



#### Attendees

<b>BS</b>	Cllr Bob Standley	Wealden DC	<b>ME</b>	Martin Ellis	Recruitment South East
<b>CB</b>	Cllr Christine Bayliss	Rother DC	<b>PC</b>	Cllr Peter Chowney	Hastings BC
<b>CE</b>	Christina Ewbank	ACES	<b>PJ</b>	Philip Johnson	Locate East Sussex
<b>CS</b>	Clive Soper	FSB	<b>PSp</b>	Peter Sharp	Lewes DC / Eastbourne BC
<b>DE</b>	Dave Evans	East Sussex CC	<b>RD</b>	Richard Dawson	East Sussex CC
<b>GP</b>	Graham Peters (CHAIR)	ES Rural Partnership	<b>SD</b>	Stewart Drew	De La Warr Pavilion
<b>JS</b>	Jo Simmons	South East LEP	<b>SH</b>	Simon Hubbard	Hastings BC
<b>KG</b>	Cllr Keith Glazier	East Sussex CC	<b>TL</b>	Tony Leonard	Rother DC
<b>MA</b>	Marwa Al-Qadi	East Sussex CC			

#### Apologies

<b>AC</b>	Ana Christie	Sussex Chamber of Commerce	<b>JH</b>	James Harris	East Sussex CC
<b>DSp</b>	David Sheppard	D-RisQ Ltd	<b>MS</b>	Martin Searle	FSB
<b>DSy</b>	Dan Shelley	East Sussex College Group	<b>Psm</b>	Penny Shimmin	Sussex CDA
<b>DT</b>	Cllr David Tutt	Eastbourne BC	<b>SBi</b>	Steve Bishop	Steer (SELEP ITE)
<b>HD</b>	Helen Dyer	South East LEP	<b>SBx</b>	Sue Baxter	University of Sussex
<b>IF</b>	Ian Fitzpatrick	Lewes DC / Eastbourne BC	<b>ZN</b>	Cllr Zoe Nicholson	Lewes DC
<b>IG</b>	Isabel Garden	Wealden DC			

**All of the papers and any presentations delivered at the meeting can be viewed on the following page of the ESCC website: [www.eastsussex.gov.uk/business/eastsussex/selep/tesminutes/tes200316](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/business/eastsussex/selep/tesminutes/tes200316)**

## 1. Welcome & introductions

- 1.1. **GP** welcomed the attendees and delivered the apologies, *noting that many people weren't able to attend due to the latest Government advice on the Coronavirus pandemic*. **GP** asked the group for any specific conflicts of interest with today's agenda items and for any additional interests not already held on record; no additional interests were declared.
- 1.2. **GP** advised that **PC** is stepping down as Leader of Hastings BC, so this is his final TES meeting. The group thanked **PC** for his work with TES and SELEP over the last few years. *Cllr Kim Forward* will be the new Hastings BC Leader and its TES representative moving forward. **GP** further advised that **SH** is also leaving Hastings BC; again the group thanked **SH** for his dedicated work to Hastings and to the wider county.

## 2. Review of previous minutes (27 Jan 2020)

- 2.1. **GP** ran through the actions of the previous meeting and noted that all had been completed or are now in progress. The minutes were approved by the group as an accurate record of the meeting.

Matters arising – Coronavirus: in light of the current pandemic, **GP** asked all colleagues to please think about how our decisions may impact, or be impacted by, the ongoing Coronavirus situation. We're already aware of one project asking to postpone loan repayments to SELEP due to their business's cashflow being affected, and no doubt more companies, particularly small businesses, will be affected as the situation develops. A £500m hardship fund is being made available, but perhaps SELEP could also look to join up LEP money with other funding to help small businesses at risk (**GP** and **RD** agreed to explore with SELEP an approach made by LDBG to expand loan provision to suffering businesses). We know that the Government will be considering further steps over the coming days and weeks as restrictions on peoples' movement are brought into effect – such as business rates relief, changes to statutory sick pay, loans and even cash grants to businesses. In such a rapidly changing situation, the most sensible and appropriate approach for us all is signpost people to the [Gov.UK website](http://Gov.UK) and the [South East Business Hub](#) which provides information on Coronavirus and the national and local programmes of support available. In addition we must simply support each other as best we can.

