

Thames Gateway Kent Partnership Board

APPROVED Minutes of the TGKP Board Meeting held in Sunderland Room, Innovation Centre Medway, on 18th February 2019.

Present:

Board members and observers

Rob Bennett, BBP Regeneration (Chair)
Cllr Andrew Bowles, Swale Borough Council
Cllr Rodney Chambers, Medway Council
Cllr Martin Cox, Maidstone Borough Council
Cllr Mark Dance, Kent County Council

Also present:

Alison Broom, Maidstone Borough Council
Neil Davies, Medway Council
David Hughes, Gravesham Borough Council
Graham Harris, Dartford Borough Council
Johanna Howarth, Kent County Council
Richard Longman, TGKP
Matthew Norwell, TGKP
David Smith, Kent County Council
Emma Wiggins, Swale Borough Council

Apologies:

Cllr Jeremy Kite, Dartford Borough Council
Cllr David Turner, Gravesham Borough Council
Kamal Aggarwal, Thomson, Snell and Passmore
Robert Goodman, Land Securities/Bluewater
Paul Jackson, Dovetail Games
Mark Heeley, Tarmac
Ian Piper, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation
Rehman Chishti, Member of Parliament

Ann Komzolik, North Kent College
Carole Barron, University of Kent
Richard Penn, Environment Agency
Paul Kitson, Homes and Communities Agency
Iain McNab, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Sarah Nurden, Kent County Council
Adam Bryan, South East Local Enterprise Partnership

Action

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1. The Chairman welcomed those present and noted apologies as shown above.

Item 2. Minutes of the Board Meeting and 18th Annual General Meeting held on 13th December 2018, and matters arising – TGKP 190218(1a) and (1b).

1.2. The minutes of the AGM were agreed. On matters arising:

1.2.1. Budget. The Chairman asked KCC to clarify its position on its subscription to TGKP for 2018/19 and 2019/20. At a recent Kent Leaders' meeting, Maidstone BC had queried whether and why KCC had indicated they were halving their subscription. It was understood the Leader of KCC had remarked that could not be right and that David Smith had undertaken to sort this out. It was noted, however, that KCC's approved budget for 2019/20 did not include provision for the full TGKP subscription; and no subscription had yet actually been paid despite the invoice having been issued in August 2018. Board Members commented that the uncertainty over funding put the TGKP team in an unfair position, as well as preventing the Board from agreeing the following year's budget.

Actions:

- **Cllr Dance would chase up payment of the 2018/19 subscription.** **MD**
- **The Chairman would seek clarification from the Leader of KCC as to his understanding and intentions.** **RB**

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| | Action |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat would re-circulate copies of the minutes of the 2017 and 2018 Board meetings where this was previously discussed. | MN |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swale BC would seek advice from MidKent on the HR implications. | EW |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat would produce and circulate an illustration of what effect a reduced KCC contribution would have over future years. | MN/RL |

1.3. The minutes of the TGKP Board meeting were agreed. On matters arising:

1.3.1. Private Sector Board Members. Matthew and Rob had met with Daniel Ghinn and commended him to the Board to fill one of the PSBM vacancies. It was agreed that Matthew would circulate a biographical note to Board Members and in the absence of any objections, Daniel would be invited to attend the 3 June meeting as an Observer with a view to his membership of the Board being ratified then.

Actions:

- | | |
|---|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MN to circulate Daniel Ghinn’s biography. | MN |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Board Members to provide feedback within the deadline set. | All |

1.3.2. High Streets & Town Centres. Richard reported that all TGK authorities seemed to be considering bids to the Future High Streets Fund. We were keen to explore whether TGKP could add value to authorities’ bids. To date no draft bids or firm ideas had been shared. MHCLG were hosting a workshop for potential bidders in the Thames Estuary area on 22nd February. Johanna added that for two-tier areas letters of support would be needed from the County Council. KCC was keen to give such support and awaited sight of draft bids with interest.

Actions:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authorities submitting FHSF bids were encouraged to share these with the TGKP Team and with Johanna Howarth with a view to getting expressions of support. | NK LAs |
|---|---------------|

Item 3. Kent & Medway Enterprise & Productivity Strategy – Johanna Howarth

3.1. Johanna summarized the background to this initiative, including the procurement of Arups to provide consultancy input. Arups were assembling the evidence base against which to test propositions for strategic interventions. The current approach is centred around three strands: Business, People and Place. A first draft report had been received: this needed more penetrating and locally-informed analysis. JH intended stakeholder engagement to include four policy areas: skills & employability; business support (working with the Growth Hub Steering Group); Innovation; and Infrastructure. The analytical and engagement work could continue during Purdah but care would be needed to avoid exposing politically contentious issues.

3.2. In discussion the following points were noted:

3.2.1. The strategy needed to support delivery of inclusive growth. The analysis needed to capture and reflect the diverse demographics across Kent & Medway. Some useful work had been done by Joseph Rowntree Foundation which the consultants should be asked to consider. **Action: JH to explore further with Maidstone BC**

JH

Action

3.2.2. Stakeholders would need clear exposition of how this work related to and complemented the Local Industrial Strategy work led by SELEP.

