

**County Durham Economic Partnership  
Officer Delegated Group  
17:30, Monday 02 July 2007  
Committee Room 2, County Hall**

**MINUTES**

**In attendance:**

Bob Ward	CDEP Lead Officer Secretariat
Zoë Thirlaway	CDEP Secretariat
Linda Edworthy	Durham County Council Chief Officer & Physical Development Group Chair
Lindsey Crawford	CDEP Secretariat
John Pearson	District Council Representative (Derwentside)
Sue Parkinson	Business and Enterprise Working Group Chair
Richard Prisk	Economic Regeneration Working Group Chair
Nick James	Learning and Skills Council
John Anstee	Knowledge Economic Advisory Group Chair
Tess Mantzoros	Durham University
Chris Duffill	Shared Intelligence
David Eiser	Shared Intelligence

**1. Apologies**

Tom Warburton	One NorthEast
Nick Muse	One NorthEast
Neil Stokell	District Council Representative (Teesdale)
Rob Statham	Durham University
Melanie Sensicle	Area Tourism Partnership Chief Officer
Rob Strachan	Government Office North East

**2. Declarations of Interest.**

None.

***Items for decision:***

**3. County Durham Economic Strategy Action Plan / Single Programme Investment Plan**

Chris Duffill from Shared Intelligence presented the CDES Action Plan. It was hoped that following on from this meeting a revised draft could be submitted to the Board at the end of the month.

**Enterprise:**

Discussions had taken place regarding enterprise and it was apparent that the Partnership needed to avoid commissioning new start up activity until it was clear what ONE and BLNE would be covering. There needed to be more coherent enterprise education delivery and it was suggested that priorities needed to sit outside the regional activity. Questions were also raised as to whether the Partnership was being ambitious enough.

### Competitive Business:

This element of the Strategy was a bit clearer as there were some very specific sub regional support programmes identified, together with a need to look at the manufacturing sector. This section would also need to tie into the City Region agenda. It would also have to be clear that the public sector needed to invest in workforce development, they would need to encourage and empower the private sector and there would need to be stronger partnerships between the LSC, colleges and universities.

It was highlighted that the Strategy didn't say anything about the finance / business sector and that potentially more could be said about retail. It was also felt that the Strategy didn't say enough about science/technology and innovation the document would need to capture how the Partnership were going to work more closely with Durham University.

It was felt that the employability agenda was very distributed across the County and the Partnership would need to make sure the activities were all linked.

It was highlighted that the new draft would look at the need for an integrated transport plan.

It was felt that NetPark and PETeC were missing from the current draft and that the Partnership needed to make sure that the Action Plan demonstrated the links between these and other businesses across the County as well as Science City.

It was felt that there needed to be a coherent approach to the 14-19 Enterprise Education agenda. The Partnership would need to be very clear as to what exactly was meant by this as enterprise and education were two very different things.

It was felt that within the Enterprise section there was currently a huge challenge but equally a lack of certainty. Negotiations would need to take place as to who does what. In order to identify the gaps and add value the enterprise review would need to be completed first.

It was felt that the NEETS issue identified in the Strategy would need to link in with the Young People LAA Block to see if the LAA could meet the needs identified or if the Partnership would need to look at additional activity.

It was felt that opportunities around the public sector were missing e.g. workforce development especially in the NHS, worklessness and aspirations to encourage a shift of civil service jobs from the South East to County Durham.

It was suggested that there should be more reference to the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector.

It was highlighted that new and improved educational establishments were all very well but there would also need to be demand. How do we make

individuals want to improve themselves and employers invest in their employees. It was suggested that the Partnership could invest over and above the national prescription, as previously happened after the coalfield closures, such as intervention activity to match up local people with organisations. It was highlighted that this was not just about young people but also current employees and those out of work where attitudes to work would need to be changed.

#### Physical:

This part of the agenda sets out what the Partnership had been spending. This would act as a starting point, as it would demonstrate the continuation of activity and highlight the broad areas of spend. Initially Shared Intelligence had looked at capturing existing commitments and had then been contacting each district council and asked them what their priorities would be. It was felt this should still be a strategic approach and not a wish list in order to manage expectation. Although this wasn't just about Single Programme funding it would still need to be taken into account. ONE were only looking at 15-20 regional projects/priorities therefore within County Durham there may only be 4-5. The Partnership already knew what these projects were likely to be. The capital available was going to start to decline rapidly and the suggested funding requirements coming through were well above the likely available funding. It was highlighted that NetPark, Beamish and Eastgate were not mentioned in this section.

It was felt that the Partnership needed to get the Strategy clear before trying to prioritise. It was agreed that the document was currently a wish list and the Partnership would have to look at how these projects would help to achieve their aspirations. It was felt that it didn't harm to capture the full picture of the County's aspiration but that a distinction would need to be made between core business and activity which would be subject to further funding becoming available.

With regard to the consultation, the question was raised as to how much detail should the Action Plan go into at this stage. It was emphasised that only the Action Plan would go out to consultation not the Single Programme Investment Plan.

It was felt that Shared Intelligence needed to understand which of the aspirations identified were unlikely to get Single Programme funding. It was agreed that the Partnership needed to be able to identify what they would like to do if additional money or if other funding sources were available such as Objective 1 or Coalfield Housing Renewal. It was agreed that the Action Plan should be drawn up with funding aside.

With regard to the Place element further discussions needed to take place with the local authorities in order to identify robust priorities. It would also be necessary to check with ONE what exactly needed to be submitted and by when.

It was summarised that the Action Plan needed to look at key priorities, current commitments, marginal activity, other funding streams and demonstrate the overall aspirations for the County.

It was suggested that the Action Plan Should be put to the Board with the recommendation that the detail be delegated to the ODG. It was agreed that a special meeting of ODG should be set up.

**Agreed      Action: Secretariat**

#### **4. County Durham LAA Governance Arrangements**

Linda Edworthy presented the questionnaire which had been circulated regarding LAA governance arrangements. She explained that due to the tight timescales she had completed the questionnaire herself but that if anyone had any differing views to those she had submitted to let her know as soon as possible.

It was suggested that the NEETS agenda could be brought out more in the response.

It was suggested that under point G it should explain how heavily reliant the Partnership were on the member organisations providing resources to subsidise the work for example in the case of the LAA Block Leads and Chair.

Linda was thanked for all her hard work.

#### **5. Any Other Business**

None

#### **11. Forward Programme of Meetings**

- Thursday 16 August 2007 – County Hall
- Thursday 27 September 2007 – County Hall
- Thursday 8 November 2007 – County Hall
- Tuesday 18 December 2007 – County Hall