

SELEP Strategic Board Meeting – 22nd March 2019

Present	Company	Representing
Chris Brodie	Chair	
Adam Bryan	Managing Director	
Ana Christie	Sussex Chamber of Commerce	East Sussex - Business
Angela O'Donoghue	South Essex College, Skills Advisory Group - Chair	Further Education
Clive Soper	Federation of Small Businesses	East Sussex – Business
Cllr Chris Whitbread	Epping Forest District Council	Essex – Local Authority
Cllr David Tutt	Eastbourne Borough Council	East Sussex – Local Authority
Cllr Graham Butland	Braintree District Council	Essex – Local Authority
Cllr John Lamb	Southend on Sea Borough Council	South Essex – Local Authority
Cllr Kevin Bentley	Essex County Council	Essex – Local Authority
Cllr Paul Carter	Kent County Council	Kent – Local Authority
Cllr Peter Chowney	Hastings Borough Council	East Sussex – Local Authority
Cllr Rob Gledhill	Thurrock Council, OSE	South Essex – Local Authority
Cllr Rodney Chambers	Medway Council	Kent – Local Authority
Cllr Rupert Simmons	East Sussex County Council	East Sussex – Local Authority
Colette Bailey	Metal	South Essex – Business
David Burch	Essex Business Board	Essex – Business
David Rayner	Birkett Long	Essex – Business
Douglas Horner	KMEP Business Member	Kent – Business
Geoff Miles	Vice Chairman for Kent & Medway	Kent- Business
George Kieffer	Vice Chairman for Essex and South Essex	Essex – Business
Graham Peters	Vice Chairman for East Sussex	East Sussex – Business
Jo James	Kent Invicta Chamber	Kent – Business
Paul Thomas	DLS Limited	Kent – Business
Penny Shimmin	Social Enterprise Working Group - Chair	Social Enterprise
Perry Glading	Thurrock Business Board	South Essex – Business
Prof Anthony Forster	University of Essex	Higher Education

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 The following apologies were received: Cllr Simon Cook, Cllr Keith Glazier (substituted by Cllr Rupert Simmons), and Cllr Peter Fleming.

2. Minutes, Declarations of Interest and Matters Arising

2a. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 7th December 2019 were agreed with the amendments noted below:
- In the list of those present: Perry Glading showing as from Southend Business Board, should have read Thurrock Business Board; and



- Under section 2.11: “..... felt that a strong working group *consisting* of top businesses.....”, should read *including* (rather than consisting).

2b. Declarations of Interest

2.2 During the meeting the following declarations of interest were made:

- Jo James, under agenda item 5, noting organisation runs Kent and Medway Growth Hub.
- Angela O’Donoghue, under agenda item 8, South Essex College was involved in one of the LGF3b projects listed.
- Rupert Simmons, under agenda item 8, reported interest in one of the Sea Change Sussex LGF3b projects.

2.3 Chris Brodie reminded the Board that it was important that everyone kept their register of interests up to date.

2c. Matters Arising

2.4 **LEP Annual Performance Review (APR):** Adam Bryan informed the Strategic Board of the outcome stating that SELEP received for good for Governance –good for Delivery and requires improvement for Strategy.

2.5 Adam Bryan noted that good progress had been made against the assessment categories. He noted that the require improvement assessment for Strategy was partly due to the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) not being as far advanced as Government would have liked. Adam Bryan stated that the LIS would be covered later on the agenda, under item 9. Adam Bryan invited Iain McNab from the Cities and Local Growth Unit to comment on the outcome of the APR. Iain McNab noted that he echoed Adam Bryan’s comments, that SELEP had made progress which was good to see.

2.6 **Tri-LEP Energy Strategy:** The Board received an update on the launch of the tri LEP Energy Strategy. It was confirmed that the Boards’ previous comments had been considered and the final version of the Strategy would be circulated to Board members. Adam Bryan noted that the tri LEP Energy Strategy would be launched on Monday 25 March 2019 and invitation to the event had been extended to all Board Members.

Action: To distribute the copy of the tri LEP Energy Strategy to Board members.

2.7 **Careers Enterprise Company:** Louise Aitken read out a statement to the Board, in relation to the Enterprise Advisor Network contract with the Careers Enterprise Company (CEC)
“We wish to bring to the Board’s attention a risk to our ‘Enterprise Adviser Network’ contract with the Careers Enterprise Company, delivering against the LEP Skills Strategy. This facilitates joint working between industry and schools (at a senior level). Currently SELEP holds the contract for Essex, Southend and Thurrock to ensure a Greater Essex approach.