3.2.3. Cross-boundary issues would need to be carefully considered, particularly with London – recognizing that the 2050 horizon does not map across to the London Plan period (to 2031) nor with SELEP or Essex planning horizons.

3.2.4. On skills clarity was needed about whether the focus of interventions would be with residents or workforce. Historically most approaches have been provider-led.

Actions:

- **JH to re-circulate email request for feedback on Board Members' perspectives of key opportunities and challenges.** JH
- **All to provide feedback within deadline set.** All

Item 4. Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission – Matthew Norwell

4.1. Matthew advised that informal feedback from Cities & Local Growth Unit suggested the Government's response to the TEGC Report was unlikely any time soon. The question for Thames Estuary partners was whether to proceed with our own proposals or wait for the Government's response. In the meantime, Seven Hills (PR consultancy) had been commissioned by KCC to develop branding and place promotion material to add some of the 'spark' missing from the TEGC report.

4.2. In discussion the following points were made:

4.2.1. The emerging Seven Hills proposition offered two 'routes': one focusing on the Estuary, and the other on its connection to London. It may be that either route could be appropriate depending on different audiences, but KCC (via David Godfrey) were keen to know Leaders' preferences.

4.2.2. Clarity was needed on how the Seven Hills work might link to wider Thames Estuary positioning, including the Thames Estuary Production Corridor. David Godfrey was setting up a separate discussion with Essex counterparts.

4.2.3. It would be important for the Seven Hills assignment to reach closure with clear next steps.

Actions:

- **Ask Seven Hills to re-circulate their slide pack in a manageable file size.** RL
 - **Any comments on the slide pack to be sent to David Godfrey.** All
 - **Members asked to see the commissioning brief given to the consultants: KCC to provide this.** JH/DS
- 4.3. On the TEGC position more generally, the Board was cautious about taking definite steps to put pan-Estuary arrangements before seeing the Government's response and clarity about any resources that might be committed to deliver on recommendations. The Chair was keen that momentum be maintained particularly on issues where there was consensus across Kent and Essex.
- 4.4. Mark Dance was concerned to ensure Thanet and Canterbury were fully meshed into the North Kent and wider Thames Estuary discussions. Matthew confirmed that dialogue was underway and in addition both authorities' Chief Executives were

Action

being invited on a 3-month trial basis to attend the TGK Officers' Group (from 18th March), with the position to be reviewed thereafter. **Action: MN to issue formal meeting invitations.**

MN

Item 5. Thames Estuary Production Corridor and Cultural Development Fund CDF) – TGKP 190218(2)

5.1. Matthew updated the Board. Finishing touches were being made to the Regeneris report, which was expected to be formally launched post-May elections. This contained 11 recommendations, seven of which are supported by the components of the CDF package (in Kent and Essex only). The CDF partners were scoping each work stream in more detail, including budget profiling. This would be circulated to the Board for information when the information had been fleshed out. This would be an agenda item for the June TGKP Board meeting – **Action: Matthew.**

MN

5.2. Alison asked about the oversight arrangements for the CDF programme. Matthew envisaged different arrangements would be put in place to fit the purposes of each work stream. He would be presenting a paper to the 22nd March SELEP Strategic Board meeting which would include proposals for governance and delivery. Colleagues should use Matthew as the point of contact for any queries.

Item 6. TGKP Work Programme – Review and future priorities – TGKP 190218(3)

6.1. The paper prepared by Matthew and Richard gave a summary of progress against the main headings of the existing work programme and suggested a revised structure for a new outline work programme under four main headings.

6.2. In discussion, the following points were noted:

6.2.1. Strand 1 should avoid reference to 'campaigning' because of restrictions affecting local authorities. Lobbying or promotional activity would be acceptable: a campaigning edge might be developed in partnership with Locate in Kent and Visit Kent (since they are not bound by the same local government rules).

6.2.2. The focus on high streets might embrace more of a 'smart cities' flavor, possibly working with the Future Cities Catapult.

6.2.3. Andrew Bowles referred to a presentation given to the District Councils' Network by Bill Grimsey, which provided sobering food for thought about the future high street presence of existing retailers and banks. **Action: RL to source a link to the presentation and circulate (NB Not yet on DCN website).**

RL

6.2.4. Subject to these observations, the Board was in principle content with the outline and invited Matthew to develop this in more detail as appropriate. It was noted, however, that the programme would need to be reviewed in the light of resource and budget considerations.

Item 7. AOB

7.1.1. Alison drew attention to Maidstone BC's bid for ERDF funding towards construction of the proposed Innovation Centre at Kent Medical Campus, due to be considered by the SELEP ESIF Sub-Committee on 7 March. An expression of support from TGKP would be appreciated: the Board was content that a letter should be sent on its behalf.

Action: RL prepare a letter of support.

Item 8. Dates of Board Meetings in 2019

- 8.1. The next meeting on 3 June was timed for 4.30pm start. Andrew Bowles queried whether the 2.30 start time (as today) was a barrier for private sector members. The Chair promised to explore this further, including broaching options for breakfast meetings.
- 8.2. The meeting concluded at 4.30pm.

TGKP, 27 February 2019