
Approved Minutes of the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership Board Meeting
held in the Darwin Room, Innovation Centre Medway, from 10.00am to 12.00am on
Thursday 25th September 2014

Board Members and Observers Present:

Rob Bennett, BBP Regeneration (Chair)
Cllr Andrew Bowles, Swale Borough Council
Cllr John Burden, Gravesham Borough Council
Robin Cooper, Medway Council
Cllr Mark Dance, Kent County Council
Cllr Jeremy Kite, Dartford Borough Council
Ann Komzolik, North West Kent College
Naisha Polaine, Homes and Communities Agency
David Simms, Lafarge Tarmac
James Speck, Kent Science Park

Also Present:

Kevin Burbidge, Gravesham Borough Council
Barbara Cooper, Kent County Council
Martin Davies, University of Greenwich
Ross Gill, Kent County Council
Graham Harris, Dartford Borough Council
David Hughes, Gravesham Borough Council
Abdool Kara, Swale Borough Council
David Liston-Jones, Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
Richard Longman, Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
Dr Max Nathan, What Works Centre
Jonathan Sadler, Homes & Communities Agency
Linda Searle, Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
Paul Whittlesea, DCLG

Apologies:

Kamal Aggarwal, Thomson Snell and Passmore
Professor Tom Barnes, University of Greenwich
Cllr Rodney Chambers, Medway Council
Rehman Chishti MP
Neil Davies, Medway Council
Robert Goodman, Bluewater
David Hughes, Gravesham Borough Council
Andrew Pearce, Environment Agency

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1. The Chairman opened the meeting, in particular welcoming James Speck, who was attending his first meeting as a Board member, Dr Max Nathan (Deputy Director of What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth) who was giving a presentation at Item 3, and Jonathan Sadler (HCA) who was giving a presentation at Item 6.
- 1.2. The Chairman congratulated Barbara Cooper on her promotion to Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport at KCC.
- 1.3. As Dr Max Nathan had suffered transport delays, it was agreed Item 3 on the Agenda would take place after Item 5.

2. Minutes of Board Meeting on 14 May 2014 and Matters Arising

- 2.1. The minutes of the 14 May Board Meeting were agreed. On Matters Arising:
 - Page 2, paragraph 2.1 – David L-J said he would welcome suggestions for future Agenda items.
 - Page 4, paragraph 4.4 – actioned. A revised TGKP response had been submitted to the Airports Commission by its 23 May deadline.
 - Page 5, paragraph 5.3 – actioned. CORE was on the agenda for today's meeting.

3. Item 4 – Board Membership – paper TGKP(14)14 by David Liston-Jones

- 3.1. David L-J introduced his paper and advised that changes in Bluewater's ownership had resulted in Robert Goodman now being employed by Land Securities rather than Lend Lease. Under TGKP's Constitution it was the company that was the Board member, with the individual being that company's representative on the Board. Hence for Robert to continue on the Board it would be necessary for Land Securities to become a Board member.
- 3.2. It was argued that Robert Goodman's continued participation in the Board was hugely valuable to the partnership. David explained that the Constitution did not provide a simple mechanism for one private sector Board member to be replaced by another. So, following a brief discussion, **it was agreed** that the permitted number of private sector Board members should be increased from 5 to 6 to enable Land Securities to be invited immediately become a Board member. The arrangements for ending Lend Lease's membership could then be pursued separately.
- 3.3. The Board agreed that Land Securities should be invited to become a private sector Board member, with Robert Goodman as the company's representative. **Action: Rob Bennett to invite Land Securities Group PLC to become a TGKP Board member, with Robert Goodman as**

their representative. The TGKP Constitution to be amended to permit 6 Private Sector Board members.

4. Item 5: Ebbsfleet Development Corporation Consultation – paper TGKP(14)15

4.1. David L-J introduced his paper. He explained that the consultation sought views on the proposed boundaries, planning powers and UDC Board composition. One issue to consider was how wider North Kent interests could be reflected in the UDC Board's membership. The consultation was limited in scope, but did provide an opportunity to make any broader comments. A draft TGKP response for the Board to consider was at Annex B to the paper.

