### Main Board Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0930</td>
<td>1. Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Chris P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0935</td>
<td>2. Apologies for absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0940</td>
<td>3. Declarations of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0955</td>
<td>4. Minutes from previous meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5. Whitehall Sponsor Update</td>
<td>Jon Bright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>6. Strategic Economic Strategies</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>• PowerPoint presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion/Endorsement of paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>7. Finance Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>8. Other Board Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>9. Any other Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>10. Date of next meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Action required**

- **Welcome and Introductions**
  - Chris P

- **Apologies for absence**
  - Chris P

- **Declarations of interest**
  - Chris P

- **Minutes from previous meeting**
  - Action Sheet
  - Chris P

- **Whitehall Sponsor Update**
  - Jon Bright

- **Strategic Economic Strategies**
  - Growth Deals
  - Economy & Culture Strategy
  - Plymouth City Deal
  - Employment and Skills Strategy
  - EU Investment Strategy
  - Chris P
  - Emily Kent, Phil Mcvey, Glenn Caplin attending
  - Sandra

- **Finance Update**
  - Robert

- **Other Board Business**
  - Performance and Risk Review:
    - CDC reports
    - LEP Business Plan: September update
    - Chris P
  - Letters of Support
    - Chris P

- **Any other Business**
  - Chris P/Sandra
  - Robert

- **Date of next meeting**
  - 20 November 2013 – New County Hall
MINUTES of a Meeting of the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership
held at Foot Anstey, High Water House, Malpas Road, Truro, TR1 1QH on Wednesday
24 July 2013 commencing at 10.00am

Present:-
Chris Pomfret (Chairman)
Chris Loughlin (Vice-Chairman)
Robert Davey, Tom French CC, Julian German CC, Dudley Mumford, John Pollard CC, Gavin Poole, Richard Reed, Roland Tiplady, Andrew Williams

Officers:-
Glenn Caplin, Emma Coad, Emily Kent, Phil McVey, Diana Mompoloki, Mel Richardson, Sandra Rothwell
Jon Bright (to item 7)

Apologies for absence:-
Anne Carlisle, Gaynor Coley, Simon Tregoning, Nicholas Brookes (Brussels Office),

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
(Agenda No. 1)

LEP52 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular he welcomed Jon Bright LEP Whitehall Sponsor, Councillor Pollard, newly appointed Leader of the Council, Councillor German, newly appointed portfolio holder for Economy and Culture, Councillor French a member of the opposition Group and Dudley Mumford, Vice-Chairman of the Council of the Isles of Scilly.

He also welcomed Emily Kent and Phil McVey who were attending to present the EU Investment Strategy.

The Board thanked Gavin Poole and Foot Anstey for hosting today’s meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
(Agenda No. 2)

LEP53 Apologies for absence had been received from Anne Carlisle, Gaynor Coley, Simon Tregoning and Nicholas Brookes from the Brussels Office.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
(Agenda No. 3)
LEP54  There were no declarations of interest.

MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
(Agenda No. 4)

LEP55  It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2013 were a true and accurate record, subject to the following amendments:-

Outstanding Actions, Action 18: Business and Communications Advisor should read Business and Independent Advisor to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Minute No. LEP 45.1 – it was noted that the Local Environment Partnership should be formally recorded as the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Environment Partnership where appropriate throughout the minutes.

Minute No. LEP 48 - 1. Cornwall and Isles of Scilly LEP submission to Government

The last paragraph of the above item be amended to delete the words “proposed governance arrangements” to be replaced with the word “governance proposals”; and

The last point of Action 12, ‘The governance arrangements to be approved’ to be deleted.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW BOARD DIRECTORS

LEP56  The Board was advised that further to the recent Local Government Elections in May 2013 the local authority representatives on the Board had changed and that in accordance with the adopted Model Articles there was a requirement for the existing Directors to formally appoint John Pollard, Tom French, Julian German and Dudley Mumford.

John Pollard, Tom French, Julian German and Dudley Mumford left the room during consideration of the appointments.

