



Minutes - Business Development Board

8 March 2016, 8.30 am – 10.30 am
Humber Bridge Board

Attendance

Members: Paul Sewell (PS), Tim Rix (TR), Chris Haskins (CH), Gary Warke (GW), Councillor Jane Evison (JE), Richard Tuplin (RT), Malcolm Scott (MS), James Sweeting (JS), Anita Pace (AP), Mike Pennington (MP), Bill Walker (BW), Richard Stansfield (RS), Mark Webb (MW), David Kilburn (DK), Helen Bissett (HB), Councillor Rob Waltham (RW)

Officers: Richard Kendall (RK), Kishor Tailor (KT), Emma Toulson (ET), Alyson Calvert (minutes)

Guest: Matt Jukes, Chief Executive, Hull City Council (MJ)

Item	Action/key points	Responsible
1	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Gary Young</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting on 12 January and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes were approved.</p>	
3	<p>LEP Chair's feedback and members' hot topics</p> <p>CH updated on recent meetings.</p> <p>PS asked for an indication from the Board of their voting intentions at the EU referendum. 9 were for remain, 2 were for leave and 5 were undecided.</p>	
4	<p>Devolution and the Humber economy</p> <p><u>i) Hull and East Riding</u></p> <p>MJ said Hull had always supported a Yorkshire deal but the Sheffield City Region deal had complicated this. Hull City Council's position is to be part of a Greater Yorkshire deal but this was looking less likely so talks were underway with East Riding, York and North Yorkshire. Decisions needed to be made soon due to the first mayoral elections being scheduled for 2017.</p> <p>JE added that East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not see a model without Hull in it, and that there would be financial</p>	

	<p>consequences without a deal.</p> <p><u>ii) North and North East Lincolnshire</u></p> <p>RW said the South Bank authorities had started the journey by talking to the North Bank about a Humber deal, but that the prospect of a deal with Lincolnshire authorities had seemed more realistic. They were now in the final stages of negotiation with Government and would know the outcome soon. RW added that the two authorities remained committed to the Humber LEP and were not dividing from the Humber.</p> <p><u>iii) Discussion and next steps</u></p> <p>CH said there was much to work out over the coming months, including how the Humber LEP would work with two combined authorities. He discussed the Northern Powerhouse and the risk of the Humber being marginalised if it was not careful.</p> <p>KT said it was important to maintain momentum through the transition.</p> <p>JE reiterated that East Riding and Hull are working hard to resolve the issue on the North Bank. The councils need the active support of business and for them to keep engaging.</p> <p>TR emphasised the need for collaboration across a wider geography.</p> <p>Members reflected on the challenge of maintaining business engagement through a period of change.</p> <p>RW summed up by saying the role for the Humber LEP continues and it was important to keep the focus on the economy.</p>	
5	<p>Vision and asks from Humber Business</p> <p>Members discussed the long-term vision for the Humber, how it should be positioned and the big things that need tackling to get us there.</p> <p>Issues included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making sure the Humber is an easy place to do business • Perceptions when bringing in visitors – e.g. litter • Port ownership and utilisation • Competitiveness • Flood defences are a major priority 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowing what we're selling – defining our proposition • Being ambitious with transport • Leadership and permanence to drive projects • Attracting talent • Marketing/comms – telling people what's going on • Help with exporting <p>The issues discussed would be fed into the SEP refresh and local authorities' discussions on devolution deals.</p>	RK
6	<p>LEP contribution to Business Week</p> <p>RK outlined proposals for the LEP's role in Business Week 2016.</p> <p>The Business Development Board approved the LEP's sponsorship of Business Week 2016 for £3,000.</p> <p>The Business Development Board approved the approach to Business Week 2016 outlined in the paper, including the organisation of a major event on the Northern Powerhouse, and delegated the LEP Executive to form a steering group for the event and move forward with preparations.</p>	RK RK
7	<p>City of Culture and the Economy</p> <p>MS updated on recent work. It had become a larger proposition than previously expected but is on schedule. A Business Club had been introduced at cost of £25,000.</p> <p>The Guardian article on Hull was well received by the Board.</p> <p>PS felt the business community should be more proactive in using the time in the spotlight.</p>	
8	<p>The Leadership Deficit</p> <p>PS said there was a leadership deficit in many organisations. He had approached Common Purpose with Hull 2020 – it had been some years since the last Common Purpose in Hull and he wanted to see this reconstituted in Hull and the Humber.</p> <p>Members agreed that a bespoke Common Purpose programme over a one week period would be beneficial to business in the region. Many of the board had previously been on a longer programme. Members discussed the need to identify the right people and ensure they stay together at the end.</p>	

	The board endorsed the plan.	
9	<p>Project team reports</p> <p>Communications – RK updated on staffing arrangements and said that in response to the request at the previous meeting he had taken on leadership responsibility for comms in the LEP Executive, supporting the LEP’s Communications Officer.</p> <p>The reports were noted.</p>	
	<p>Next meeting: 4 May 2016, 8.30am-10.30am, Humber Bridge Board</p>	