

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Economic Development Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 8 November 2012.

PRESENT: Mr M A Wickham (Chairman), Mr N J Collor (Vice-Chairman), Mr K A Ferrin, MBE, Mrs E Green, Mr S J G Koowaree (Substitute for Mr T Prater), Mrs J P Law, Mr R A Pascoe, Mr K Smith, Mrs E M Tweed and Mrs C J Waters

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms B Cooper (Director of Economic Development), Mrs T Bruton (Head of Regeneration Projects), Mr R Gill (Economic Policy and Strategy Manager), Ms J Hansen (Finance Business Partner BSS), Mr N Smith (Head of Development and Investments), Mr Baillie (Skills and Employability Manager (Mid)), Mr S Charman (Head of Consultation and Engagement) and Mrs C A Singh (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

33. Membership

(Item 2)

1. The Chairman read out a statement from the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Mr Dance, in his absence, and then gave his own tribute to Mr Snelling's work on this Committee. The Committee then stood in silence in memory of Mr Snelling.

2. RESOLVED that:-

- a) Mr Prater's appointment to the Committee to fill the vacancy for the Liberal Democrat Group be noted; and
- b) following the sad death of Mr M V Snelling there was a vacancy on this Cabinet Committee for the Conservative Group.
- c) Members of the Committee asked that their sincere condolences be forwarded to Mr Snelling's family.

34. Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2012

(Item 5)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September were correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

35. Future Meeting Dates - 2013

(Item 6)

RESOLVED that the future meeting dates for 2013 be noted as follows:

Wednesday, 9 January
Friday, 19 April
Friday, 14 June

Friday, 20 September
Thursday, 7 November

(All meeting will commence at 10.00 am)

36. Incubators/Start Ups Workspace Programme

(Item B1)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Ms B Cooper, Director Economic Development)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of Economic Development, Ms Cooper, to introduce the report and Members considered the recommendations.

2. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Development would be asked to make a decision on taking the proposed programme forward, as set out in paragraphs 1.1 to 1.4 of this report be noted, and
- b) the Economic Development Cabinet Committee endorsed the proposed decision to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Development.

37. Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio Financial Monitoring 2012/13

(Item C1)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development, Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support)

(Ms J Hansen, Finance Business Partner, Business Strategy and Support was present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Finance Business Partner, Ms Hansen, to introduce the report. Ms Hansen advised that an update on the first quarter's monitoring report 2012/13 was submitted in the monitoring exception report to Cabinet on 15 October 2012, on which this report was based.

2. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the Cabinet Committee thanked Ms Hansen for all the work carried out on the budget; and
- b) the revenue and capital forecast variances from budget for 2012/13 based on the first quarter's full monitoring to Cabinet and the subsequent exception report, be noted.

38. 2012/13 Half-Year Monitor Report

(Item C2)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support)

(Ms J Hansen, Finance Business Partner, Business Strategy and Support, was present for this item)

RESOLVED that the mid year 2012/13 Business Plan monitoring be noted.

39. Consultation on 2013/14 Revenue Budget

(Item D1)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development, Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support and Mr A Wood, Corporate Director for Business Strategy and Support)

(Ms J Hansen, Finance Business Partner, Business Strategy and Support and Mr S Charman, Head of Consultation and Engagement, were present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Finance Business Partner, Ms Hansen, to introduce the report. Ms Hansen gave a summary of the consultation process which included; 2 workshops with 80 residents and 416 responses to the questionnaire. The Economic Development Budget Informal Member Group (IMG) met on 11 September and 17 October when they focussed on the largest areas of the budget and were given the opportunity to meet with Mr Wookey, Chief Executive, Local Enterprise Kent, at the second meeting. Members of the IMG concluded at those meetings that they would recommend to the Cabinet Committee that the budget should remain at the same level as 2012/13 for 2013/14. Mr Charman added that an analysis of the consultation responses would be ready for submission to Cabinet on 16 November.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