It was resolved that John Pollard, Tom French, Julian German and Dudley Mumford be appointed as directors of the Company.

Following the appointments, the Board welcomed the new directors.

Action 1: The Company Secretary be instructed to make appropriate filings at Companies House.

Action Sheet
(Agenda No. 4.1)

LEP56.1 A summary of actions confirmed at the meeting held on 15 May 2013 had been circulated, details of which were noted, together with a summary of outstanding actions. The Board were informed of the following updates.
Action 1 – Community Infrastructure Levy - it was confirmed that Roland Tiplady and Simon Tregoning had met with Terry Grove-White and other officers at Cornwall Council to discuss the Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation and that the views of the Local Enterprise Partnership had now been submitted.

Action 2 – Cornwall Local Plan – it was confirmed that the response to the Cornwall Local Plan had been submitted.

Action 3 – Financial Arrangements - Robert Davey advised that he had met with Russell Ashman, Assistant Head of Finance to discuss financial arrangements between the local authority and Local Enterprise Partnership. A paper had been tabled for discussion at today’s meeting.

Action 4/5 – Management Meetings/VAT - a paper had been prepared in connection with both these actions to be discussed at today’s meeting.

Action 6 – Processes involved with progressing business growth ideas – the Board was informed that this action would be tabled in a paper at the next meeting.

Action 7 – Letter of Support – a letter of support had been provided.

Action 8 – Letter of Support – the letter of support process had been revised and the website updated accordingly with the revised details.

Action 9 – Communications Update – the Board was informed that a Public Relations Company, Deborah Clark Associates (DCA) had been appointed following the tender process.

Action 10 – London Office – A paper had been prepared in connection with the options for a London Office and would be tabled at the meeting today for discussion.

Action 11 – Executive Summary – an executive summary of the board evaluation survey had been prepared to be discussed at today’s meeting.

Action 12/13 – EU Investment Strategy – Emily Kent and Phil McVey had prepared a presentation to enable a discussion to take place at today’s meeting. (It was noted that Action 12 should be amended to reflect the amendment to the minutes which deleted the part of the action which stated that “The Governance arrangements were approved”)

**JON BRIGHT**
(Agenda No. 5)

LEP57 Jon Bright attended the meeting and outlined his role as senior Whitehall sponsor for the Local Enterprise Partnership. He explained that he would assist the LEP navigating the corridors of Whitehall and break down barriers to enable the LEP to communicate with the relevant people in Government departments. He advised that he would assist the LEP make sense of Government policies and he offered the opportunity to challenge on behalf of the LEP. He also referred to his work with the Heart of the South West LEP and the uniqueness of the County.
He considered that the Heseltine Review was a defining moment for LEPs putting them in the driving seat and that long term funding via the single local growth fund and stewardship of the EU funds to LEPs was a first step toward the devolution of responsibilities from Whitehall to local areas. The Government in turn was looking to see the local authority and businesses work together to grow. The envisaged model would be that Government would set the national framework with LEP’s developing strategies and other organisations handling delivery.

Looking ahead to the autumn, he considered that the three main challenges facing the LEP were:-

1. The need to produce an overarching strategic economic plan with the first draft complete in early December 2013;
2. As part of the “Growth Deal” the need to lobby for Freedoms and Flexibilities;
3. The EU Structural and Investment Fund Strategy to be completed by 7 October, 2013.

All of which, it was essential, were nested together. He concluded by suggesting that the LEP challenge its thinking to enable it to continue to improve.

Arising from the above, the Board commented that:

(i) the idea of being challenged should be explored and that an appropriate list of people should be investigated;
(ii) the Board welcomed the role of the LEP sponsor and considered that the role could have a benefit for the LEP, specific reference being made to breaking down tight timescales with Government Agencies;
(iii) reference was made to the relationships with the “Local Growth Teams and the National Growth Board”;
(iv) it was commented on the need for a simplified process of communication between Government groups and using Jon Bright’s role as an opportunity to raise any issues with other Government Departments.

