

## SCR - LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON:

THURSDAY, 21 MAY 2020 AT 11.00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Sheffield  
City Region

LOCAL ENTERPRISE  
PARTNERSHIP

---

### Present:

James Muir (Chair)	Private Sector Member
Nigel Brewster (Vice-Chair)	Private Sector
Lucy Nickson (Vice-Chair)	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Alexa Greaves	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Professor Chris Husbands	Representative for Higher Education
Gemma Smith	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Neil MacDonald	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Owen Michaelson	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Peter Kennan	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Richard Stubbs	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Bill Adams	TUC Representative
Professor Dave Petley	University of Sheffield
Councillor Chris Read	Rotherham MBC
Mayor Dan Jarvis MBE	SCR Mayoral Combined Authority
Mayor Ros Jones CBE	Doncaster MBC
Councillor Sir Steve Houghton CBE	Barnsley MBC

### Officers in Attendance:

Dr Dave Smith	Chief Executive	SCR Executive Team
Dr Ruth Adams	Deputy Chief Executive	SCR Executive Team
Noel O'Neill	Chief Finance Officer/S73	Sheffield City Region
Mark Lynam	Director of Transport, Housing and Infrastructure	SCR Executive Team
Sharon Kemp	Chief Executive of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Rotherham MBC
Sarah Norman	Chief Executive	Barnsley MBC
Craig Tyler (Minute Taker)		

### Apologies:

Laura Bennett	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Tanwer Khan	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Councillor Julie Dore	Sheffield City Council
Steve Davenport	
Charlie Adan	Sheffield City Council
Damian Allen	Doncaster MBC

## 1 **Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed members and officers to the first virtual meeting of the SCR LEP Board.

Members' apologies were noted as above.

## 2 **Declarations of Interest**

None.

## 3 **Notes of Last Meeting**

It was agreed the notes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

## 4 **Economic Implications of COVID 19**

A report was received to consider the economic implications of Covid-19 and to present an update on the SCR Economic Recovery Plan.

The report proposed the development of the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Economic Recovery Plan (ERP) is a vitally important move to mitigate the worst effects of the Covid-19 crisis and ensure a strong and timely recovery towards a more resilient economy and society.

It was noted the ERP will set out SCR's primary response to Covid-19 and will be aligned with the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). The ERP will be the bridge to the SEP, in that it will set out the more immediate to medium term actions we need to take.

The meeting considered:

- the alignment of the city regional plan with local district level recovery plans,
- the alignment of the economy with wider societal issues facing places,
- the need to recognise that the actions required to aid recovery have very different timeframes and need to be sequenced correctly for maximum effect
- the importance of flexibility and the need to deploy recovery activity quickly and efficiently

It was suggested the SCR's capability to derive funding for recovery from central government will be enhanced if our asks are ambitious and well communicated, with support evident from all public and private sectors.

RESOLVED, that the Board notes the economic implications and the process proposed to react to the Covid crisis and plan for recovery.

## 5 **Approach to Working with Businesses**

Item restricted.

## **Energy Strategy**

A report was received to present the final draft SCR Energy Strategy for approval. It was confirmed the Strategy as presented encompasses the amendments previously agreed by the LEP Board.

It was proposed that the 'strategy' as presented presents the SCR's ambition and an outline road map for achieving that ambition, rather than being a fully costed strategy per se and will act as a basis for determining where the SCR needs to prioritise effort and investment and in doing so inform our plans.

It was agreed the document presents very good baseline data and is therefore capable of supporting the development of those plans.

The meeting discussed the importance of aligning our energy strategy with our carbon net-zero ambition and where this will need to be evident in our action plans.

It was noted plans will be drafted in a manner which enables supporting new technologies to be pulled in as they become commercially available.

Questions were raised around references to research assets and a request made for the report authors to re-check some of those references.

Action: Mark L to address the questions raised in relation to the research assets.

It was suggested there is still a great deal of intelligence that can be drawn on to support the development of the strategy and plans to ensure it is fully ambitious and requested that all such evidence be submitted as soon as possible for consideration.

The meeting recognised that the strategy needs to be written mindful of the covid pandemic and ensure the thinking of employers in respect of how and when they proposed to return to full operation is captured.

RESOLVED, that the LEP Board notes the SCR Energy Strategy as recommended by the SCR Infrastructure Board and notes the proposed next steps for implementation, including the revisions required ahead of submission to the MCA.

## **LGF Update (year end 19/20 & 20/21 Programme)**

A report was received to inform the Board of the LGF Year end 2019/20 position and set out the 2020/21 LGF programme activity, noting this is the final year of the current six-year LGF programme.

It was reported the 2019/20 position was of 100% spend and delivery and that whilst a 2020/21 grant of £43.2m is expected this year this is still to be formally confirmed by government.

Members thanked the SCR Executive Team for the report and discussed how

there might be more delegated decision making at a local level to speed up our ability to invest LGF funding.