It has a strategic relationship with Kent, Medway and East Sussex which is achieving growing coverage supported by the local authorities in those areas.



The model is that host organisations employ Enterprise Co-ordinators, with each one working with up to 20 schools and employers. These Enterprise Co-ordinator posts are funded 50% by the host organisation and 50% by CEC. Hosts for the Greater Essex network are Southend Council, Thurrock Council and Essex County Council. The CEC Grant is paid to the SELEP (via the Accountable Body) and SELEP has back to back contracts in place with the host organisations and passports the funding to them.

Essex County Council has recently indicated that it is currently considering whether it will continue contributing match beyond its currently committed period that ends in August 2019. Without pre-empting the decision-making process at ECC, SELEP and CEC are exploring potential risks and options associated with this, such as lack of coverage across ECCs area and the necessity to find a new delivery partner. We will keep the Board up to date on developments and seek to ensure continuity of this contract.”

- 2.8 **Timely flow of information:** Board members noted the considerable number of reports and the late circulation of certain documents. The Chair noted that it was important for the Board to have information well in advance of the meeting.

3. LEP Review Implementation

- 3.1 The Board received a report from Chris Brodie, Adam Bryan and Suzanne Bennett, regarding update on the progress made towards implementation of the recommendations in the LEP Review. The Board was asked to agree an approach for ensuring that all recommendations were implemented by March 2020, as required by Government.
- 3.2 Chris Brodie introduced the item and noted that SELEP had been built on trust with strong local input from the Federated Areas, and that this was the Federated Boards are integral part of how we operate. He went on to comment that SELEP had made good progress over the last 12 months, although there was further work to be done. Chris Brodie emphasised that as the Chair, he would continue to make the case for the Federated model as SELEP progresses in implementing all the LEP Review requirements.
- 3.3 Chris Brodie set out that the challenge for SELEP over the next 12 months would be implementing elements of the LEP review, and that today’s discussion was about setting out the roadmap regarding where the partnership needed to get to and to ensure that that funding was made available in the south east to deliver local projects.
- 3.4 Adam Bryan noted that the large amount of work which would make an impact on the Secretariat’s capacity should not be under-estimated. He stated that the capacity impact could fundamentally change the way SELEP operates These changes must operate and interacted with partners. He further added that any changes must be made in full consultation and engagement with all key stakeholders.
- 3.5 Adam Bryan then went on to draw out the key points from the report, including the five workstreams proposed; Board size and composition; Chair and Board members recruitment, including diversity of the Board; legal personality; independent secretariat; and embedding



scrutiny and oversight into policies and procedures. It was noted that SELEP was already compliant in most areas and had examples of best practice.

- 3.6 The Board discussed how to undertake the five workstreams identified as priorities for 2019/20. This included consideration of procuring an independent company/adviser to conduct an independent review or to form a small working group of board members to lead a review.
- 3.7 During the Board's discussion the following points were raised:
- The Board was reminded that KMEP had put conditions when offering their support for the LEP Review, as noted in their January 2019 meeting. One of these conditions was that there would be no changes to the SELEP Accountability Board or Investment Panel. *Amendment requested by Douglas Horner, approved at the meeting of the 28th June 2019: to clarify that the "no changes" referred to in this bullet point is referencing the membership of the Accountability Board and its modus operandi, not wider questions around legal personality and the structure of the SELEP.*
 - The importance of Government's red lines should be taken into consideration for SELEP to focus its efforts appropriately.
 - Following an in-depth conversation, most of the Board members felt that the Board would benefit from an external resource, with capacity and an impartial view, recognising some of the tensions which exist, would help to support this work review performed by an independent reviewer.
 - The Board noted that the scope of the review should be fully articulated, and any resource procured be kept to task and monitored against the agreed scope asset by the Board.
 - The Board discussed, the importance of Board members being fully engaged in the process including driving the workstreams. It was thought that a strong steering group of Board members could enable this.
 - Furthermore, Suzanne Bennett outlined the proposals regarding legal personality, as set out in the report.
- 3.8 The Board **ratified** the results of the recent electronic procedure; this being that the Board approved the recommendation that the Board should move to a model of no more than 20 Board Members with five co-opted members and a private sector majority of two-thirds.
- 3.9 The Board **approved** the scope of a workstream considering the size and composition of the Board and the production of advisory options and recommendations on how the Board could be reformed to meet the requirements agreed under the electronic procedure. Noting that whichever delivery option was selected, the final decision on Board size and composition would remain with the Strategic Board.



