

Minutes

Local Growth Strategy Group Meeting

18th April 2016 – 11:00 -13:00

Meeting rooms 0.1a and 0.1b, Pathfinder House, Huntingdonshire DC

In attendance Nigel McCurdy (NM) - HDC (Chair)
 Adrian Cannard (AC) – GCGP
 Alex Francis (AF) - GCGP
 Sue Bedlow (SB) - HDC
 Gary Garford (GG) - Fenland
 Darren Hill (DH) - ECDC
 Steve Bowyer (SBo)- Peterborough
 Andrew Limb (AL)- City
 Jo Mills (JM)- SCDC
 Andrea Mayley -

Apologies Paul Phillipson (PP) - Rutland
 Lynsi-Hayward Smith (LHS)- CCC
 Jeremy Smith (JS) - CCC
 James Talbot (JT) – West Suffolk
 Ostap Paparega (OP) - Kings Lynn & West Norfolk BC
 Simon Machen (SM) – Peterborough

Standing agenda items	1	Welcome
	2	Minutes and matters arising Minutes accepted
Main business of Meeting	3	<p>Agree amended TOR for the group & paper for PSB</p> <p>The group noted that the TOR needed to be amended to include South Kesteven Council and Cambridge City Deal as members and that under point 10 'decision making' amendments were required to clarify that in the event of dispute/lack of resolution referrals should be made to both the Leaders Board and the PSBs but that this would be exception rather than rule.</p> <p>The group discussed how the TOR should be ratified in Local Authorities (LAs) not covered by the Cambridge PSB (CPSB) and it was determined that:</p> <p>Action: members of this group from LAs not represented by the CPSB should take responsibility for progressing the ratification of the TOR through</p>

	<p>their respective and appropriate governance procedures.</p> <p>Action: AC to get contact for South Kesteven to join the group</p> <p>Discussion of the PSB paper concluded that it should be refreshed to make reference to the parallel governance ratification process in non-CPSB areas. Also suggested that the paper needed to be clearer on how this LGSG influences the Leaders and CEO groups.</p> <p>Action: NM to finalise draft of paper to go to CPSB with the ToR</p> <p>As NM is not available to take the papers to CPSB on 13th May it was resolved that someone else should do this in his stead rather than wait until the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: NM to ask SM to take CPSB report and ToR to 13th May meeting</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Presentation of the Economic Assessment commissioned by the LEP</p> <p>The group noted that the LEP are working with Grant Thornton (GT) who are using their place analytics tool to conduct an economic assessment that would look at trends over last 10 years, be reconciled to the forecasting model and reference other data available such as that from the SFA. The assessment will plug a recognised gap in data gathering and analysis would be broken down by district. Whilst the assessment is not expected to suggest any significant change in strategic direction, it will provide a useful more robust evidence base for future funding bids such as the Local Growth Deal.</p> <p>AC informed the group that the report will be part of a review to go to the LEP board in June. He also stated that whilst there was no requirement to produce a new economic assessment for Govt. it will inform the timetable that we currently have. One the few anticipated changes is a new emphasis on productivity given new that this is a national focus/priority but it is anticipated that the basic strategy of 'stretching the Cambridge benefit and the regeneration of Peterborough' would remain the same.</p> <p>The report, due in 7-10 days.</p> <p>Action: AC to circulate GT report to this group once completed</p> <p>AC informed the group that the LEP have subscribed to the GT Place making analytic tool and are working with them to make best use of this.</p> <p>At the request of a group member AC agree to:</p> <p>Action: AC to look into terms of licence and any opportunity for joint commissioning of access to the data.</p>

	<p>SBo suggested that the LEP should ask GT to challenge whether the LEP's target sectors are the right ones.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>The LEPs evidence based strategic Vision –</p> <p>AC informed the group that there was no pressure coming from the board to change the strategy but that this will be informed by the data coming forward from GT. Main change anticipated is around the focus on housing delivery and so the LEP will be looking for a focus on projects that bring housing delivery. Productivity emphasis is coming from directors rather than board.</p> <p>AC informed the group that he is not aware of any lobbying to increase the LEPs geographic area further, notwithstanding South Kesteven's inclusion.</p> <p>Members of the group questioned whether the key themes from previous meetings of this group had been reported back to Mark/Board?</p> <p>JM gave her opinion that the LEP should clarify the key messages for the LEP area so that this could be an agreed vision. This would lift the discussion at the higher level and set a framework to which the LAs can all sign up. It was suggested that the lack of a singular voice was not as big an issue as the LEP perceives it to be.</p> <p>GG noted that the north/south divide would make this difficult.</p> <p>It was suggested that perhaps the work that was done for the devolution deal could be lifted into the LEPs vision.</p> <p>Various members re-iterated the need for the LEP to articulate a clear vision. The point was made that a single vision could still allow for different measures in different areas.</p> <p>S Bo - expressed the need for structure in the discussion and to differentiate between Vision, Strategy, Tactics and Interventions.</p> <p>AC – reminded the group that the LEPs vision is articulated as part of their Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), which also sets the strategy. He noted that it doesn't, however, include the sector approach that has since been endorsed by the board. He stated that the LEP could just carry on with this bidding under this framework but that it doesn't help when it comes to the measurement criteria.</p> <p>GG – emphasised that whilst he recognised the risk that too generic a vision would not tick boxes with Govt., the 'two yolk'</p>