- a) It was considered that there was a link between this consultation and Grow for it: East Kent regarding economic prosperity.
- b) A request was made for a report to be submitted to the January meeting of this Cabinet Committee on the consultation results. Mr Charman agreed to forward the result of the consultation outside the meeting when they were available for publication.
- c) A Member suggested that the Cabinet Committee used the evidence gathered by the Budget IMG such as jobs/wealth creation and data on cost per job to strengthen the case for the budget remaining the same.
- d) A Member considered the response to the consultation extraordinarily low and asked whether there was a view why that was. Mr Charman advised that the figure of 416 responses was higher than in the previous year. He explained that the Budget Consultation for 2013/14 was launched in September 2012. There had been a county wide media

campaign. Public Meetings were held through the locality Boards and county based Forums and Ipsos Mori, Market Research Company, also held Focus Groups with a random selection of participants.

- e) In response to a question, the Director of Economic Development agreed to forward information outside the meeting about attendance at *Le Marché International des Professionnels de l'immobilier* (MIPIM), by Locate in Kent and how it offered Value for Money.
- f) A suggestion was made that the County needed to be shown in its best light eg business parks being used as lorry parks should be stopped as this could put off potential investors in the areas Mr Wookey would be promoting.
- g) Members agreed to the suggestion from Mr Wookey that KCC invests in attracting foreign investment from USA and Europe, following the demise of SEEDA, and that this recommendation be included in the submission to the Cabinet Committee.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the budget consultation process and that full analysis of responses will be presented to Cabinet in December be noted; and
- c) that the EDCC Budget IMG recommendation that the Economic Development budget remains at its current level for 2013/14 financial year and Mr Wookey's request that KCC looks to invest in attracting foreign investment from USA and Europe be endorsed by the Economic Development Cabinet Committee for its submission to Cabinet at its meeting on 3 December.

40. Business Planning Priorities 2013/14

(Item D2)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of Economic Development, Ms Cooper, to introduce the report. Ms Cooper highlighted the 3 core economic development and regeneration priorities/objectives as set out in *Delivering Bold Steps and Unlocking Kent's Potential*. 1. *Encouraging Business Growth* – How KCC would continue to support business growth including promoting international trade. 2. *Developing Strategy and Partnerships* – KCC would continue to work with key Partners including Borough and District Councils especially on Grow for it: East Kent and the Thames Gateway and 3. *Delivering Infrastructure and Housing* – KCC would progress the BDUK broadband project for the whole of Kent; noted that the tender process has begun and KCC was adhering to its published timescales. Work would continue on the delivery of new housing, especially with “unlocking” sites to deliver infrastructure and regeneration projects to support economic growth.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) In response to a question on whether the sectors were fit for purpose Ms Cooper advised that the sectors were right at the time they were set out in 2012/13. KCC was now extending the reach of its conversations to include advanced manufacturers; creative and digital growth. Ms Cooper considered that the sectors would be further defined. From the conversation sessions businesses had appreciated being able to network with KCC acting as the facilitator. Mr Smith mentioned Skills and whether this area would be included in Economic Developments Business Plan or left to the Education, Learning and Skills Directorate. Ms Cooper stated that stronger links had been forged with ELS so that both services could direct resources to shared objectives.
- b) A comment was made that there needed to be flexibility within KCC Directorates to work with one another to bring more investment into Kent eg Culture and Sports Unit and Trading Standards. Ms Cooper advised that Economic Development already worked closely with the Culture and Sports Unit, offering advice on how sports and arts can generate jobs.
- c) A suggestion was made that the number of people employed and their spend per year be included in the report.
- d) In response to a question, the Director of Economic Development agreed to report back outside the meeting on what KCC could do/was doing to support Job Centre staff being trained to be able to “sell” the range of jobs they had available.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- (b) the headline priorities for the Business Plan 2013-14, as set out in the report be noted.

41. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Levers for Growth update

(Item D3)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support)

(Mr N Smith, Head of Development, was present for this item)

1. The Chairman invited the Head of Development, Mr Smith, to introduce the report. Mr Smith advised Members of the changes to secure the necessary funding and provision of infrastructure for new developments through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Kent was in a transition period from the old system for securing developer contributions through section 106s, planning obligations and the new regime under CIL. He advised that advocates of the new Levy say that it was necessary because it offered consistency and transparency and therefore could

speed up the planning process. He highlighted that critics of the process pointed out that the new process was borne in a time of economic prosperity and relatively strong land values.