4.2. Points made in discussion included:

- the approach adopted by the Department in involving the local authorities in developing the plans for the UDC had been positive and constructive. All three local authorities – Kent County Council, Dartford Borough Council and Gravesham Council - would have seats on the UDC Board;
- in filling the remaining positions on the Board, the Government and UDC Chairman would not be seeking representatives from particular areas or interests; they would be looking to secure the specific skills and expertise that the Development Corporation needed to achieve its goals. That would not, of course, rule out individuals being appointed that had both the specific skills needed and an understanding and knowledge of the North Kent area. There would no doubt be opportunities for North Kent/TGKP to seek representation on other sub-groups and stakeholder groups;
- this would be an unusual UDC; it would not own the major parcels of land. Providing the infrastructure would be key. The UDC would need to be innovative if it was going to be able to up the pace of delivery significantly;
- it was important to recognise that the implications of the UDC's decisions would have implications far beyond the boundary of the Corporation's area. This point needed to be made in the Partnership's response;
- there was merit in including in the response, as proposed in the draft, some of the principles, such as the importance of achieving high quality in design and construction, that the Partnership would want to see adopted by the UDC;
- the response should include a reference to developing a 'smart' city for the 21st Century with the necessary digital/ICT infrastructure;
- to avoid confusion we should no longer use the term 'Ebbsfleet Valley' and stick to using 'Ebbsfleet Garden City'.

4.3. In terms of other responses to the consultation:

- David Simms said that Lafarge Tarmac and Land Securities were working on a joint response;
 - Barbara Cooper said that KCC was preparing a response on similar lines to the proposed TGKP response. The County Council would also be making a specific point, as the minerals and waste Planning Authority, in relation to the continued health of the wharves.
- 4.4. Summing up the discussion, the **Chairman said that the Board was generally content with the draft response, subject to taking account of the points made in discussion. It was agreed** that the revised response should be signed-off by the Chairman, and did not need to be circulated to the Board again for approval.
- 4.5. **Action: David Liston-Jones to revise the draft response in the light of the Board's comments, submit to the Chairman for approval, and forward the approved response to DCLG by the deadline of 6 October.**
5. **Item 3 – What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth – Presentation by Dr Max Nathan, Deputy Director, What Works Centre.**
- 5.1. The Chair invited Dr Nathan to give his presentation.
- 5.2. Dr Nathan explained that the What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth was a partnership between ARUP, the London School of Economics and Political Science, and the Centre for Cities. The Centre had a short-term, medium-term and long-term programme.
- 5.3. The short-term programme involved a series of reviews looking at the effectiveness of different policy interventions. Areas looked at so far included employment training, business advice and mentoring, sports and cultural events, and access to finance. The aim was to ensure findings were accessible to users and disseminated.
- 5.4. Max said that in the medium term they would continue to carry out evidence reviews of different programmes, and also develop best practice evaluation guidance. In the longer term the Centre wanted to support demonstration projects with local partners and embed robust evidence in the local policy development process. Their remit was to evaluate impact, showing the change in outcome for those in the programme versus change in outcome for those not in the programme.
- 5.5. Max then gave a brief summary of the findings from the evidence reviews carried out to date. [These findings are set out in the presentation slides that have been circulated separately to Board members].
- 5.6. There followed a wide-ranging debate covering questions such as: the weight the Government placed on the Centre's findings; the length of time over which an evaluation should be carried out in order to judge properly the effectiveness of a programme; the risk that having a series of What

Works Centres looking at different policy areas could lead to reinforcing a 'silos' approach; and the confidence the Centre had that its evaluations would continue to be accessible to users in the longer term, given the past experience that some previous sources of good practice advice were no longer available.

- 5.7. Dr Nathan was also asked about the scope for the Partnership collaborating with the What Works Centre on local demonstration projects. He responded that the Centre was keen to work with local partners on a small number of demonstration projects. The Centre could work with the local partner on setting up a particular policy or intervention, help with the policy design and to embed evidence in the policy process.
 - 5.8. **The Chairman** thanked Max Nathan for his presentation, which had sparked an interesting debate. **It was agreed** that the question of whether there was scope for participation in a local demonstration project should be explored further.
 - 5.9. **Action: David Liston-Jones to contact Dr. Nathan to discuss scope for TGKP participation in local demonstration projects.**
- 6. Item 6 – Kent and Medway Economic Assets Advisory Group: programme update – paper by Homes and Communities Agency**
- 6.1. It was reported that the KMEAAG quarterly meeting due to take place prior to today's Board meeting had been cancelled due to likely low attendance and an item had been included instead on the Board's agenda.
 - 6.2. Naisha Polaine sought the Board's views on 3 options for the future of KMEAAG:
 - Advisory Group to meet every six months
 - Include an item about the Economic Assets Programme twice a year on TGKP Board agendas
 - Business carried out via email exchange or 1:2:1 meetings.
 - 6.3. In discussion, it was argued that it was important to have a discussion on the programme twice a year, and that this could be done at TGKP Board meetings. It was also felt that it would be useful to have updates from HCA on their programmes more generally at Board meetings.
 - 6.4. **It was agreed** that there should be a discussion on the Economic Assets Programme twice a year at a convenient TGKP Board meeting. In addition, an update item on HCA programme and activities more generally would be included on every Board agenda. **Action: David Liston-Jones to ensure, in consultation with Naisha Polaine, that items on HCA Economic Assets programme, and on regular HCA Updates, are included on Board meeting agendas as agreed.**