## 3. SELEP updates

- 3.1. **JS** provided an update on some of SELEP's key areas of work, commenting that we're now entering a new era of 'post-LEP Review' SELEP, with new members, a new delivery plan and lots of new ideas.

- 3.2. LEP Review: SELEP's governance now demonstrates full best-practice by adopting all of the recommendations of the LEP Review, including incorporation, gender balance, and membership. The first meeting of 'SELEP Ltd' will formally approve all of the new policies and appoint the co-opted Directors. The new SME Champion role will also be appointed, for which **AC** and **CS** have put themselves forward.
- 3.3. Local Industrial Strategy (LIS): excellent feedback has been provided on the work done so far, but we're now on a bit of a hiatus until the Government provides its revised timescales (expected to be 2-3 months). This means that we currently have another opportunity to feed back in any further comments, essentially an extra chance to input while the SELEP team considers the conceptual work on the content. There's a good summary of the LIS in the current SELEP Board papers, along with a copy of the most recent draft LIS (Jan 2020) included in the appendices.
- 3.4. SELEP Board agenda: *the upcoming SELEP Board meeting on 20 Mar 2020 has now been cancelled* due to the Coronavirus situation. It's likely to be rescheduled as a virtual meeting in around six weeks' time. Agenda items will include the new Delivery Plan and consultations on the Lower Thames Crossing, Freeports and the Bradwell B nuclear power station. Other items coming up for future consideration include 'strengthening the Southern LEPs' (as a force to contend with the Northern Powerhouse) and the formation of a Major Projects group. Also note that this year's AGM may need to be pushed back (TBC); the focus of the AGM is likely to be Clean Growth or possibly Women in Business.

#### 4. SELEP Funding Programmes

- 4.1. Growing Places Fund (GPF) Round 3: **RD** and **MA** ran through a presentation setting the context for GPF-R3. A total of 18 projects have submitted Strategic Outline Business Cases (SOBCs) to SELEP with a total ask of £45.18m. Of those, 6 are from East Sussex (as previously endorsed by TES) to the value of £18.62m. The total amount of GPF available for reinvestment in this round is up to £25.48m.
- 4.2. The SELEP ITE has conducted a full assessment of the SOBC submissions using the previously agreed criteria – viability, deliverability, benefits etc – but also considering the initial strategic priorities set out by each federated board (based only on the brief information provided in the Expression of Interest forms). The ITE has 'banded' the projects as follows:
  - Band 1: projects with high federated area support (local strategic fit) and also high scores on the ITE criteria (green RAG ratings); the ITE has put 6 projects into this band with a total ask of £13.6m; 2 of the projects are from East Sussex.
  - Band 2a: high federated area support but not-so-high scores on the ITE criteria (deliverability/viability risks); there are 4 projects in this band with a total ask of £10.2m; 1 of the projects is from East Sussex.
  - Band 2b: lower federated board priority but high scores on the ITE criteria; there are 5 projects in this band with a total ask of £16.3m; 3 of the projects are from East Sussex.
  - Band 3: lower federated board priority and lower scores on the ITE criteria; there are 3 projects in this band with a total ask of £5m; none of the projects are from East Sussex.
- 4.3. Given the amount of GPF available we'd expect all of the Band 1 schemes to be funded, which is excellent news for East Sussex. However, before the above assessment is considered by the SELEP Investment Panel, federated boards are asked whether they want to make any amendments to their local strategic priorities. TES members discussed this question, specifically whether our highest-ranking projects in Band 2b (having scored very well against the ITE's technical criteria) could potentially leapfrog our project in Band 2a if we give them a higher local strategic priority. The main points raised by TES members were as follows:
  - Given the current situation with Coronavirus, we could consider changing our overall strategy to prioritise investments that produce *earlier* outputs and outcomes rather than the long term.
  - The project in Band 2a scored Amber in deliverability and benefits realisation, however the 'good health' of this particular organisation is *essential* to the county overall. If the project doesn't get funding through this round of GPF then it's vital we support them elsewhere in building the case and looking at alternative funds in the future.