2. Mr Smith explained three fundamental points to CIL. 1. That the District and Borough Councils were “charging authorities”. They were responsible for setting local priorities, collecting money and where appropriate redistributing that money. 2. CIL was available for strategic infrastructure. Significantly the viability needed to be taken into account when setting charging schedules for CIL - a level of CIL can not be set that would inhibit a development coming forward. 3. There was an obligation to hand a meaningful proportion of CIL to Neighbourhood Funds, ie Parish and Town Councils although the level had yet to be defined.

3. In the past 18 months, KCC had worked to produce finance modelling in the form of “Integrated Infrastructure and Finance Model” (IIFM), which sets out the need for KCC services against housing trajectories. This provided the evidence base for KCC services and therefore assisted and supported the District and Borough Councils to produce the infrastructure delivery plans and the charging schedules.

4. There was a CIL pilot involving KCC, Dover District and Ashford Borough Councils. This Pilot would include looking at sharing best practise and scenario testing.

5. KCC had undertaken some early financial modelling showing likely income through CIL and New Homes Bonus against infrastructure requirements. Although the figures were draft it was clear that there could be significant funding gaps in North Kent and East Kent.

6. KCC was meeting with individual District and Borough Councils to help determine local priorities and to identify difficult decisions that would need to be resolved. The issues had also been discussed at the Kent Forum.

7. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

a) A comment was made that it was difficult to determine what the gaps were in infrastructure because there was so little development taking place.

b) A Members sought a response to two questions; 1. What level of development was being assumed and 2. What level of development had to be supported through CIL.

c) It was considered unclear what definition was being use for the term “infrastructure”.

d) In response to the comments and questions in (a), (b) and (c) above, Ms Cooper explained that it was inevitable that the figures put forward in the report would be incorrect as there would be different assumptions made by each local council. The graphs appended to the report show that there was a funding gap. The Integrated Infrastructure and Finance Model (IIFM) collected information on indigenous growth and new growth though to 2026 as provided by each Borough and District Council. Based on indigenous growth, funding

for schools would also be taken into account of in those figures. The model gave a breakdown of schools, communities, Adult Social Care and all other services provided by KCC. KCC then added in transport and at the same time the Borough and District Councils identified other services they required eg Police, Health etc.

The report shows KCC's service requirements and, even using those services alone, there was a funding gap. The Government was saying that local government had the growth levers available in order to fund the infrastructure for growth. Ms Cooper explained that KCC was showing, that even committing if all the New Homes Bonus and CIL there was a funding gap, particularly as you travelled East through the County.

The Leaders would be able to argue that Kent still had ambitions for growth in Dover, Ashford, and Thames Gateway, however, it was not possible to fund this growth even using 100% of the Homes Bonus and CIL as there was still a funding gap.

Ms Cooper explained that meetings with the Borough and District councils had begun.

e) In response to a question, Ms Cooper advised that to date a meeting had been held with Dartford Borough Council whilst others had been arranged. The issues raised included; whether there was a CIL levy on energy, waste facilities and how were affordable homes to be funded. Ms Cooper said that for KCC the most important infrastructure to fund would be roads and schools. The question would then be; what would happen to the community aspects, where did affordable housing fit in?

Ms Cooper and Mr Smith agreed to keep the Cabinet Committee informed of the outcomes of the meetings held with the District and Borough Councils.

8. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members and the report be noted with thanks; and
- b) the Cabinet Committee be kept informed of progress.

42. Apprenticeships and Job Creation

(Item D4)

(Report by Ms D Dunn, Head of Skills and Employability)

(Mr A Baillie, Skills and Employability Manager (Mid) was present for this item)

1. The Skills and Employability Manager, Mr Baillie, introduced the report highlighting key points in the report and advised that the up to date figures on apprenticeships were due to be published this week.

2. Members made comments and asked questions which included the following:

- a) A Member praised the report and the work undertaken since the apprenticeships function moved to the Education, Learning and Skills portfolio and the partnership Economic Development was forging with Education, Learning and Skills on this function.

