

Notes from the LEP Place Leadership Group

18 January 2017

South West Water Offices, Peninsular House, Rydon Lane, Exeter EX2 7HR

Attendees

For list of attendees, see Annex A

	Agenda item	Lead
1	<p>Welcome, introductions and apologies (Barbara Shaw)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited attendees to introduce themselves. Apologies are noted in Annex A. 	BS
2	<p>Introduction to the Productivity Plan (Eifion Jones)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EJ introduced the Productivity Plan stressing that the emphasis was on productivity in the context of other significant events and issues for the local economy including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brexit - Industrial Strategy - Devolution • Productivity is a major challenge for the UK and was stressed as such in the Chancellor's Autumn Statement in 2016. • Comparing the region with the productivity estimates for other areas of the UK and Europe posed questions such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are these (high) figures our aim for the region? - Are they realistic for the region? - What is their distribution? E.g. Cities vs rural areas • A key message to convey was that the region was characterised by diverse economic activity. • The importance of effective engagement with and feedback from stakeholders across the region was stressed. 	EJ
3	<p>Productivity Plan Green Paper (Ben Neild)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BN provided a brief on the Green Paper evidence base, stressing the importance of the need to produce an enduring strategy and plan that is relevant to local stakeholders and central government departments. • Whilst providing an overview of the evidence and factors that characterise the region in terms of productivity and contributory factors (e.g. skills, enterprise, innovation and competition) the following broad questions emerged: 	BN

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should we adopt a sectoral approach? The context here being that some sectors are significant locally (e.g. tourism and agriculture) but may not have the potential to deliver significant productivity gains. - What are the opportunities for the region? There are many variables and what are the levers that would deliver effective results? - What does the region want to be? Is the region aiming to shape itself to resemble other areas or build upon local distinctiveness for example? - How does productivity translate into results for people? For example, productivity is a work based measure and does not necessarily impact where they live. Also, what is the relationship between wages, employment rates, innovation and investment? Should we measure wages as well as productivity? - What is the impact/risk of being on the periphery? The context for this was that markets and competition are important drivers for productivity. Therefore, being on the periphery (e.g. because of geographic location and the limitations of regional infrastructure) could be significant. - How do we exploit natural capital? The natural environment is one of the strengths of the area. How do we best use it? - What is the role of the physical infrastructure in the region? - What are the opportunities and threats associated with the regional demographic trends? 	
4	<p>Discussion Groups (All)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting divided into three groups, each picking up one of the questions identified above. - Group 1: Natural Capital - Group 2: Role of Infrastructure - Group 3: Demographic Opportunities and Threats <p>For summaries of each discussion see Annex B below.</p>	

5	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific questions arising from this round of discussion and consultation (across the LEP Groups) will be the focus of the next Place Group meeting. • A specific session to engage with the Local Nature Partnerships to ensure that their perspective is fed into the process will be convened (date to be confirmed but ideally before the next Place Leadership Group meeting). • It was agreed that culture should be included in the consideration of natural capital. This to be considered when convening the meeting with Local Nature Partnerships. 	<p><i>RH</i></p> <p><i>RH/PH</i></p>
11.	<p>Next meeting: 10:00 – 12:30 20th February 2017, Cullompton Community Centre.</p>	

ANNEX A: ATTENDEE LIST

	Name	Organisation
1	Barbara Shaw (Chair)	Westward Housing
2	David Northey	Network Rail
3	Doug Bamsey	Somerset District Councils
4	Eifion Jones	HotSW LEP
5	Helena Davison	HotSW LEP
6	Ian Harrison	HotSW LEP
7	Joe Keech	Devon County Council
8	John Dixon	Plymouth City Council
9	Mark Worsfold	South West Water
10	Mike O'Dowd Jones	Somerset County Council
11	Pat Steward	Torbay Council
12	Paul Hickson	Somerset County Council/HotSW LEP
13	Tim Jones	HotSW LEP Board
14	Rob Hensley	HotSW LEP

Guests

	Name	Organisation
15	Adrian Dawson	Plymouth University
16	Ben Neild	University of Exeter

Local Authority Transport Board*

	Name	Organisation
17	ClIr Andrew Leadbetter	Devon County Council
18	Phillip Heseltine	Plymouth City Council
	Mike O'Dowd Jones*	Somerset County Council
19	Richard Ormerod	Highways England

*Mike O'Dowd Jones (SCC) and David Northey (Network Rail) are Place Group Members