- Of the projects in Band 2b, one has sought funding previously and has made several planning applications, but it's an expensive scheme so gets overlooked. However, there is the option to scale the project, and it seems this particular version of the scheme is more 'real' than any previous attempt, so to date this is probably the best opportunity to back it. The second project builds on previous SELEP/TES investments and can complete with strong payback. All agreed that both projects are of high strategic importance with very strong cases for their potential impact.
- The projects have been assessed on a given set of criteria, both from the ITE and our own strategic priorities, so thinking reasonably the assessment ought to stand. If all of the federated areas try to 'reprioritise' now in a reactive way, the whole banding could be changed and we risk those schemes that have done well and are currently likely to get funded.
- Irrespective of our discussions here, any project that doesn't get funding through this round will be considered a pipeline scheme (as long as it's a good viable scheme) to receive funding if/when additional GPF becomes available.

4.4. **GP** clarified that nothing is to be decided today, and any further comments should be sent to **RD** by the end of this week, 20 Mar. All of the comments and options will then be discussed with our three Investment Panel members and County Council officers (who have to provide S151 officer approval on the deliverability/viability and repayment of each project put forward), and passed onto SELEP by 27 Mar for inclusion in the papers for the Investment Panel meeting on 17 Apr 2020, where all 18 project submissions will be considered for LEP-wide prioritisation. Much will depend on the discussions during the meeting itself, but our Investment Panel members will pay regard to the above comments when making their decision.

*[Action: TES members to submit any further comments on GPF-R3 prioritisation to RD by 20 Mar 2020; RD to prepare a short paper for SELEP by 27 Mar 2020, with the approval of the TES Chair, and brief TES's three Investment Panel members prior to the Investment Panel meeting on 17 Apr 2020]*

4.5. Local Growth Fund (LGF): **MA** advised that the amount of unallocated LGF is now £11.2m (as a result of other LGF projects underspending or reallocating funding). This means that the next 6 projects in the prioritised pipeline are able to come forward to the Accountability Board in Jul 2020 for funding approval, including both East Sussex pipeline schemes – Exceat Bridge Replacement Tranche 2 (£611k) and Eastbourne Fisherman's Quayside & Infrastructure Development (£1.08m). All other LGF projects are having their financial/delivery profiles reviewed to determine those that need to ask for an LGF extension beyond Mar 2021, after which we will seek TES endorsement plus SELEP Board and SELEP Accountability Board approval over the coming months.

4.6. Sector Support Fund (SSF): **RD** ran through a briefing provided by *Louise Aitken*, the SELEP Skills Lead, on a bid to extend an existing SSF project, 'teaching for growth', asking for TES endorsement. The project has been very successful to date, with excellent benefits to East Sussex in terms of the bursaries awarded to colleges/providers (Bexhill, Plumpton and East Sussex College). **TES members agreed to endorse the SSF project application.**

4.7. Other funding: **RD** ran through some of the other funding bids that ESCC officers and partners have been working on, including a successful ERDF bid to continue the South East Business Boost (SEBB) programme for a further 3 years to 2023, additional funds secured for inward investment services for a Locate East Sussex contract to 2023, plus a funding extension to the LoCASE programme that's very likely to succeed. The SEBB and inward investment services are currently out to tender, to be assessed shortly.

## 5. Coastal Communities Economic Prospectus

5.1. **SH** delivered a short presentation on the new economic prospectus for the south east coast, covering its purpose, ambitions and opportunities, plus some of the potential 'first projects' to develop as next steps. The development of this Prospectus has already influenced the inclusion of 'coastal' in the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). The Prospectus will sit under the LIS and be aligned to it, providing a framework for those living and working along our coast. It will support funding bids going forward in the same way the LIS will.