- b) A comment was made that there was still work to be done to increase the number of apprenticeships; look at where the service was going; and looking at apprenticeships in a holistic way. Mr Baillie advised that the potential for apprenticeships was being looked into. There would have to be a considerable shift in thinking to consider offering for example a level 3 apprenticeship instead of the pupil sitting "A" levels. He considered that there was potential to do this as companies such as Microsoft already offered level 3 apprenticeships in software engineering, which he felt would make the apprentice very employable perhaps more so than sitting A levels.
- c) In reply to a question, Mr Baillie explained that apprenticeships were different to how they were viewed years ago. Apprenticeships were varied now. Work had been carried out over the past year and a report written on the types of apprenticeships. He advised that apprenticeships were carried out for a minimum of a year before a qualification such as a NVQ level 2 was gained.
- d) In reply to a question, Mr Baillie considered that it was important for apprenticeships to have a robust framework, and good quality training. Mr Baillie advised that the term apprenticeship was used broadly and perhaps more broadly than it should be. The Skills and Employability Team were working with employers on what apprenticeship meant now and what level the apprentice would be working at to gain employment. The Member responded saying that it was important that apprenticeships retained their credibility.
- e) Mrs Law agreed to send Mr Baillie information on work being carried out in Herne Bay with those young people Not in Education Employment or Training (NEETs).
- f) In response to a question, Mr Baillie advised that apprenticeships were often viewed as a solution to NEETs and it was not the solution as many did not have the qualifications required to gain an apprenticeship, therefore there was work to be undertaken to prepare those young people to enter a level 2 apprenticeship.
- g) In reply to a question, Mr Braille advised that the local authority had a duty after the apprenticeship was completed to track those young people up to the age of 19 years. One of the key indicators from the 14-24 Learning and Employment and Skills Strategy was to progress more young people from level 2 (equivalent to GCSE level) to level 3 (equivalent to A level). Some employment sectors such as engineering required level 3 whereas hairdressing and construction employment could be gained with level 2. The criteria of one year as a minimum for an apprenticeship was brought in this year but the majority of apprenticeships were for 18 months to 2 years and often led into level 3 apprenticeships.

3. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and
- b) the Economic Development Committee noted that in order to deliver the targets within the 14-24 Learning, Employment and Skills Strategy by 2015, the Skills and Employability Service will:
 - Integrate all apprenticeship work undertaken by KCC into the “Kent Jobs for Kent young people” campaign.
 - Develop further the strong relationships with partners, including NAS, KATO, KAFEC and JCP, and any training providers that cover Kent through national funding programmes.
 - Develop a delivery model of the Skills and Employability Service to promote an all embracing “Apprenticeship Advisory Service” that supports all employers and all young people to access apprenticeships.
 - Continue to work closely with district councils, and other organisations that are promoting apprenticeships, to ensure a consistent message is given to young people and employers about the value of apprentices.
 - Develop a closer link with employers and training providers that offer apprenticeships within the KCC key sectors, and link them into sector conversations and other KCC sector actions.
 - Take a strategic lead on the development of apprenticeship pathways through the growth in provision of Higher Apprenticeships in partnership with NAS.
 - Develop employability programmes to equip all young people to be ready to access an apprenticeship. This will include regular work experience for all young people studying post-16.
 - Be more proactive in identifying national funding opportunities that can add value to KCC apprenticeship work, and ensure we link in with existing initiatives.

43. Visit Kent - Feedback from Presentation and Member visits

(Item D5)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Ms T Bruton, Head of Regeneration Projects)

1. The Chairman explained that as part of the Cabinet Committee looking at tourism in Kent, arrangements were made for the Committee to attend Tours arranged with Visit Kent on Friday, 12 October, covering West Kent and Tuesday, 16 October covering East Kent. He commended the arrangements made by the Chief Executive, Visit Kent, Mrs Matthews Marsh, and her team for the visits provided. He thanked those businesses involved with Visit Kent who attended and gave presentations. He advised that during discussions there were issues raised as indicated in the report that included planning issues which had an impact on tourism developing an offer.