EU INVESTMENT STRATEGY
(Agenda No. 6)

LEP58 The Board received a presentation from Glenn Caplin, Phil McVey and Emily Kent regarding the 2014-2020 European Structural and Investment Fund (SIF) Strategy development.

The Board was provided with a summary of the key points from the latest Government guidance, including confirmation that the LEP would need to send its draft SIF Strategy to Government by Monday 7 October together with details of a timeline and next steps from October onwards, criteria proposed to be used by the Government to evaluate the Strategy, details of the narrative and spreadsheet, details of the allocations, guidance on the programme priorities and points worthy of note,
government encouragement for maximum use of private match funding and details on the commentary.

The recommendations, based on the findings of the four LEP Priority working groups, to agree the principles in the following areas to allow the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Structural and Investment Fund Strategy to be written and a draft presented to the next Board meeting for approval for submission to HMG.

a. 16 priority investment areas set out in point 6 of the report;
b. Funding split between thematic objectives set out in point 10 of this report;
c. Percentage split between grant and loan set out in point 11 of the report;
d. Percentage split between ERDF and ESF set out in point 13 of the report;
e. Key principles of delivery approach including the adoption of Community Led Local Development across 100% of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly and provisional sum of £25m for LEADER and CLLD as set out in points 17, 18 and 19 of the report;
f. Collaboration with other LEP’s set out in point 20 and 21 of the report;
g. Project pipeline development set out in points 24, 25 and 26 of the report.

The Chairman thanked the Board members for leading the four LEP Priority working groups and the executive team for the work undertaken in the last few weeks.

Glenn Caplin advised that they now had a better idea of the funding and timescales for delivery, the two main points to note were the proposal for a mid term review in 2016 and the levels of funding granted to Less Developed regions. There had been no announcement yet of the funding allocation by DEFRA, this was an issue that could be taken forward by Jon Bright. The paper tabled at the meeting was providing a first reaction to the consultation and government guidance. A final version of the strategy would be submitted for consideration at the September Board meeting.

The Chairman advised that he would be engaging with the appropriate Council’s Portfolio Advisory Committee and that engagement would be welcome with the Isles of Scilly Council.

Phil McVey provided the Board with a powerpoint presentation on the EU Structural and Investment Fund Strategy covering areas relating to:-

- Progress on the Strategy
- Deadline for the draft SIF Strategy
- Key tasks for the Board
- Levels of allocations, referring to two national top-slices
- How the government will evaluate the Strategy and criteria to be used
- Details of the Programme Priorities
- Details of the National opt-in programmes
- Priority areas - Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Strategy
- Business competitiveness - Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Strategy
- Employment, Skills, Labour mobility and Social inclusion - Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Strategy
- Research and Innovation - Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Strategy
Following a full and lengthy debate regarding the EU Structural and Investment Strategy, the main points were noted as follows:-

Government Guidance

- There was a need to provide “added value” to the Strategy with emphasis on value for money, it was suggested that this should be explored further;

- Reference was made to response regarding requests for “Freedoms and Flexibilities” and that assistance could be sought from Jon Bright to take this forward;

- There was a need to challenge the allocations against thematic objectives to ensure that the output was correct for less developed regions;

- The scope of the opt-in programmes was slightly more limited than expected, of particular note was that the Technology Strategy Board did not feature and that there was little detail of DWP’s employment programme.

Priority 1 – Business Competitiveness

- It was commented that there was a need for further debate on the strengths to enhance the market, and the need to be realistic about delivery against output tables;

- There was a need to focus on the priority areas to ensure that they were fit for purpose;

- It was important that emphasis was placed on growth opportunities whilst ensuring that there was a business case to support, the critical point would be how you identify the businesses to focus on;

- Benefits associated with focus on the cultural features of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly

Priority 2 – Employment, skills, labour mobility and social inclusion

- Reference was made to the issue of engagement and possible new methods of engagement to ensure that targets could be hit;

- It was commented on the alignment of this priority with other priority groups and the need to ensure the right skills were available within business and in communities.

