomed everyone in attendance. It was noted that the Board could be regarded as quorate for all matters.</p> <p><b><u>Declarations</u></b> UL declared an interest in Boole Technology Centre, Lincoln Transport Hub and Meadow Way, Old Leake. CllrW declared an interest in Normanby Enterprise Park HK declared an interest in two of the Unlocking Rural Housing Programme schemes.</p> <p><b><u>Minutes</u></b> Minutes of the last meeting were agreed as drafted and can be published on the website.</p> <p><b><u>Matters Arising</u></b> <b><u>Apprenticeship Levy</u></b> Following on from discussions at the last Investment Board, there was a consensus that a letter to government from the LEP regarding the apprenticeship levy, requesting that this money is used /influenced locally, does not need to be written. The LEP may still want to try and influence the larger businesses that pay this Levy to take on Apprentices. There will be no 'surplus' money to be invested; the Levy is being used to fund Apprenticeship training as a whole.</p>	<p><b>LEP Secretariat</b></p>
<p><b><u>Normanby Enterprise Park, Scunthorpe – In Principle Decision</u></b> The Tata Steel redundancies have resulted in local partners creatively rethinking priorities in and around the Scunthorpe area. The LEP Board discussed and approved proposals for the Investment Board to consider projects at the Normanby Enterprise Park and north of the Lincolnshire Lakes site in place of the originally proposed Berkeley Circle scheme. This decision was taken due to the exceptional circumstances in Scunthorpe and the need to</p>	

<p>enable significant job creation in the short to medium term. The Tata Steel Task force recently reviewed independent evidence of demand for business expansion and business premises at the locations concerned. Investment Board considered the summary paper explaining the two potential replacement projects and agreed that full due diligence appraisal should be carried out on both. They will be presented to the 24 March Investment Board for detailed discussion and a formal decision.</p>	<p>HD to ensure the appraisal deadlines are achieved</p>
<p><b><u>Growth Deal Programme Update</u></b></p> <p>A paper was circulated providing full updates on individual schemes. CllrO said that he was pleased to see from the report the level of progression across the programme.</p> <p>HD stated that on the 22<sup>nd</sup> December following on from the Government's Spending Review, indicative growth deal funding profiles for 2016/2017 to 2020/21 were confirmed to Greater Lincolnshire LEP's Accountable Body. Core funding of £250k to the LEP for 2016/17 has also been confirmed.</p> <p>HD explained that the Annual Conversation with BIS had taken place on 30 November 2015 and that the review process had covered programme delivery, freedoms and flexibilities, Growth Hub, devolution and LEP overlaps. PH said that it had been a very constructive meeting and the notes taken are to be made official and shared in the near future. A letter confirming the outcomes is due to be sent at the beginning of April.</p> <p>North Lincolnshire Council have been successful in securing £8m from the first round of the Growth and Housing Fund towards key infrastructure for the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme, though a formal announcement is yet to be made by Highways England.</p> <p>PH asked how Skegness Countryside Business Park was progressing. HD said that the agreement was in the process of being signed and returned to the Legal Department.</p>	
<p>CllrD left the meeting</p>	
<p><b><u>Unlocking Rural Housing Programme (URHP) - Decision</u></b></p> <p>CJ explained that £965k remains available to allocate to schemes within the Unlocking Rural Housing Programme, using the sequential approach agreed by the July 2015 Investment Board.</p> <p>At the November 2015 Investment Board meeting, members agreed support in principle for the following schemes to go to full application. Members requested that careful consideration of flooding be given for these schemes and this is covered in the Due Diligence Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodthorpe Avenue/Toot Lane (Waterloo Housing Group)</li> <li>• Church Lane, Old Leake (Waterloo Housing Group)</li> <li>• Riverside (Longhurst Group on behalf of Boston Mayflower)</li> <li>• Land off Meadow Lane, Old Leake (Longhurst Group on behalf of Boston Mayflower)</li> </ul> <p>As the HCA's Affordable Housing Programme has now closed to new schemes, it has been confirmed that any bids submitted prior to the closure, have been approved. The bidders for the 4 URHP schemes which include HCA match funding have confirmed that this is the case.</p>	