2. Mrs Tweed gave her thanks for the arrangements of the visits. Mrs Tweed attended that first visit and explained that Members were advised, at Leeds Castle, of plans by Maidstone Borough Council to build warehouses and light industry in the area of Mercury Hotel [formerly Great Danes]. Mrs Tweed stressed that Leeds Castle was a “jewel in the crown” for Kent and it would not remain that way if people had to drive through light industry. The Mercury Hotel benefitted from tourism

brought by Leeds Castle. She sought Members support in putting pressure on Maidstone Borough Council against this proposal. She asked Members to consider the detriment this could have on what generated a large tourism income to Kent and the fact that they were major employers and crucial to the County.

3. The Chairman mentioned that both Port Lympne and Buckmore Park had issues with planning applications too. Port Lympne had been issued with conditions where it was unable to operate at a certain time of year and for Buckmore Park neighbouring home owners had put forward objections to plans that it had submitted.

4. Mr Smith suggested that when the Borough Council considered planning applications information regarding how the application would affect the local economy was not included as it was not a consideration for the planning application eg the local jobs it would create or the money it would generate. Ms Cooper advised that KCC, through the Head of Development, Mr N Smith, was usually involved when developers sought assistance when they were having difficulty with planning applications, to see if KCC was able to unlock the problem by discussing the economic impact their development would have with the Borough Council but recognised KCC was not the local planning authority. Ms Cooper advised that there had been a suggestion to the Kent Planning Officers that they look at the economic impact of planning applications on a consistent basis to assess how many jobs were created by developing a common methodology that could be use across Kent.

5. It was advised that during the visit to East Kent the issue of good hotels being available in the Dover area was raised. A Member considered that unless KCC intervened with creating a hotel and conference facility in East Kent through a joint development with a major international hotel chain it would not happen. Ms Cooper advised that KCC had funded two hotels through the Regional Growth Fund RGF and a formal announcement would be made on 28 November 2012. She explained that Kent had a need for top quality hotels and quirky hotels. There were hotel chains that would like to develop but they did not want the development costs. Ms Cooper suggested that the Rendezvous site may offer KCC an opportunity, as the land owner, to create a joint development but the market had to be right.

6. RESOLVED that:-

- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted;
- b) the key perceptions and outcomes of the fact finding tours be noted; and
- c) Mrs Sandra Matthews-Marsh, Chief Executive, Visit Kent, be invited to provide an update to the Cabinet Committee during 2013/14.

44. Visit Kent and Locate in Kent Service Level Agreements

(Item D6)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development, Ms B Cooper, Director for Economic Development)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of Economic Development to introduce the report.

2. A Member referred to page 60, paragraph 4.3 of the report that suggested ways that Visit Kent illustrated performance standards. He gave Members the example of Ms Sarah Wood, “Self Catering Homes” business, which provided 5 star self catering holidays, who Members met at the visit East Kent. Ms Wood advised Members that since adding Turner Art Gallery to her list of attractions in the area, her business income had risen by over £90k. He considered that this was the evidence Visit Kent should produce rather than the Cambridge model. Ms Cooper explained that the two Service Level Agreements for Visit Kent and Locate in Kent were being discussed.

3. *Visit Kent* – Ms Cooper advised that during discussions with Visit Kent the Trim Index was mentioned, where East Kent Scored 74 with an average of 93 and the rest of Kent was 83. KCC was asking for Visit Kent to identify how these scores could be improved. Visit Kent had been asked to look at national trends and forecasts to see how Kent had performed against other areas on growth.

4. *Locate in Kent* - Ms Cooper advised that, similarly, Locate in Kent had a raft of criteria many of which were still relevant including; what investment and how many jobs it was bringing into Kent and where. Ms Cooper suggested that it would be possible to look at the fine grain of those indicators. A detailed report would be submitted to the January meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

5. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions raised by Members and the priorities for the new Service Level Agreements for Visit Kent and Locate in Kent as outlined in paragraph 4 and the timetable set out in paragraph 5 of the report be noted.