- 3.10 Following a vote with 22 in favour, the Board **agreed** to:
- a) Appointing an independent, external body, through an open and transparent selection process, to provide options and recommendations on how an appropriate Board size and composition could be achieved; and
 - b) Creating a Steering Group, to be chaired by the Board Chair, to oversee the Independent Review and the scope of the review. Nominations would be sought for the Steering Group, and the Steering Group would comprise of at least one member from each of the Federated Areas.
- 3.11 The Board **approved** the suggested approach and timelines for ensuring that all LEP Review recommendations were fully implemented by the end of March 2020.
- 3.12 The Board **approved** the principle of the future selected incorporated model being a 'nil return' company and **noted** that this decision does NOT restrict or inhibit any options or models that might be considered for incorporation.
- 3.13 The Board **approved** the principle that Board members would act as sponsors for workstreams for the implementation of the LEP Review requirements.

4. Assurance Framework

- 4.1 The Board received a report from Rhiannon Mort, the purpose of which was to seek agreement from the Board on SELEP's revised Assurance Framework and revised Terms of References.
- 4.2 Rhiannon Mort outlined that the revised Assurance Framework presented to the Board reflected the minimum requirements from the LEP Review and set out the requirements in terms of what needed to happen, noting that the 'how' it happened was for the Board to agree. Rhiannon Mort also noted that the Assurance Framework needed to be signed off before any funding would be released to SELEP, including the Local Growth Fund due in 2019/20, in the region of £55m. The Strategic Board Terms of Reference presented to the Board had been revised to ensure that they were in line with the revisions to the Assurance Framework.
- 4.3 Rhiannon Mort explained that the intention was not to make any substantial changes at this time, rather to reflect the changes as required and where areas were to be agreed by the Board to put placeholders in the document relating to the requirements of the LEP Review (e.g. "we are committed to...").
- 4.4 Rhiannon Mort reiterated that no changes were being proposed to the Investment Panel or Accountability Board or their terms of reference.



- 4.5 It was noted that the diversity statement had been strengthened, with the wording now being more appropriate.
- 4.6 Regarding some of the points in the Assurance Framework, the Board members commented that they were still ambiguous. It was noted that these had been within the Assurance Framework for some years and were not a result of the revisions made in 2019.
- 4.7 It was stated that as the ambiguities remained, it was a good opportunity to address these to future proof the Framework.
- 4.8 Following a long discussion, the Board considered the viability of delaying approval of the Framework until the next Board meeting in June 2019 to allow for further revision to take place.
- 4.9 Adam Bryan reminded the Board that SELEP is requirement to have an Assurance Framework in place by the end of March 2019, which met the requirements as set out by Government with the National Local Growth Assurance Framework. If this was not the case, the S151 officer could withdraw their assurance statement provided to Government and from this there would be a risk that the LGF funding would not be forthcoming.
- 4.10 The Board acknowledged that whilst improvements could be made, the flow of funding was dependant on the approval of the Assurance Framework, therefore the Board could agree at this meeting, with an updated version to come back to the Board in June 2019. This option was voted on. It was confirmed that the Assurance Framework could be amended further following its initial approval.
- 4.11 The Board **approved** the updated SELEP Assurance Framework (2019), after voting on the issue on the basis that the Assurance Framework would be reviewed again by the Board at its meeting on the 28 June 2019. The motion was carried with 16 votes in favour.
- 4.12 The Board **noted** that the SELEP Assurance Framework (2019) would require further revisions during 2019/20 due to the LEP Review Implementation work and the new requirements to be in place by the end of 2019/20, and therefore would work towards making further revisions within the next three months.
- 4.13 In agreeing the Assurance Framework, the Board **approved** the SELEP diversity statement, set out in paragraph 4.3 of the revised Assurance Framework.
- 4.14 The discussion in relation to the SELEP Strategic Board Terms of Reference was postponed and would be discussed at the next Board meeting in June 2019.

5. Delivery Plan 2019/20

- 5.1 The Board received a report from Suzanne Bennett. The purpose of the report was to seek an agreement on the Delivery Plan for 2019/20.