District Councils

	Name	Organisation	Representing
20	Victoria Hatfield	Exeter City Council	Great Exeter
21	Darren Arulvasagam	South West Devon Council	Greater Plymouth
22	Ellen Vernon	North Devon Council	Northern Devon
23	Brendan Cleere	Taunton Deane Borough Council	Taunton Deane/Sedgemoor/West Somerset
24	David Julian	South Somerset District Council	Mendip/South Somerset

ANNEX A: ATTENDEE LIST *cont'd*

Local Nature Partnerships**

	Name	Organisation	Representing
25	Dan James	Exmoor National Park	The National Parks
26	Sarah Jennings	Devon County Council	Devon Local Nature Partnership

Apologies:

Name	Organisation
Chris Garcia	HotSW LEP
Derek Phillips	South West Chambers of Commerce
Heidi Hallam	HotSW LEP
Mark Beard	Knightstone Housing
Mark Williams	Devon District Councils
Stephen Bird	South West Water/ HotSW LEP
Cllr Mark King	Torbay Council
Cllr Patrick Nicholson	Plymouth City Council
Cllr David Fothergill	Somerset County Council
Nick Engert	Local Transport Board
Andrew Roberts	Highways England
Kathryn Deeney	Devon, Plymouth and Somerset LNPs

ANNEX B: SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

GROUP 1 – NATURAL CAPITAL

- Natural environment is a USP/asset to the region, particularly as we have a strong agricultural sector and tourist industry.
- Want to keep it as an asset.
- Invest to maintain.
- Need to be realistic regarding level of productivity compared to other “sectors”.
- Scenario planning/modelling would be valuable to inform investment decisions, estimate the effects of initiatives on the productivity of the “natural capital” based economic activities.
- Growth to reinforce natural capital e.g. recreational capital.
- A vision/strategy outlining what we want from our natural capital would be valuable for setting the context for developing the productivity plan.
- This would inform the environment as a potential driver for productivity, for example setting the context for innovative solutions (e.g. clean energy), supporting a resilient regional infrastructure (e.g. natural flood management) and promoting the region as a high quality tourism destination.
- Infrastructure – where to?
- The natural capital/quality of life is important and a factor in attracting people to the region.
- The natural capital/quality of life also contributes to health and well-being (with beneficial effects for employers and local services).
- Digital is an enabler.
- Placing the productivity plan in the context of a distinctive, high quality environment would help to underline the region’s USP (South West Pleasure Dome!).

Note: a group to engage the Local Nature Partnerships will be convened.

ANNEX B: SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS Cont'd

GROUP 2 – ROLE OF INFRASTRUCTURE

- Key elements are:
 - Transport
 - Utilities
 - Digital and connectivity
 - Natural capital which is a strong driver for people to live in the area.
- Long journey times could contribute to the low productivity for the level of skills in the region.
- Under employment also identified.
- Sustainable growth – do higher salaries mean growth in longer commutes and greater travel?
- Premises and buildings:
 - What type?
 - Focus on hubs?
 - Housing vs employment land.
- Enhanced road/rail – could improve productivity or increase “leakage” from the region.
- Digital vs physical connectivity:
 - Prioritise digital both in situ and in transit.
- ICT role in reducing journey times.
- Access to market (e.g. manufacturing, tourism and agriculture) requires physical transport.
- Enhance natural capital in infrastructure investment.
- Access to retraining.
- Growth in high value can lead to increased demand.
- Build on R&D from SMEs via universities.
- Understand science of USPs to guide infrastructure investment.
- No one-size fits all solution.
- Low productivity over all our USPs (retirement and migration).
- Mix of digital and physical.

ANNEX B: SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS Cont'd

GROUP 3 – DEMOGRAPHIC IMPLICATIONS

- Unknowns – BREXIT.
- Population up 400K (local plan evidence).
- Self-employment trends (hidden/untold story).
- Ageing demography is an opportunity as well as a risk.
- There is a spatial dimension to demographic change and needs plans to accommodate.
- Future workforce divergence of our demographic change; e.g. M5 corridor vs the rest.
- Demise of job for life mind set.
- Longer working life perspective for our young people; more of a portfolio career – we therefore need to compete as a place.
- Housing cost implications for demography.
- Changing demographics change the housing market – ownership vs rent affects accommodation needs.
- Critical mass of older population makes us distinctive.
- Health dimension of workforce.
- On-line dimension/broadband – CPD.
- How can we shape things to get “the right” people to come to our area?