

## Thames Gateway Kent Partnership Board

Approved Minutes of the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership Board Meeting held in the Darwin Room, Innovation Centre Medway, on 14 December 2017.

### **Present:**

#### **Board members and observers**

Rob Bennett, BBP Regeneration (Chair)  
Cllr Rodney Chambers, Medway Council  
Cllr Mark Dance, Kent County Council  
Robert Goodman, Land Securities/Bluewater  
Ann Komzolik, North Kent College  
Kamal Aggarwal, Thomson, Snell and Passmore  
Mark Heeley, Workman LLP  
Cllr David Turner, Gravesham Borough Council  
Cllr Mike Cosgrove, Swale Borough Council  
(deputising for Cllr Bowles)

### **Also present:**

Neil Davies, Medway Council  
Graham Harris, Dartford Borough Council  
David Hughes, Gravesham Borough Council  
Richard Longman, TGKP  
Matthew Norwell, TGKP  
Sarah Nurden, Kent County Council (deputising for David Smith)  
Linda Searle, TGKP  
Emma Wiggins, Swale Borough Council  
Jacqui Ward, Kent County Council (Item 3)  
Jeremy Biggs, NCL (Item 3)  
Katie Stewart, Kent County Council (Item 4)  
Sarah Platts, Kent County Council (Item 4)

### **Apologies:**

Cllr Jeremy Kite, Dartford Borough Council  
Cllr Andrew Bowles, Swale Borough Council  
Paul Jackson, Dovetail Games  
Ian Piper, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation  
Professor Alan Reed, University of Greenwich  
Rehman Chishti, Member of Parliament  
Julie Foley, Environment Agency  
Paul Kitson, Homes and Communities Agency  
Iain McNab, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy  
David Smith, Kent County Council  
Adam Bryan, South East Local Enterprise Partnership

### **Item 1. Welcome and Introductions**

- 1.1. The Chairman welcomed those present, including colleagues from Kent County Council and NCL for items 3 and 4. He also congratulated Emma Wiggins on her permanent appointment as Director of Regeneration at Swale Borough Council.

### **Item 2. Minutes of the Board meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2017**

- 2.1. The Minutes of the Board meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> September were approved. Regarding ongoing matters from the previous minutes (16 May):
  - Item 4 – TGKP continues to engage with Highways England on the Lower Thames Crossing through the Stakeholder Panel and bilaterally.
  - Item 6 – Thames Gateway Strategic Group – this would be covered under item 5 of the Agenda.
  - Item 8 – Growth and Infrastructure Framework – this would be covered under item 4 of the Agenda.
- 2.2. Matters arising from 21<sup>st</sup> September, not on the agenda:

- Paragraph 3.4 – Matthew Norwell has been working with Paul Jackson and other private sector representatives on shaping next steps of the work programme. Richard Longman attended the rail franchise meetings with Kent CC.
- Paragraph: 3.5 – The work stream on new technology work was being pursued with the renamed TGKP delivery group (formerly North Kent EDO partnership). Maidstone’s position had already been referred to in the preceding AGM, but was also covered under Item 6 on the constitution.
- Paragraph: 5 – Matthew Norwell confirmed that TGKP did respond to the M2 junction 5 consultation. Various Board Members spoke reinforcing their support for the stance taken in TGKP’s response. It was vital that Highways England should look at the interconnections between the Lower Thames Crossing and all the other junctions on the M2. Work on Junction 5 needed to be accelerated because of the knock-on effects in all directions arising from current limitations. The impacts of the Lower Thames Crossing on A227 and A228 also needed to be examined. **Action: these points would be followed up through the LTC Working Group that TGKP has convened (MN/RL).**

### **Item 3. Kent & Medway Business Fund (presentations from Jacqui Ward and Jeremy Biggs**

- 3.1. The purpose of this item was to advise the Board on the potential for ring-fencing some portion of the recycled TIGER loan fund, currently standing at £4.7million, to support equity-based investment in innovative companies, and for promoting the Kent Life Sciences Fund (KLSF) across North Kent. The intention was to take any feedback from the Board to the next meeting of the K&MBF Investment Panel on 19<sup>th</sup> December, to inform their decisions.
- 3.2. Jeremy Biggs gave a short presentation on the work NCL was doing with KCC on the KLSF. To date they had secured around £30million of private capital and £6.2million of grants to complement the scheme investments made. Although KLSF had been ‘seeded’ with funds recycled from Expansion East Kent, the fund was available to innovative companies across Kent & Medway. KCC/NCL operate a filtering process to identify companies with high growth potential and where a wide range of companies and supply chains would benefit from investments. One example of a success in the medtech sector was with Medway Community Health.
- 3.3. In discussion, Board Members queried whether KCC/NCL were talking to Ebbsfleet DC about their health-related ambitions. Jacqui said this would be followed up. **Action: Jacqui Ward.** For schemes to be investment-ready, the right accommodation and infrastructure needed to be already in place. NCL have done some mapping of what companies there are in Kent & Medway fitting the sector focus and have had some dialogue with Kent Science Park; Locate In Kent have also done some mapping through the BioGateway initiative. Jacqui confirmed that if any North Kent-based company seeks support from KLSF, the return on investment would come to North Kent; and if any recycled funds are added to the KLSF pot, these can be ring-fenced for investment in North Kent-based companies.
- 3.4. In conclusion, it was agreed that the merits or otherwise of ring-fencing part of the recycled TIGER funds for KLSF, or for other priority sector(s), should be explored by the TGKP Delivery Group. The TGKP team would work with Jacqui to put together a paper on the options. **Action: JW/MN.**