45. Grow for it: East Kent - Presentation by Seven Hills Group (Charlotte Hastings, PR Consultant)
(Item D7)

(Presentation by Mrs C Hastings, Seven Hills PR Consultancy)

1. The Chairman invited the Director of Economic Development, Ms Cooper, to give an introduction. Ms Cooper advised the following:

- Kent County Council was funding a innovative investment campaign for East Kent to exploit all opportunities it had including the £35m RGF offering 0%, Discovery Park and available employment land.
- Mrs Hasting had been working on this campaign since its inception and it was felt important for the Economic Development Cabinet Committee to receive the progress before it was launched on 28 November at 6.30 pm at Dover Cruise Terminal.

2. A Member sought clarification as to why the Economic Development Cabinet Committee Members had not been invited to the launch due to take place in Dover. Ms Cooper gave her assurance that all Members of this Cabinet Committee were on the list of invitees and should have received an invitation.

3. Mrs Hastings then gave her presentation using overheads and a short campaign video to explain the work undertaken on the campaign. This included the following:

- Research Phase – This included a series of interviews and focus groups with stakeholders in the region to get their views. 60-70 were spoken to amongst the 4 district councils as part of this process and a clear pattern emerged which formed the basis of the recommendations for the campaign going forward.
- A positioning workshop – This meant creating key messages that would be used in advertising, the media etc ensuring that East Kent's assets were clearly vocalised.
- There were two launch events planned; 28 November, this would be a preview event for everyone to have an sight of the campaign, with a guest speaker Mr Doug Richard and 29 November with an event starting at St Pancras travelling down to East Kent College.
- The three key assets that East Kent had to promote itself were; (1) *connectivity* – train links to France and London high-speed rail network had made a difference, (2) *value for money* - In terms of a residential and commercial costs and (3) *lifestyle* - heritage and creative communities, which all offered opportunity and choice.
- Mrs Hastings read out the campaign story, which was going to be told to the press and people outside the region. “ *East Kent was a vibrant exciting place in which to start and grow a business, rich in heritage and natural beauty and offers a flexibility environment for living and working. its modern infrastructure keeps you connected to London and the continent bringing you closer to key commercial markets and business opportunities. Low cost and access to significant investment provide outstanding value while its creative hubs, excellent facilities allow you to build a winning business*”.
- There were four sectors that were the focus of the campaign - creative and digital, tourism, green tech and life sciences.
- Mrs Hasting advised that “Faces of the Campaign” had been chosen and included Mark Sargent of Rock Salt restaurant, Folkestone, Andrew Park of Cognitive Media, Folkestone Simon Westbrook, Tetrad Biotechnology, Folkestone and Shaa Wasmund, Smarta.com.
- An advertising campaign was to be rolled to London Underground stations and on London buses.
- A website was being developed in conjunction with Kent County Council which would be available at the launch.
- An events calendar had been produced. The target audience included regional stakeholders, entrepreneurs and SMEs in the region.
- Discussions were taking place with various people to bring their events to the region including “Start Up Britain” an initiative supported by major corporate such as Microsoft that were supporting young businesses.
- Mrs Hastings advised that next week would be Global Entrepreneur Week, when many events would held in all four East Kent Areas.
- Events would be held in the first 4 months of 2013 on green technologies, biotech and digital which would include a series of debates being held on those sectors.
- A major event would be held in March 2013 on Coastal tourism.

- A campaign bus was being created with a number of services including offering advice on regional growth funding and mentoring advice for young businesses.
- Mrs Hastings then spoke about the Media campaign.

4. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:

- a) In answer to a question, Mrs Hastings agreed to enquire and report back on whether the music accompanying the campaign video was produced by a local musician from East Kent.
- b) A Member commented that it was right to go to where the investors were but there was a challenge with converting this message locally. The expectation was built up but local people had to be aware of what was being done to promote their region. The launch events would help. The campaign needed to be networked in the districts and the surrounding areas with the local ambassadors. It was suggested that the organisers of the campaign needed to understand what was happening in rural East Kent. Mrs Hastings explained that Seven Hills had done its utmost to involve all stakeholders in the region in the campaign. She advised that she had a meeting with Dover District Council following this meeting. Everyone's input was appreciated and the key to the campaign was having a better understanding of the region. Ms Cooper reminded Members that there was a presentation on the campaign held in Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone, two months ago. All Chief Executives and Leaders of the District Councils and others were invited. Seven Hills had produced a news letter and another was due to be issued. There would also be a website where there would be wider communication.
- c) In reply to a question, Mrs Hastings agreed to add Lydd Airport to the refreshed presentation.
- d) In response to a question, Mrs Hastings agreed to look at another winning aspect other than Folkestone Racecourse.
- e) In reply to a comment that the map shown of London and Europe should be on a larger scale to show the connectivity from Kent. Mrs Hastings agreed with the observations regarding the presentation and asked Members to take it as an illustrative view as it had been evolving over a few months and advised that by the launch event the material would be refreshed.
- f) A Member considered that there needed to be a strong link with Visit Kent, the County Council and the District councils to ensure the areas were presented well including cutting back hedging/trees that the signage was visible and potholes filled etc.
- g) In reply to a question, Mrs Hastings advised that discussions had been held with South Eastern trains regarding them branding their trains in East Kent with "Grow for it" but the trains had already been named after Olympic Athletes.

- h) In response to a question, Mrs Hasting advised that there had been much discussion on other ways of naming East Kent but there was no real alternative. Ms Cooper advised that the areas of East Kent were being highlighted too so there was recognition that East Kent meant; Canterbury, Shepway, Dover and Thanet.
 - i) In answer to a question, Ms Cooper advised that the campaign was for London and the domestic market. There was not an international dimension to the Grow for it campaign. Locate in Kent and Visit Kent were a crucial part of the campaign. She advised that the Chief Executive of Locate in Kent, Mr Wookey, had spoken about how Locate in Kent could use the Grow for it campaign to expand the interest from the European markets.
 - j) In response to a question, Ms Cooper advised that East Kent came out of the demise of Pfizer and the RGF gained by the four districts and it had been kept to that. It was not known what would happen in the future. A lot of effort was being put into promoting Ashford's key sites. Work would be carried out on the marketing of those sites.
 - k) In reply to a question, Mrs Hastings advised that Mark Sargent's Rock Salt restaurant was being used as a case study for the campaign along with a number of other people throughout the campaign and would not be paying for the advertising. It was a two week campaign in terms of advertising in London but there would be another tranche of advertising later on in the campaign.
 - l) In reply to a question, Mrs Hastings advised that the key focus markets for this campaign were not the tourism markets. These were commuter destinations for the business community. The messaging was a combination of a business message and lifestyle and would be in places where there would be a key target audience eg Old Street, Victoria .
 - m) In answer to a question, Mrs Hastings advised that the Enterprise Zone status was an important aspect of the offer.
 - n) A Member advised that there were a lot of people from London now living in Ramsgate who were starting to bring their businesses to the area too. It was suggested that Town and Parish councils be kept informed of the campaign too.
 - o) In answer to a question, Mrs Hastings advised that the advertising was in King's Cross station combined with St Pancras Station. The advertising in St Pancras was extremely difficult because it was a heritage property.
5. The Chairman summed up the discussion suggesting that there needed to be more contact with the District Councils, Town and Parish Councils.
6. Mrs Hastings welcomed further comments that Members may wish to make on the campaign and agreed to forward her contact details.
7. RESOLVED that:-
- a) the responses to comments and questions by Members be noted; and

b) the Cabinet Committee thanked Mrs Hastings for her presentation.

46. TIGER - Thames Gateway Innovation, Growth and Enterprise

(Item D8)

(Report by Mr Dance, Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Economic Development and Mr Cockburn, Corporate Director Business Strategy & Support)

1. The Chairman invited the Economic Strategy and Policy Manager, Mr Gill, to introduce the report. Mr Gill began by explaining Thames Gateway Innovation Growth and Enterprise scheme (TIGER).