<p>Due Diligence establishes that the identified approved mechanism for funding available to GLLEP and appropriate for schemes of this nature is the operation of the Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI).</p> <p>Flood Risk – all 4 sites are in EA Flood Zone (High Probability), which denotes that land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of river flooding, or a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of flooding from the sea in any year. The Due Diligence appraisal has particularly scrutinised this aspect of the proposals and each report summarises findings in some detail. The schemes incorporate all possible additional measures to enable development and mitigate the flood risk. Thomas Listers have confirmed that from discussion with the applicants, they are not aware of any additional flood risk mitigation works that could be or need to be incorporated within these projects.</p> <p>A query was raised regarding flood mitigation works once the Boston Barrier Risk Model has been finalised. In the absence of a formal review of impact of the barrier by the Environment Agency (EA) the schemes being proposed in Old Leake have had to be appraised based on current recommendations. The Board did however agree the need for a reassessment of risk for future schemes in Boston in light of the anticipated benefits of the Boston Barrier.</p> <p>Each scheme was considered in turn.</p> <p>The Board approved the schemes as set out in each Due Diligence Assessment subject to contract, UL left the room whilst the discussion took place regarding the scheme at Meadow Way, Old Leake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodthorpe Avenue/Toot Lane, Boston – maximum funding of £320k</li> <li>• Church Lane, Old Leake – maximum funding of £158k</li> <li>• Riverside, Boston – maximum funding of £150k</li> <li>• Land of Meadow Way, Old Leake – maximum funding of £300k.</li> </ul>	<p>CJ to progress contractual agreements accordingly</p>
<p><b><u>Commercial Feasibility Grant Pot</u></b></p> <p>Investment Board members approved to convert the allocation of £300k loan funding for feasibility projects to a challenge grant pot at the last meeting.</p> <p>Discussion took place regarding the criteria of this grant pot which was subsequently agreed. The Challenge Fund is to be launched to the private and public sector, demonstrating clearly why they should apply. The application form was discussed and approved.</p> <p>CllrO said this showed flexibility and support for key sectors.</p> <p>CD asked how developed a project needs to be in order to be classed as eligible. RC clarified funding will only be considered for schemes which have already progressed beyond the initial concept, scoping and selection phase. The feasibility stage should focus on the more detailed and technical aspects of delivery, including surveys, plans, legal issues and business and financial planning.</p> <p>PH said that it should be pointed out that if an application is submitted, it does not infer that it would be prioritised over other pipeline projects and that further investment would only be provided if the project is worthwhile. The challenge grant pot will not ensure any</p>	

<p>preferential treatment.</p> <p>It is proposed that the grant funding will be awarded under the De Minimus Regulation. Applicants will therefore be required to demonstrate that the grant requested will not result in the company having received more than €200k in state support over a 3 year rolling period.</p>	
<p><b><u>Social Value Act 2012</u></b></p> <p>A paper was presented by HD to inform Board members of the opportunities the Social Value Act 2012 can create for Greater Lincolnshire and to highlight what the LEP can do to support the key aims and objectives of the Act.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised initially in terms of how procurement related restrictions might cause greater complexity/costs for businesses; however businesses will decide for themselves whether social value warrants additional time and investment and ultimately if it provides favourable longer term outcomes.</p> <p>Post discussion it was agreed that Local Authorities already have procedures in place that consider social value i.e. looking at specific procurement measures, encouragement of local employment. Using communication tools and networks at its disposal, there is an opportunity for the LEP to promote the Act to the private sector and show how social value can help support smaller businesses/help develop social enterprises.</p> <p>CllrW suggested that a Statement of Expectation could be issued, giving examples.</p>	<p>HD/RC to look at existing authority measures, website links and wider communication opportunities</p> <p>Produce a Statement of Expectation</p>
<p><b><u>Lincoln Transport Hub Revised Scheme – For Information</u></b></p> <p>UL left the meeting after declaring an interest.</p> <p>HD explained that the complexity and cost of delivering the dual-purpose footbridge element of the Lincoln Transport Hub scheme to Networks Rails specifications would require substantial additional funding. The difficulties in obtaining this funding would add time and additional cost to all components of the scheme, and jeopardise the likelihood of any of the scheme being delivered at all. Stakeholders therefore have developed alternative plans for delivering the scheme, identifying a two-phase approach, with the footbridge and Tentercroft Street area improvements being delivered as Phase 2 and all the other components in Phase 1. A revised planning application is to be submitted on 21 March seeking approval by May, subject to ministerial approval. DFT appraisal of the scheme will now be completed in late spring/summer.</p> <p>A plan depicting the proposed changes to the scheme was shown to the Board. Board members were asked to note the changes and revised programme details. All expressed their awareness of the strategic importance of this scheme for Greater Lincolnshire and endorsed the revised project approach.</p>	
<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>24 March 2016</p>	