
**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE**

HELD ON 3 SEPTEMBER 2014 AT 5.30 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL OFFICES, WEELEY

Present: Councillors D Miles (Chairman), M Patten (Vice-Chairman), C Amos, J Hawkins, T Howard, A Pugh and I Tracey

Also Present: Councillors M Page (Leader of the Council and Regeneration, Inward Investment and Asset Management Portfolio Holder), N W Turner (Deputy Leader of the Council and Environment and Coast Protection Portfolio Holder) and R J Bucke

In Attendance: Chief Executive (Ian Davidson), Corporate Director (Public Experience) (June Clare), Democratic Services Manager (Colin Sweeney), Inward Investment and Business Manager (Sally Looker), Regeneration Manager (Tom Gardiner) and Democratic Services Officer (Janey Nice)

15. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting David Godfrey, Director of the South-East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) and Lorraine George, the EU Funding Lead seconded to SELEP.

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor C Callender.

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

18. SOUTH EAST LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

David Godfrey advised the Committee that Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) had been formed by Central Government and were non-political. The SELEP, he said, comprised of Essex, Kent and East Sussex, which equated in size, to a country the size of Belgium. Mr Godfrey added that the purpose of the LEP was "to provide clear vision and strategic leadership to drive sustainable private sector-led growth and job creation" with job creation and housing as key objectives.

Mr Godfrey added that the LEP had been awarded £442 million in Single Local Growth Fund resources on the back of its Growth Deal and Strategic Economic Plan. He added that the funding would need to be used responsibly in key areas such as transport, skills, and housing and against agreed priorities.

Mr Godfrey and Ms George then delivered a presentation, which is attached as Appendix A to these minutes.

Mr Godfrey said that the delivery review would need to embed the federal model and the LEP had the capacity to deliver this, however, it would have to prove to the Government it could deliver. Mr Godfrey added that the Growth Deal (Round 2) for 2016/17 would be due in March 2015 and the SELEP was waiting to see how much money was to be allocated.

He went on to show a chart which gave the structure of the SELEP: Federal Structure, Governance and Accountability and then gave the details of the various personnel working under the Kent and Medway Economic Partnership, Team East Sussex, Greater Essex

Business Board and the Thames Gateway Strategic Group, who all worked under the SELEP Board. He added that the Secretariat was very small, which was supported to progress work or coordinate activity with Board Members, Federated Boards' Senior Officer Group and work stream leads.

The Chairman thanked David Godfrey and Lorraine George for their presentations and invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

The Chief Executive (Ian Davidson) started by saying that the funding was all about growth and a key area which had been targeted had been the A.120, being a growth corridor, as this linked Stanstead Airport with the Port of Harwich. He said that, if the corridor was not there, there would not be such a link available to customers. He added that one particular issue was not having enough good quality schemes coming forward and gave examples of where such funding could be used.

Councillors Hawkins, Howard and Patten asked the following questions:

- Were schemes ready to go?
- Will all or part of the money be used?
- Were projects starting from scratch?
- How do the SELEP manage the delivery of the projects?
- How was the process actually managed?
- While local Councils can bid, can businesses apply for smaller amounts?
- How was the process promoted and made known to people?
- Were checks and balances in place to encourage a wider depth of applications?
- What key performance indicators needed to be in place (both qualitative and quantitative)?
- Where would Tending be in a year's time?

In addition to questions, Members raised concerns and issues in respect of:

- Governance - agreeing and monitoring of projects;
- The extremely complex process to go through to secure funding;
- The apparent lack of people in Tending who knew about the process of bidding;
- The level of support from SELEP with a very small secretariat;
- Tending (and surrounding areas) Transport system, especially trains and train services, which were particularly poor in Tending;
- Tending could lose out to bigger local authorities such as Chelmsford, Colchester and Hastings and how the money would be allocated; and
- The A.120 having the worse safety record in this part of England

In response to some of the questions put, Mr Godfrey said that the majority of money received tended to be spent on transport, however, there were a number of different initiatives coming from Government, which included broadband provision in affected areas. In addition, he said that where there were a number of schemes, some of these would not progress or would take place later after being reprioritised.

In response to a question as to how applications for funding should be received, the Leader of the Council commented that any applications for funding should go through the Council's Regeneration Team as it would be able to assist with the application process.

In response to concerns raised by the Chairman in respect of transport issues across the District, and, in particular, the train service from Tending as it posed problems for commuters, Mr Godfrey said that the SELEP could have a role in the refranchising process and could make a point to Network Rail about reinvestment.

The Chairman thanked Mr David Godfrey and Ms Lorraine George for attending and for their interesting and informative presentation.