- 5.2 Suzanne Bennett outlined that the Delivery Plan had been constructed to reflect the strategic objectives as set out in the Economic Strategic Statement. She advised that a further revision of the Plan would be necessary once the Local Industrial Strategy had been formed and agreed by the Board.
- 5.3 During the Board's discussion the following points were raised:
- 5.4 It was noted that various activities were being planned as part of a communications and engagement piece, including the Annual General Meeting scheduled for 17 July 2019. The communications strategy would be updated to reflect the recently launched Economic Strategic Statement. The Board noted that it was important that the communications strategy was developed together with the Federated areas.
- 5.5 It was suggested that, for the key performance indicators for creating places and houses, it would be helpful to review and consider more extensive indicators.
- 5.6 It was noted that staff stress in the risk register, was ragged as high risk. The Board was keen to know that appropriate measures were in place to support staff members. Suzanne Bennett informed the Board that the SELEP team had access to a health and well-being service provided by the Essex County Council. Adam Bryan noted that the recruitment plans, were also a key component of addressing this.
- 5.7 The Board stated that they wanted to review the risk register twice a year.
- 5.8 The Board **approved** the adoption of the Delivery Plan and the submission of the plan to Government.
- 5.9 The Board **noted** the intention to further strengthen and build on the light-touch plan with colleagues at the LEP Network over the coming months.
- 6. Sector Support Fund (SSF)**
- 6.1 The Board received a report from Adam Bryan. The purpose of the report was to seek endorsement for the SSF project which had been submitted to SELEP for revenue funding support.
- 6.2 Adam Bryan outlined the project as the SELEP Creative Open Workspace Masterplan and Prospectus project. This project is which was aiming to address a gap in suitable available workspace for the Creative, Cultural and Digital Sector across the SELEP area.
- 6.3 The Board **endorsed** the SELEP Creative Open Workspace and Masterplan Prospectus (£49,000) for funding through the 2019/20 SSF allocation.
- 7. Digital Skills Partnership**



- 7.1 The Board received a report from Louise Aitken. The purpose of the report was to seek agreement from the Board for the Digital Skills Partnership pilot run together with the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).
- 7.2 Louise Aitken outlined the purpose of the partnership and that the SELEP had been one of only three LEPs to have been successful in securing the second wave pilot status and funding.
- 7.3 Louise Aitken advised that the new co-ordinator post, still to be recruited to, would support the pilot and would work one day a month in Whitehall with his/her counterparts from other LEPs. The partnership would have strong links with the LEP Skills Advisory Panel which was being established and with the Local Industrial Strategy. It was noted that it was important for the digital skills work to link with the very wide range of existing networks.
- 7.4 Louise Aitken informed the Board that working with the LEP local skills boards and Skills Advisory Group, a launch event was being planned. As soon as there were more details about the proposed event these would be shared with the Board. It was proposed that the launch would take place in East Sussex and would also showcase some of the existing activity underway locally.
- 7.5 The Board **approved** the establishment of the Digital Skills Partnership with DCMS, the partnership, having been endorsed by local skills boards and secured on behalf of the LEP Skills Advisory Group.

8. **Local Growth Fund Capital Programme Update**

- 8.1 The Board received a report from Rhiannon Mort. The purpose of the report was to provide an update on the LGF programme, outcome of the Investment Panel held on 8 March 2019 and to approve the next steps in relation to LGF3b.

Rhiannon Mort outlined that for 2018/19, it was expected that SELEP would spend a total of £100.621m on LGF projects, which was a variance of £54.478m. Rhiannon Mort noted that this delay to LGF spend was as a direct result of slippage in spend for several projects across the LGF programme. There were several larger scale projects which had experienced slippages in LGF spend of greater than £3m during 2018/19. Rhiannon Mort summarised these projects.

- 8.2 Furthermore, Rhiannon Mort updated the Board on the Accountability Board funding decisions and changes to agreed projects within the LGF programme. Rhiannon Mort
- 8.3 informed the Board that these changes were driven by increases in project costs, the constrained timescales to deliver projects and reductions to Essex County Council's capital investment programme (impacting Essex County Council projects).
- 8.4 The Board noted the extensive work on the LGF programme and thanked all those involved.
- 8.5 It was noted that there continues to be the need for a project pipeline to be in place and that these projects needed to be ready to utilise LGF underspend as / when required.