- 6.5. Jonathan Sadler then gave a presentation, expanding on the information contained in the circulated paper, updating the Board on the progress being made on the sites covered by the Economic Assets Programme. In North Kent that included three sites in Dartford – Northern Gateway, Unwins and the Station Mound/Co-op site, Northfleet Embankment in Gravesham, Rochester Riverside and Chatham Maritime in Medway and, and Queenborough and Rushenden in Swale.
 - 6.6. In discussion, HCA were asked whether there had been any revision in the instructions and guidance from Government on how quickly sites should be sold. Naisha responded by saying that whilst the aim was to realise assets from the disposal of sites, this did not mean a ‘fire sale’; the case could be made for investment to improve value.
 - 6.7. The point was made that there would be significant sums being realised from disposals – what scope was there for these receipts being ‘captured’ for new investment in Kent and Medway? Naisha Polaine said that forecast receipts had already been accounted for in DCLG’s baseline.
- 7. Item 7 – Next Steps on the Local Growth Fund - Ross Gill, Kent County Council – verbal update**
- 7.1. Ross Gill said he had recently circulated an email alerting partners to the second round of Local Growth Fund. DCLG/BIS were looking to the LEP to come forward with an indicative list of priorities by 6 October. We had our original list of project priorities produced for the first round, but this could be reviewed. There would be value in the sub-county partnerships producing a shortlist of schemes for their areas. The level of resources to be made available under LGF2 was not yet known, but was expected to be modest, perhaps £20-25 million for Kent and Medway – all capital.
 - 7.2. Resources at this level meant that there would only be scope for a handful of schemes at the Kent and Medway level, which meant no more than two or three projects for North Kent. In discussion it was argued that, given the small number of schemes that could go forward, it was important to select the best projects with the greatest chance of success in meeting the criteria, rather than strive for geographical balance.
 - 7.3. Following a brief discussion it was agreed that a meeting would be arranged quickly for local authority Chief Executives/Regeneration Directors to get together with Ross Gill and the TGKP team to draw up a priority list for North Kent.
 - 7.4. **Action: Ross Gill/David Liston-Jones to convene an urgent meeting with local authority officers to identify small number of priority schemes for North Kent.**
- 8. Item 8 – TGKP Action Plan - paper TGKP(14)16**

- 8.1. Richard Longman advised the paper should be taken as read, subject to any further comments or suggestions. As there was little time for discussion, David L-J asked for any comments on the annex to be emailed to either Richard Longman or himself. **Action: Board members to send any comments on the Action Plan annex to the TGKP team.**
- 9. Item 9 – Kent Centre for Offshore Renewable Engineering (CORE) update**
- Paper TGKP(14)17
- 9.1 Richard Longman advised that this paper was for noting.
- 10. Item 10 – verbal updates on current issues from members**
- 10.1 There were no further updates from members.
- 11. Item 11 – Chief Executive’s Report** – verbal update by David Liston-Jones
- 11.1 David L-J reported that Penny Mordaunt MP had been confirmed as the new Thames Gateway Minister, and that a meeting of the Thames Gateway Strategic Group had now been fixed for 27 October.
- 12. Item 12 - Budget Report** – paper TGKP(14)18
- 12.1 This item was for information only.
- 13. Item 13 – AOB**
- 13.1 Naisha Polaine raised the issue of future Ministerial visits to North Kent. Brandon Lewis, as the Minister responsible for the Garden City had already visited Ebbsfleet on several occasions. It was argued that Penny Mordaunt MP, as the new Minister for the Thames Gateway, should be invited to visit North Kent. **Action: David L-J to draft invitation letter for Rob Bennett to send to Penny Mordaunt inviting her to visit North Kent. Paul Whittlesea to ascertain if Penny Mordaunt MP had any scheduled visits to the area already diarised.**

Thames Gateway Kent Partnership
September 2014