RESOLVED, that the Board:

1. Notes the 2019/2020 Year End position
2. Notes the predicted 2020/21 LGF programme activity

## 8 **Annual Performance Review**

A report was received to present the outcome of the 2019 / 2020 LEP Annual Performance Review.

It was reported that following the conclusion of the Review, it has been confirmed that the Sheffield City Region LEP has attained 'good' for the themes of delivery and governance and 'requirements met' for strategic impact.

RESOLVED, that the Board notes the outcome of the Annual Performance Review.

## 9 **LEP Annual Report 2019-20 and Delivery Plan 2020-21**

A report as received reminding members of the requirement of the LEP Review 2018 that all LEPs are required to publish an end of year report to outline the activities, outputs and achievements that have been delivered in the preceding financial year, and an annual delivery plan of activities for the coming year.

The report therefore presented, for approval, the LEP Annual Report (2019-20) and Delivery Plan (2020-21). It was noted these have been combined into a single document rather than separate documents for ease.

It was noted the document needs to be published by 31<sup>st</sup> May this year and any comments should be received in good time.

Members were asked to note the key achievements listed at section 2.2 of the report.

RESOLVED, that the Board:

1. Endorses the content of the LEP Annual Report (2019-20) and Delivery Plan (2020-21)
2. Delegates final approval of the final document to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair, to comply with the requirement to publish by the 31st May 2020.

## 10 **Mayoral Update**

The Mayor presented the mayoral update and highlighted the key economic matters contained within his report.

The meeting considered matters of finance in more detail and the wider

potential effects of the covid pandemic on local government.

11

## **Chief Executive's Update**

A report was received to provide Members with a general update on activity being undertaken by the LEP.

Questions were received from Cllr Dore who was unable to attend the meeting. Below is the listed questions and responses.

Q. As the Mayor has now set up his Social and Economic Recovery Group; does this cause implications for the LEP Board, undermining its role and the role of the Members of the LEP?

A. The linkages between the work of the LEP Board and the Economic Recovery Group were formalised at the commencement of the Recovery Planning process. The LEP Chair is a Member of the Recovery Group, and as part of this work convenes a business focused sub-group which is led by the LEP Chair / Vice Chairs, with involvement of other Board Members. Private sector LEP Board Members have been invited to provide input to the developing Recovery Plan. Following discussion of this question and response Private Sector Members of the LEP Board did not express any sentiment of their role being undermined.

Q. In a news bulletin from the SCR Mayor it stated that three businesses had had their loans extended. Who were these three companies? Who took the decision to extend the loans and on what basis, what are the implications of extending these loans and which other companies have loans with the SCR? As a matter of courtesy, shouldn't Members of the LEP be informed of these decisions, prior to it being published?

A. The three companies were Gulliver's Valley, DSA and Yorkshire Wildlife Park. There have been no changes to the amount of debt to be repaid or the outcomes to be delivered by these companies as a result of these decisions. It is merely a deferral of the repayment dates. The decision to extend the term of the loan was made by the S73 Officer; The Constitution allowing the Finance Director to determine the standard payment methods that may be used to collect income and responsibility for debt recovery and general sound financial management of the Authority. James Muir writes a briefing for the LEP Private Sector Members each week and advised Private Sector Members of this matter in his briefing on 3rd April 2020. The deferred repayments will be reported to the MCA in the delegated authority report. In response to the question Mayor Jones asked for a further update on the implication of income deferral on the budget. The S73 Officer reported that the loan repayments had not been factored into the profile of the capital programme budget for future spend.

Q. Price Waterhouse Cooper - why was this organisation appointed to work with the SCR, on what basis and for how long? Who made the decision?

A. A tender was issued on the 12th February 2020 for a company to support the work of the LEP in revising the approach to business support

and growth aligned to the approach in the economic plan. The outcome of the procurement process was to award to PWC. Due to the pandemic and potential for a recession and significant economic downturn this work was delayed refocusing energies toward developing an economic recovery plan. SCR utilised the flexibility in the procurement regs linked to COVID (PPN 01/20 (Procurement Policy Note - Responding to COVID-19) published by government), whereby contracting authorities are able to utilise exceptions to public procurement regulations. SCR has made a direct award due to extreme urgency (regulation 32(2)(c) to appoint PWC to support the Economic Recovery Plan, as the successful bidder in a related procurement exercise that had been openly run and awarded and based upon the skillset identified in their winning business support tender. The decision was made to award the additional deliverable to PWC by the Statutory Officers utilising their delegated authority as set out in the Constitution.

The meeting discussed how the Covid pandemic might impinge on both revenue and capital budgets and treasury management activity.

Action: Noel to circulate further information to members to explain how LGF loan repayments are factored into budget forecasting.

I, the undersigned, confirm that this is a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Signed .....

Name .....

Position .....

Date .....