- A bid had been submitted in the Summer of 2012 to the third round of the Government's Regional Growth Fund for £30 million to operate a loan finance product for businesses looking to invest in new capital enhancements and projects which would lead to new products, processes and services. Kent was successful and received £20 million allocation.
- The TIGER scheme would operate in the whole of North Kent [including Medway] and Thurrock [Thurrock's involvement in the bid was considered a significant factor in its success because of the issues that Thurrock was facing at the time received national publicity].
- The £20 million was not in a formal grant but an allocation subject to due diligence and the approval of the terms of the draft grant agreement, similar to that of the expansion of East Kent.
- The aim was to launch the fund in April 2013. The programme drawn up could enable the launch to be sooner in February or March 2013.
- There had been little information given on the scheme until the eligibility criteria and detail of the scheme was settled.
- Local partners had to pay for the administering of the scheme. There was agreement in principle with the three North Kent Districts and from Medway and Thurrock that they were willing to contribute to the cost of administration at £1.3 million over the 3 years of the scheme. The Kent Partners would discuss how this would be broken down between the local authorities.
- KCC shall act as the accountable body for TIGER, which meant that KCC would formally be responsible for the allocation of the funds and the contracts with individual companies.

2. There was a Key decision in the Weekly Forthcoming Executive Decisions List for January, which Members would be asked to endorse to Cabinet Member.

3. RESOLVED that:

- a) the TIGER programme and the outline arrangements proposed for its delivery be noted;
- b) the Economic Development Cabinet Committee endorses that the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Development, through the Key Decision process:
 - (i) decides that KCC shall act as the accountable body for TIGER;

- (ii) accepts the Government's offer of Regional Growth Fund grant in respect of the TIGER project, subject to due diligence and the approval of the terms of the draft grant agreement by the Director of Economic Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Development;
- (iii) delegates authority to the Director of Economic Development to sign on behalf of the County Council the final Grant Offer Letter; and
- (iv) a further report outlining recommended governance and management options be submitted to the January meeting of this Cabinet Committee.

47. Verbal Update by Director of Economic Development

(Item D9)

(Verbal update by the Chairman, Mr Wickham and Ms B Cooper, Director of Economic Development)

1. The Chairman raised the issue of the Cabinet Committee visits which he considered had not been well attended in the past. He asked whether Members wished to retain the idea of visits and if so whether they wished to visit businesses that were recipients of the Regional Development Fund.

2. Members were given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions which included the following:-

- a) A Member suggested that this Cabinet Committee was enhanced by the visits which gave the opportunity for Members to speak with business people to gain a better understanding of the issues businesses faced. This was considered a strength of this Cabinet Committee.
- b) A Member suggested that the visits could be combined with the diarised Cabinet Committee meeting dates with half a day set aside for the meeting and the other half of the day for the visits as a solution to overcome poor attendance.
- c) A Member considered that it was important that the Cabinet Committee meetings were not curtailed and full debate took place to ensure that the Members views were heard by the Cabinet Member.
- d) A Member asked that the visits were set well in advance to give more Members the opportunity to attend to avoid clashes with other diary commitments.
- e) The Chairman suggested that High Growth Kent gave a presentation at the next Cabinet Committee and Ms Cooper suggested a visit for Members to meet the coaches at High Growth Kent to hear about the barriers and obstacles to opportunities that businesses were facing.
- f) A Member suggested that the Cabinet Meeting due to be held on 19 April should be moved in light of the forthcoming County Council elections in May.

- g) The Chairman agreed to discuss the merits of the suggestions at the next agenda setting meeting.

3. The Chairman invited the Director of Economic Development to give her verbal update. Ms Cooper raised the following:

- The Cabinet Committee had received presentations at previous meeting about Kent Rural PLC and its aim to value the food and horticultural sector in Kent.
- KCC had bought the report together. The Private Sector Board had produced a report in the style of the FTSE 100 index annual report which showed that if Kent was a FTSE 100 company it would be at number 53.
- The challenge was to determine how best to use the information.
- Eminent presenters were present at the launch including a representative from Barclays that dealt with national agricultural investments who said that this was the first time they had seen anything like this report produced and that it was a good start in showing how important the horticultural sector was not only in Kent but the United Kingdom.
- Ms Cooper highlighted that the report included interesting comparisons about capital investment, upstream and down stream investment in food and horticulture compared to other sectors.
- Ms Cooper agreed to submit further updates to the Cabinet Committee.

4. RESOLVED that the responses to comments and questions by Members and the verbal update be noted, with thanks.