19. REGENERATION AND THE LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

The Council's Regeneration Manager, Tom Gardiner, referred to his attendance at the meeting of the Committee, held on 23 June 2014, and provided an update as to progress since that time. In doing so, Mr Gardiner made reference to the following:

- The membership of the SELEP Board had been reduced from 44 members to 27 as part of a streamlining exercise. Mr Gardiner articulated the view that the SELEP Board would not be receptive to any adjustment to its membership at this time and that efforts to secure a seat at the Board could be counter-productive;
- Mr Gardiner advised members that the Council's interests were represented by Councillor Kevin Bentley from Essex County Council, Councillor Graham Butland from Braintree District Council, and George Kieffer, Chairman of the Haven Gateway Partnership and Vice-Chairman of the SE LEP; 70% of the SE LEP's Growth Deal funding were to be allocated against transport schemes;
- The Council's Regeneration, Inward Investment and Growth Team would be expanding following the creation of three new posts;
- Mr Gardiner confirmed that the Council was actively engaged with the SE LEP Board and its Secretariat and had contributed to the development of its Growth Deal and Strategic Economic Plan. Mr Gardiner also reminded members that Tendring led and co-ordinated the work of the SE LEP Coastal Communities Group and on 1 July 2014 had participated in a South East Coastal MPs Briefing at Westminster at which, the Group discussed issues impacting upon the South East LEP's Coastal Communities, including housing; transport; tourism and offshore energy;
- A significant amount of work was being progressed by the Coastal Communities Group and that the SE LEP had recently announced its intention to prepare a strategy for the areas coastal strip;
- On 22 September 2014, the SE CORE partners (SELEP, Kent and Essex) were due to meet to discuss the governance, management, administrative arrangements and financial requirements of the newly configured SE CORE; and
- At the Senior Managers' Forum, held on this day (3 September 2014), Mr Godfrey and Ms George had attended to update managers on the role and investment priorities of the SE LEP.

During discussion, the following questions and comments were raised:

- How this Council's economic targets would fit in;
- TDC had played a key role in the LEP;
- Essex County Council was a lead partner for Essex with the Haven Gateway Partnership being a major player;
- TDC, while being a small District Council more than punched above its weight;
- European social funding was a key source and literature needed to be put together and shared amongst businesses what opportunities were available;
- As the business advisor would be focusing on small businesses, other than Harwich, where would opportunities come from?
- What role would a growth in the levels of housing play in the regeneration of Tendring District?

In response to some of the questions and comments put, the Leader of the Council said that, if there was housing growth in the District, then this would mean more people coming here, spending money and creating jobs and he gave an example where this had happened in

Corby. Housing was a major driver for regeneration and the Chief Executive said there was a need for 12,000 houses to be built and if more housing was built there would need to be a supporting infrastructure in place.

The Chief Executive further added that £36 million was being spent on a coastal defence scheme and that this - and the regeneration planned for Jaywick - would create links for other funding and would hopefully provide a basis for other significant schemes to be introduced to the district.

The Leader of the Council added that he was a nominated substitute member on the SELEP Board and was Chairman of the South East LEP Coastal Communities Group (one of a number of advisory groups established by the Board) and was working closely with Essex County Council to make sure that the two Councils worked together on partnership funding matters. He added that the Council needed to be ready with shovel-ready schemes in order that these could be put together and be ready at the appropriate time, when funding became available. In conclusion, Councillor Page said that he had supported the 12,000 extra homes housing project together with the likely 5,000 jobs this would attract to the District.

The Chairman said she was not convinced the projected schemes were right for the District, and that a feasibility study was needed to identify what was needed within the District by way of regeneration, such as good quality hotels and major conference facilities to draw business in. She reiterated that the roads in the District were dangerous.

The Chief Executive agreed that the LEP funding was all about infrastructure opportunities, with 70% of funding being spent on transport improvement, and there was a need to look at different schemes and how to access LEP money. He added that with all such schemes, different parts of the District would welcome it but others would not.

Further discussions highlighted the need for the appropriate infrastructure to be in place and with an emphasis on transport and the associated costs of travelling. It was further added that another major aspect was the coast as there was not land all around the District to pull people in and there was a need to find opportunities to make the coast a draw, with offshore renewable energy. It was commented that monies for the expansion of Felixstowe port had come from Europe however the Harwich International Port did not have the capacity to expand.

The Committee thanked the Officers for all of the hard work that had been done in respect of regenerating the Tendring District.

Accordingly, it was **RECOMMENDED TO CABINET** that:

1. In terms of how the Council measured growth, key performance indicators that needed to be in place (both qualitative and quantitative) be identified and what measurements would be used to show what growth had occurred;
2. The SELEP be invited back to the CLAP Committee in 12 months' time to report on the progress, both planned and achieved by Tendring District Council in terms of the regeneration and growth, including LEP funding;
3. Cabinet inform the Committee of its short-listed priorities for seeking funding from European budgets, what these priorities were and details of any consultations which had occurred with partners and Ward Councillors; and
4. Cabinet advises the Committee of any shovel-ready projects in waiting and what these were.

19. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

There were none at this time.

The meeting was declared closed at 7.38 p.m.

Chairman