Priority 3 – Research and Innovation
• Reference was made to the need to acknowledge the market needs as well as the business need;

• It was noted that the Technology Strategy Board were intending to visit the Council this week which may provide an opportunity discuss issues.

• It was acknowledged that businesses did engage with research outside of Cornwall and Isles and Scilly

• It was of note that there was very little opportunity within the Strategy to invest in housing.

Priority 4 – Natural Environment

• Reference was made to the ‘green and marine’ theme and the alignment between environmental and economic issues and the appropriate balance to be struck;

• It was suggested that the Cornwall Maritime Strategy be used as a tool to take the theme forward;

• The benefits of working with the Health and Wellbeing Board and Local Nature Partnership were acknowledged.

In summary Phil McVey advised that of the up to twenty areas for investment LEPs could identify, sixteen activity areas had been developed, with Finance and each Local Action Group as additional separate activities. The funding split between the ten thematic objectives had been identified within the report with the appropriate split of allocation within the thresholds. The proposed funding table had been calculated to meet the Government requirements. It was noted that the Board was keen to ensure that Loans were offered and therefore the programme proposed an ambition of 25% to be delivered through innovative finance mechanisms including revolving funds, venture capital and crowd funding for example.

In response to questions, the Board was advised that :-

• The project pipeline development should align with the EU Structural and Investment Strategy and that there was a need to undertake headline strategic project identification and costing work to contribute to the timely delivery of the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly LEP 2014-2020 EU Structural and Investment Fund strategy;

• There was a need to move away from geographical prioritisation to become community led with local delivery;

• It was acknowledged that there was a need to ensure that the language used within the document was carefully balanced, it was important to note that the Government had specified the language to be used to ensure that all strategies would come together;
• It would be possible to create a more user friendly document for the County;

• The importance of the communication tools used was important to ensure increased buy in;

• The design of the financial instruments would enable funding to be re-used, however, it was commented that financial mechanisms could be difficult to achieve.

**Action 2:** The Board agreed that it was satisfied with the progress made to date in respect of the EU Structural and Investment Fund Strategy and that the following issues should be considered before the final Strategy document was submitted to the September Board meeting, Emily Kent was given editorial control of the document to pull together the issues raised by the Board:-

1. the colour coding element of the document should be removed;
2. the language used within the document should be carefully considered;
3. duplication within the document should be avoided;
4. key evidences should be identified;
5. Priority 1 required more detailed work to ensure that it was more specific, it was currently considered to be too broadly focused;
6. that the document should be reviewed by the Councils and with a wider peer review;
7. reference to the ‘green and marine’ should ensure a balance between business and sustainability;
8. the funding table required additional detail with the principle indication being that funding should be moved from inclusive theme to the smart theme to be split between research and innovation and business competitiveness as appropriate;
9. the percentage split between grant and loan should aim for 25% however the aspiration was to get a 50% or more split, it was acknowledged that further work was required regarding this issue;
10. the proposed split between ERDF and ESF funds should be no more than 25% ESF;
11. it was confirmed that collaboration with other LEP’s as set out in point 20 and 21 of the report was acceptable on specific subjects where value could be added and this could be taken forward by officers in discussion with LEP Board directors;
12. Sandra Rothwell and Diana Mompoloki would work together on project pipeline development to provide more clarity.
13. The sum of £25 million be earmarked for community led-projects, with funding available across all of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly.

**Budget Update**

(Agenda No. 7)

LEP59 Sandra Rothwell updated the Board on the current position regarding the 2013/14 indicative budget and sought guidance from the Board on the allocation of
the 13/14 Budget to support delivery of a number of projects and programmes and the wider LEP Business Plan.

She explained the background to the LEP funding streams and outlined the current position and future budget allocations, with particular reference to the two key points, namely:-

1. EU Budget

The Board was informed that the LEP had been granted £250k in funding for this financial year and next from the Government to assist with supporting the EU Programme development. The report provided a breakdown of the allocation of this funding, together with large elements of the Council’s ERDF Technical assistance budget, the table factored in the current work on the EU Programme, separating the TA funding and the LEP funding. The Board was informed that there was currently an under spend on the Convergence Programme and that unallocated funding could be transferred to enable project delivery. It was of note that although there were constraints on the Technical Assistance (TA) funds, such constraints were not attached to the £250k EU funds from the Government.