5.2. A final version Prospectus was circulated for TES endorsement. **TES members agreed to endorse the Coastal Communities Economic Prospectus.**

## 6. Hastings & Rother Task Force Economic Review

- 6.1. **SH** explained that the Hastings & Rother Task Force (HRTF) has been operating in one way or another for around 20 years. Whilst widely considered an important and effective force for good, the local authorities involved in HRTF have chosen to commission a review to ensure the group is still appropriate and fit for purpose. Early findings suggest the group is still very much relevant, albeit with some updating required; if it's to continue then it needs a new/revised rationale and a higher profile, so those are the next steps to be considered. **SH** agreed to provide TES with a more detailed report in due course.

*[Action: SH to provide TES, when appropriate, with a more detailed report on the HRTF Economic Review]*

## 7. Stronger Towns & Future High Street Funds

- 7.1. **PS** and **SH** delivered a presentation on the current bids to the Future High Street Fund (FHSF) from Newhaven, and to the Towns Fund from Newhaven and Hastings BC.
- 7.2. Regarding the FHSF, a maximum of £25m is available per location but bids are expected to be between £5m and £10m, "proportionate to the size of the location". Therefore the emerging bid for Newhaven is provisionally £7m. This will go to Lewes DC's Cabinet meeting next week for consideration.
- 7.3. The Towns Fund will also accept bids up to £25m, but these will each take the form of a negotiated 'Town Deal' between the applicant and Government. Further guidance is still awaited, but capacity funding has been provided to enable the towns to develop their initial business/investment plans. Newhaven and Hastings have each established a Town Board. The Newhaven Town Board has already received a strong public response to its #mytown campaign and is setting up a Task & Finish group to undertake an initial project sift; their next Board meeting is 22 May 2020. The Hastings Town Board will now commission a consultation and engagement programme, plus a Town Investment Plan to establish the strategic/economic case for investment; their next Board meeting is 27 Jun 2020.
- 7.4. Partners' endorsement will be sought for all of the above bids in due course. **TES members agreed to endorse the Future High Street Fund and Towns Fund bids from Newhaven and Hastings BC.** **PS** and **SH** will ask **GP** to provide written endorsement on behalf of TES when the bids are submitted.

*[Action: PS and SH to seek written endorsement from GP on behalf of TES for the Future High Street Fund and Towns Fund bids from Newhaven and Hastings BC when the bids are submitted]*

## 8. Additional updates & stakeholder reports (for info)

- 8.1. **GP** confirmed that the East Sussex Environment Strategy was approved by TES electronically earlier this month.
- 8.2. **KG** advised that following the Chancellor's Budget last week, the Department for Transport (DfT) published its [Roads Investment Strategy 2 \(2020-25\)](#). The A27 Lewes–Polegate was identified as a RIS-3 pipeline scheme, along with a safety package for the A21. This means they're proposals that Highways England (HE) will develop during RP2 so that they could enter construction in RP3 (but funding for construction of these schemes has not been committed). So while HE develops the proposals during the next five years, assuming it can be demonstrated through the various development stages that there is a strong business case (particularly the strategic and economic cases), then funding could be allocated by Government in RIS-3 (which would come out late-2024 for construction in the 2025-30 period).

## 9. TES round table / AOB

- 9.1. **GP** advised that **ME** has now written a Blog (as part of TES Communications), written in his own style with a couple more to follow. **ME** confirmed that the TES presentation is almost ready, so things are moving forward. He'll bring more detailed update back to TES in due course.

### Summary of decisions

- 4.6 TES members agreed to endorse the SSF project application.
- 5.2 TES members agreed to endorse the Coastal Communities Economic Prospectus.
- 7.4 TES members agreed to endorse the Future High Street Fund and Towns Fund bids from Newhaven and Hastings BC.

### Summary of actions

- 4.4 TES members to submit any further comments on GPF-R3 prioritisation to **RD** by 20 Mar 2020; **RD** to prepare a short paper for SELEP by 27 Mar 2020, with the approval of the TES Chair, and brief TES's three Investment Panel members prior to the Investment Panel meeting on 17 Apr 2020.
- 6.1 **SH** to provide TES, when appropriate, with a more detailed report on the HRTF Economic Review.
- 7.4 **PS** and **SH** to seek written endorsement from **GP** on behalf of TES for the Future High Street Fund and Towns Fund bids from Newhaven and Hastings BC when the bids are submitted.