- 8.6 Rhiannon set out the intention to convene the Investment Panel on the 28th June 2019 to agree the LGF3b project pipeline. In advance of this meeting, Federated Boards area asked to consider their top 2/3 priority projects for investment. They are also asked to consider whether there are any LGF3b projects which should be withdrawn from the process, given the limited timescales now available to deliver these new projects.
- 8.7 The Board noted the importance of learning the lessons from the most recent round of LGF prioritisation and ensuring appropriate input from all the key stakeholders. This included the importance of local discussions, and local sifting of projects.
- 8.8 The Board **noted** the update on the delivery of the LGF programme.
- 8.9 The Board **noted** the outcome of the SELEP Investment Panel meeting.
- 8.10 The Board **approved** that a report on the lessons learnt from LGF3b to date was prepared and presented to the Board at the June 2019 meeting, to inform future work.
- 8.11 The Board **approved** the reconvening of the Investment Panel on the 28 June 2019, following the Strategic Board meeting.
- 8.12 The Board **endorsed** the planned spend of £9.27m LGF beyond the 31 March 2021 for the Beaulieu New Railway Station project, as set out in section 6 of the report presented to the Board.
- 8.13 The Board **approved** the next steps in relation to the LGF3b, as set out in section 7 of the report presented to the Board (and noted below).
- In terms of the next steps for the prioritisation of the remaining LGF3b list, it was proposed that the remainder of the LGF3b list should be considered by the Investment Panel on the 28 June 2019, once Federated Boards had had time to review the technical document and consider their strategic priorities.
 - SELEP provided a commitment to Government that it would develop and maintain a pipeline of LGF projects to utilise LGF, should LGF underspend become available. This commitment was provided in response to the Deep Dive recommendations. It was therefore important that this work stream continued so that assurances could be provided to Central Government that SELEP was following through on its commitment.
 - Furthermore, there continued to be opportunities for LGF underspend to be identified. There were several LGF projects which had been awarded funding, but which were currently RAG rated as Red and/or had specific funding conditions attached. If these projects were unable to progress or the funding conditions could not be satisfied, then the LGF would be returned for reallocation through the LGF3b process. A strong pipeline of prioritised projects would be crucial to ensuring that LGF underspends could be reallocated at pace, to enable alternative projects to progress.



- The Federated Boards were therefore asked to consider the projects which they identified to be strategically important by the end of May. Given the substantial number of LGF3b applications and the limited funding available, each Federated Board was asked to focus on its top two/three priorities for investment.
- Federated Boards are also asked to consider whether there were any projects which they wished to withdraw from the process. Projects which were unsuccessful in securing a provisional allocation on the 8 March 2019 and therefore, given timescales, would be unable to spend the LGF allocation sought by the 31 March 2021.
- It was not intended that new information would be presented to the ITE, but rather that the Federated Boards would provide a view on their strategic priorities to be reflected within the reports to the Investment Panel on the 28 June 2019. Similarly, SELEP was not expecting changes to the LGF ask of projects to come forward, as this would require a further iteration of the Business Case review, to consider the impact of the changes in LGF on the outputs and outcomes which would be delivered by the project.
- Each Federated Board was asked to provide supporting evidence/narrative for the priority projects which were identified, to set out why these projects had been prioritised by the respective Federated Board. Where the ITE assessment had raised concerns in relation to these projects, Federated Areas were also asked to provide evidence of how these concerns could be mitigated.
- The Federated Board should provide a fair and equal opportunity for discussion around the relative merits of each of the projects put forward for funding.
- The local Federated Board feedback on their strategic priorities would be reflected within the Investment Panel papers for the meeting on 28 June 2019, to ensure that the recommendations made to the Investment Panel resonated with the priorities identified by the Federated Boards.

9. Local Industrial Strategy (LIS)

- 9.1 The Board received a report from Adam Bryan. The purpose of the report was to outline the approach to producing the LIS, noting that it was an iterative process and high profile in terms of Government's expectation of the LEP.
- 9.2 Adam Bryan noted that it was important for SELEP to produce a LIS which was locally resonant and fitted with Government's expectations for the LIS. This included reaching a wide Government audience, for example other departments with an interest in

interventions in the south east. As well as building on work which had previously been instructive or had been well received by Government – including the SELEP Skills Strategy and the South2East Energy Strategy.



9.3 Adam Bryan advised that the post of Strategy and Intelligence Manager, was currently out for advert, and that the role would have oversight of the LIS.

9.4 During the Board's discussion the following points were raised:

9.5 The conversation about a Local Industrial Strategy had been around for some time. It was noted that worked previously undertaken on the evidence base should be linked to developing the LIS for the south east.

9.6 If any further work was commissioned to develop the evidence base further this would be undertaken as frugally as possible and build upon existing work.

9.7 In terms of how the LIS was shaped, some Board members, including Essex Business Board representative, felt a thematic approach would be preferable.

