

## Annex B: Geography proposal response template

**LEP Name:** South East

Please outline the LEP's plans to address the geography recommendations below, noting the guidance provided by the Unit. In your response, you should outline any key milestones, risks and issues.

Proposals should be submitted to [LEPpolicy@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:LEPpolicy@communities.gsi.gov.uk) **no later than 28 September 2018**, copying in your Area Lead.

## Geography

### Recommendation:

As Local Enterprise Partnerships are central to future economic growth, Government will ask Local Enterprise Partnership Chairs and local stakeholders to come forward with considered **proposals by the end of September on geographies which best reflect real functional economic areas, remove overlaps and, where appropriate, propose wider changes such as mergers.** ...These proposals should be submitted by 28 September 2018. Government will respond to these proposals in the autumn and future capacity funding will be contingent on successfully achieving this.

### Information required in geography proposal:

All LEPs should outline their response to the Government's recommendations on geography no later than **28 September 2018.**

Those LEPs proposing geography changes should provide detail of the proposed changes. In your response you should outline why these changes would be suitable for your local area. These proposals should include timescales for the transition to different geographies. LEPs should work with the LEP Network and neighbouring LEPs to ensure a shared understanding of the geography changes being proposed exists.

For LEPs who are proposing no changes you should respond briefly outlining why no change is required. For LEPs in MCA areas, these proposals should consider the current relationship between the MCA and LEP geographies. All LEPs should aim to have revised geographies (if required), by **spring 2020.**

## LEP response

Please outline the LEP's response to the recommendation. The response should consider the information required, outlined above:

The South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) proposes NO CHANGE to its current geographical borders, which encompass the local authority areas of Essex County Council, Thurrock Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Medway Council, Kent County Council and East Sussex County Council.

There are currently two areas of overlap within the SELEP geography. Uttlesford District Council is also within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CA area and Lewes District Council is also within the Coast to Capital LEP. SELEP's Strategic Board and partners agree that these two areas should become the sole responsibility of SELEP in terms of the LEP agenda and the future operation of UK SPF.

It is our clear understanding that **Uttlesford DC**, previously shared with Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough (GCGP) LEP, will default to Essex and therefore SELEP, as the former LEP in Cambridge will be aligning to the MCA area as per the recommendation in the LEP Review. Local conversations support this assertion.

In respect of the **Lewes DC** area, SELEP Strategic Board strongly supports the inclusion of the area within our border and encourages Government to respect the county boundaries. SELEP will continue to support the initiatives for growth that Coast to Capital LEP has so ably put into place over the last eight years, including the same level of support for the Newhaven Enterprise Zone. The previous arrangement has, in particular, served Newhaven well, with both SELEP and Coast to Capital having invested funding into the area. Newhaven is a key target for improving life outcomes, employment opportunities and wider regeneration which supports not only the town but surrounding communities. This was recognised by the Enterprise Zone designation for Newhaven – which has acted as a further catalyst for wider regeneration projects and additional investment.

SELEP are clear that in seeking to remove geographical overlaps and given the needs in Newhaven particularly around skills and infrastructure, it should remain wholly in SELEP. The review makes reference to respecting county boundaries, which is also pertinent here, as is the need for strong alignment and partnership between the Local Transport Authority, Local Education Authority and the recently merged East Sussex College Group.

While Coast to Capital LEP is seeking to retain Lewes within its area, our working relationship with Coast to Capital LEP, underpinned by joint work across a range of areas, is very positive. To that end, both LEPs are committed to working constructively with Government and with



each other whatever the outcome of resolving the overlap.

### **Key milestones**

Please indicate any key milestones the LEP is required to meet to address the above recommendation:

Following agreement by Government, SELEP will need to agree a cut over for responsibilities and projects that are currently in flight in the overlap areas but led by the Cambridgeshire Peterborough CA and Coast 2 Capital LEP. These will be bi-lateral agreements made between SELEP and each of the other two LEPs that work best for the projects and responsibilities in each area. Transfer of responsibilities will be complete by 31 March 2020.

### **Key risks and/or issues**

Please indicate any risks or issues that may prevent the LEP meeting the recommendation above. The LEP should also outline how it is mitigating these risks.

The main risk that would prevent achieving the approach set out by SELEP would be a lack of a decisive response on the overlap issue, in particular if there is no resolution of border between SELEP and Coast to Capital LEP. SELEP will continue its dialogue with Coast to Capital LEP and push to expedite issues locally wherever possible, but ultimately Government will need to make a final decision.