	<p>(Cambridge/Peterborough) approach has not been well received and alienates areas beyond the two cities.</p> <p>AC – Stated that in his view the common ground across the GCGP area is the need to focus on uplifting productivity whilst improving access to homes and work. The potential for growth in the area should not be restrained, nor should there be such pockets of deprivation given the overall prosperity of the region. Pursuit of cohesive growth in short.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Local Growth Deal 3:</p> <p>The group was informed that EoI on the amended pro-forma circulated to the group in advance of this meeting need to be submitted to the LEP by 13th May and would come to this group on 31st May. It was agreed to displace the work programme to accommodate this.</p> <p>Differing views were expressed in terms of how far submissions should be moving away from or including new projects not previously submitted.</p> <p>AC- informed of the need to make a distinction between feasibilities and deliverable schemes. He said that a separate list of feasibility projects to submit to Govt was being considered. On Large local transport schemes – it is permissible to bid for scheme development.</p> <p>Action: AF to get in contact with each member to discuss priorities for the Growth Deal bidding</p> <p>Action: AF to will look at SEP2 projects list and identify which of these are ready to go forward</p> <p>The group noted the need to focus on numbers of jobs houses as well as the challenge of weighting appropriately different project areas with differing viability. The LEP needs its own approach to this and then anticipate how the Govt will do the same thing.</p> <p>AC – informed the group that his best estimate of an award for GCGP is approx. £35m. He also stated that the LEP intended to bid again for the Agritech project and for the Growing Places Fund. He also expressed a potential focus on construction skills – capital funding because of 16+ review complexities and the need to think about how to engage with other LEPs.</p> <p>The group noted that funding from this round would be available in FY18/19 - 20/21 but that there were some flexibilities around use of match funding first.</p> <p>The group raised the question as to whether the LEPs not agreeing to the devolution deal might limit chances of success in this round of bidding.</p>

		[Response under following agenda item]
Standing agenda items	7	<p>LEP Board agenda and outputs</p> <p>Devolution – not clear the outcomes so not a reason to hold back on submissions will still be accepted. It was suggested that BIS should be invited to the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: AF to extend the invitation</p> <p>Next board meeting on 26th April solely for Devolution discussion.</p> <p>AC – clarified that the LEP didn't sign and the Cambridgeshire Leaders now seem to be pulling away. The LEP are not aware of/involved in on-going discussions. Their position is that the geography was wrong and the amount on offer from Govt insufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - progress on LGDF projects (AC): <p>Transport – some progress but slower than thought. Delays due in main to back and forth between DfT and Cambs analysts. No decision yet on the release of funding, next exchange of information due to take place at the end of the week.</p> <p>Skills funding for iMET has been approved.</p> <p>Argitech scheme has used up RGF and is moving into growth deal money now.</p> <p>Growing places fund is back loaded but there are opportunities for some projects. Peterborough Fletton keys is going ahead without LEP.</p> <p>Fenland projects have been slow to pick up.</p> <p>Haverhill still stalled</p> <p>Biomed Cambridge coming forward</p> <p>TWI – building at Grantapark</p> <p>Overall in terms of delivery, the record is not in a bad position.</p>
	8	<p>Agree key messages to be reported</p> <p>The Group would like to see a clear articulation of the LEPs vision: a single voice advocating cohesive growth across the area: productivity uplift with improved access to homes and jobs</p> <p>Focus for the coming weeks would be on prep for 13th May EoI and all members were urged to get in touch with AF.</p>
	9	<p>AOB</p>

	<p>It was suggested that discussion of European funding should be added to the work programme</p> <p>Members of the group requested of the LEP greater visibility of calls for funding applications.</p>
10	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>As the next meeting date scheduled falls in school holiday it was decided to attempt to bring it forward to the preceding week.</p> <p>[Post meeting a new date for the next meeting was set as 26th May 10-12pm Pathfinder House.]</p>