9.8 Caroline Jessel, Chair of the Kent Nature Partnership, who was observing the meeting, offered to work jointly with the SELEP on the evidence base. Caroline Jessel informed the Board that the Kent Nature Partnership was developing by working with partners, a joint natural capital plan., which would underpin health, wealth and general wellbeing.

9.9 The Board **noted** the presentation and provided their mandate for the continuation of the work.

10. Lower Thames Crossing (LTC)

10.1 The Board received a report from Cat Cliffe, Head of Value and Legacy at the LTC Team. The purpose of the report was to inform Board members of the approach being taken towards developing a skills, education and employment strategy for the LTC project.

10.2 Cat Cliffe informed the Board that the LTC team was now considering the consultation responses, and once the findings had been processed the team would like to come back and share them with the Board.

10.3 Cat Cliffe went on to outline the skills aspect of the project and confirmed that the team were committed to working with SELEP. She added that there had been significant analysis of the skills demand and working with local stakeholders, including SMEs, about how businesses could work with LTC.

10.4 During the Board's discussion the following points were raised:

10.5 Cllr Gledhill stated that Thurrock Council remained thoroughly opposed to the LTC proposal.

10.6 He noted that it was important to ensure that local businesses were engaged and welcomed the idea of local SMEs being asked to get involved.

10.7 Regarding many of the professions required it was acknowledged that it would take time to train individuals therefore the Board welcomed the LTC team speaking to them about this



now. It was also noted that given the current skills shortage in many areas further move of professions to LTC could lead to shortages of appropriate skills in other projects. The Board felt that it was important to learn the lessons from other major projects that experienced similar difficulties, (for example Tideway, and the impact on other projects around the Thames).

10.8 Chris Brodie thanked Cat Cliffe for her input and taking the time to come and speak.

10.9 The Board **noted** progress and provided feedback to the LTC team.

11. Garden Communities Session Three

11.1 The Board received a report from Claire Hamilton, Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Director. The purpose of the report was to provide an update on the development of Harlow and Gilston Garden Town.

11.2 Claire Hamilton noted that the work for Harlow and Gilston Garden Community was across three districts (East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest and Harlow) and two counties (Essex and Hertfordshire County Council). Together they were working to develop good quality villages and neighbourhoods, homes, jobs and infrastructure for new and existing residents in and around the Harlow area.

11.3 Claire Hamilton outlined the developments which were coming on stream, for example the Princess Alexandra hospital that was considering the development of a health and wellbeing campus and Health England that were looking to relocate their headquarters to the area.

11.4 Claire Hamilton outlined that one key aspect of the development was to fundamentally change the way people move around the place with a sustainable transport system.

11.5 The Board **noted** the report and the presentation.

12. Thames Estuary Production Corridor (TEPC)

12.1 The Board received a report from Chris Paddock from Hatch Regeneris. The purpose of the report was to provide results of the Thames Estuary Production Corridor (TEPC) feasibility work.

12.2 Chris Paddock outlined that the TEPC was a collective programme of work to encourage the development of the creative industries and wider creative economy across the Thames Estuary.

12.3 The TEPC work to date had been overwhelmingly positive, with strong partnerships across Essex, Kent, London and the creative sector. This had included starting to develop a strong evidence base, including extensive consultation with the sector.



- 12.4 Chris Paddock outlined that the potential scale and impact of the TEPC was immense, with the potential to employ at least 50,000 new jobs, in addition to the current estimate of people already employed in the sector of 50,000.
- 12.5 Chris Paddock outlined that TEPC had successfully secured £4.3m from the DCMS Cultural Development Fund for Phase 1 of TEPC delivery in the South Essex and North Kent Estuary Region. This would assist with the Estuary-wide creative workspace property portfolio (building on the SELEP Creative Open Workspace Master Plan and Prospectus); promotion of Estuary places to attract creative industries inward investment; cultural investment in residential and mixed-use developments generating better quality places; new model creative apprenticeships and development of Estuary 2020 as an international profile cultural festival.
- 12.6 Chris Paddock noted that the project which had started as slightly nebulous was now bringing a range of tangible benefits and outcomes to the area.
- 12.7 Chris Brodie thanked Chris Paddock for his input and taking the time to come and speak with the Board.
- 12.8 The Board **noted** the report and the presentation.
- 13. Growth Hubs: South East Business Boost video**
- 13.1 Chris Burr introduced a short film, which was running during lunch, about the South East Business Boost, and commended the project as an excellent example of the partnership's work.
- 13.2 Chris Brodie thanked Chris Burr for sharing the film and information with the Board.

The Board meeting closed at 1pm.