#### **Item 4. Kent & Medway Growth & Infrastructure Fund (GIF)**

- 4.1. Katie Stewart and Sarah Platts gave a presentation on the refresh of GIF. Pressure for additional housing was one driver but infrastructure and commercial space were equally important to achieve growth. The GIF methodology emphasised a bottom-up approach, and Kent CC's decision to refresh the GIF in-house would enable more regular updating to ensure currency; and the GIF would also give a more nuanced understanding of phasing and when particular infrastructure pressures would arise. Further work would be needed to address the implications of the draft London Plan on which the Mayor of London was consulting. Another significant work stream was exploring alternative funding mechanisms. KCC would welcome any feedback as the draft is refined: KCC intend to circulate the next revision before Christmas.
- 4.2. In discussion, suggestions from Board Members included ensuring due recognition of Air Quality issues, taking an integrated approach with work on environment strategy and energy strategy. There could be presentational value in including national comparators and also emphasising the message that getting Kent & Medway's infrastructure right was critical to the economic functioning of the North and Midlands as well as the South East. **Action: KS/SP to circulate the next revision of the draft GIF for feedback.** The Chairman thanked Katie and Sarah for their helpful presentation.

#### **Item 5. Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission – Verbal update from Matthew Norwell**

- 5.1. Matthew and Rob Bennett gave feedback from the meeting on 7 December when a group of Leaders and other representatives from the Thames Gateway Strategic Group (TGSG) had met Sir John Armitt (SJA), newly-appointed as the Chairman of the Growth Commission. Matthew circulated three short papers to inform discussion:
  - A note on key messages from the meeting and what these indicated about SJA's likely approach.
  - A draft skeleton of key messages that TGKP might submit to the Commission as input into shaping the draft report.
  - Some key questions for TGKP and other Thames Estuary partners and stakeholders to consider about tactics and process.
- 5.2. There were positive signs about SJA's desire for local partners to make input into, and to buy into, the final report that would be presented to Government. We could expect consultation on a draft around March 2018, with a view to this being finalised in May.
- 5.3. These were early days in terms of SJA's acquaintance with the Thames Estuary area: he had picked up on the potential of extension of Crossrail, and the relatively greater economic benefits likely to accrue to South Essex from the Lower Thames Crossing. SJA was keen to look at shorter time horizons than the original 2050 brief. He had offered rather negative comments about local authorities' ability to deliver large-scale regeneration and Leaders present felt that his perceptions were out of date. It would therefore be crucial to invite SJA (and other Commissioners) to see progress on the ground.
- 5.4. In discussion, Board Members emphasised the importance of conveying how the Thames Estuary differed from the Oxford-Cambridge Corridor which SJA appeared to favour as a blueprint for intervention. It would be important to engage with the consultants supporting the Commission as early as possible in the New Year. The Lower Thames Crossing was clearly a major factor in any construct of the Thames Estuary and it was important for TGKP to come to a clear Partnership view about it, whilst recognising the political and environmental difficulties it presented for some partners. We should also

have regard to the Industrial Strategy White Paper now published by Government in shaping any revised submission. The Board queried how we might work with Essex counterparts, and whether Thanet and Canterbury would be involved (it was understood Canterbury were already talking directly with the Commission Secretariat).

- 5.5. The Board deputed to the Officers' Group to work on the detail, collaborating with TGSG partners as appropriate. **Action: MN.**

**Item 6. TGKP Constitution – paper TGKP(17)15**

- 6.1. The decision to invite Maidstone BC to join TGKP, and their acceptance, would require some changes to the TGKP Constitution. Following a desk-top review, there were also other minor changes which could be made at the same time to bring the Constitution up to date, and the paper summarised the possible changes and the rationale behind them. The Board agreed that the proposed revisions should be referred to the Lead Body for legal services, and discussed in detail by the Officers' Group, to bring final recommendations either to the next Board meeting or circulating these for agreement electronically. **Action: RL.**

**Item 7. Partnership approach to communications – paper TGKP(17)16**

- 7.1. Matthew explained that in the context of the work programme priority on "Positioning North Kent" it was important to review TGKP's approach to communications, including engagement with the media. The paper set out a range of options with greater or lesser resource implications, the recommendation being Option 3 – "getting out there more", which could be pursued partly using in-house resources but would require ad hoc specialist support. The Board was content for proposals to be worked up in more detail through the Officers' Group and a more developed proposition circulated for agreement electronically. The arrangements would in any event be reviewed after 6 months. **Action: MN**

**Item 8. Date of the Next Meeting**

- 8.1. This was set at 4.30pm on 20 February. There had been an indication from Sir John Armit that he would like to attend a meeting of the Board and we might need to flex arrangements to accommodate this. Further advice would be circulated in due course. **Action: MN/RL.**

**Item 9. AOB**

- 9.1. The Chairman noted that this was the last Board meeting Linda Searle would be attending as she was leaving TGKP for a new job with Medway Council. The Board echoed the Chairman's thanks to Linda for her contribution over many years at TGKP.
- 9.2. The meeting ended at 6.35pm.

TGKP

8 January 2018