The Board discussed the content of the table, make reference to the following:-

- the current structures and capacity and need to look at future capacity and detailed allocation of resources;
- The funding allocated for project development support and potential use to develop the EU Investment Plan;
- The benefits of an “Away Day” to discuss issues regarding the allocation of resources and workloads;

2. Core Project development resources

The Board was informed that whilst the Core Funding budget had not yet been finalised, part of this would be driven by the EU programmes (eligibility issues for example), the funding to date had been allocated in line with existing LEP priorities, with the table within the report summarising ‘headline’ indications for resourcing LEP activities.

It was noted that the LEP had been provided with funding to support the work of the Local Transport Board (£131K). The LEP had previously provided a commitment to the Isles of Scilly Council to support funding a strategic transport study for the Islands should it be required. The Chairman suggested that a figure of £40K should be earmarked. The Board commented that the Local Transport Board secretariat should be approached to gain an understanding of how it was envisaged that the balance of funding would be spent.

In the ensuing discussion, the main points were noted as follows:-

- The level of funding provided to the Local Transport Board for major projects was disappointing, particularly given the constraints on spending;
• It was important to avoid duplication of roles;

• The Chairman informed the Board that at a recent meeting he had attended, the Prime Minister had indicated that LEP’s should challenge where it was considered necessary, it was therefore suggested that the under investment in the South West was something which could be picked up.

• Need to focus on the immediate work priorities as detailed within the paper including the delivery of the LEP Strategy not linked to EU eligible projects;

• Development of an investment package which would drive any bid/programme for the Single Local Growth Fund;

• Need for future debate on the delivery of funding for the EU Strategic programme;

• There was a need to establish a delegation process.

It was noted that further work was being taken forward to consider the detail for a delivery budget. This would be influenced by the EU programme development; this was ongoing and would be worked through with Board members.

**Action 3: the Board approve the 2013/14 indicative budget as outlined in the report taking on board the comments raised in the discussion.**

**Financial Reports**
(Agenda No. 7.1)

LEP59.1 Robert Davey tabled a paper on the LEP Budget Monitor Update to 30 June 2013 and provided an overview of the figures contained within the report.

It was noted that it was intended to provide this report at the end of each month and that a LEP Financial Timetable had been established, details of which were appended to item relating to Financial Management.

The Board noted the financial report to 30 June, 2013.

**Financial Management and Protocols**
(Agenda No. 7.2)

LEP59.2 Financial Accountability/Protocols

The Board considered a paper tabled at the meeting regarding the financial management of the LEP and how it would operate within the Council’s systems.

Robert Davey outlined the paper and suggested that it was work in progress and that further consideration be given to the suggested management structures and the need to establish a practical system of delegation for use between meetings enabling work to be commissioned and bills paid.
The point was made that there should be a difference procedure applied to authorising expenditure for items within budget compared with those not budgeted for.

**Action 4: Rob Davey to give further consideration to the suggested management structures between the LEP and Council, details of which to be circulated to Board directors for comment.**

**LEP Financial Management**

The Board considered a paper tabled at the meeting regarding the financial operating options for the LEP and the VAT implications.

Robert Davey outlined the paper which detailed the possible options and advice which had been sought from LAVAT.

The Board welcomed the possible options as detailed within the report, particularly favouring option 2, which was a loose partnership between the two councils and the Company; it was acknowledged however that further advice should be sought on the tax and legal implications of this option. It was commented that there was a need to have a clear definition of the partnership between the Councils and LEP and that it should be compatible with the requirements of a Company Limited by Guarantee.

**Action 5: Rob Davey and Gavin Poole to seek further advice on the tax and legal implications of the options put forward in the report.**

**Governance Arrangements**

Gavin Poole provided the Board with an update on the current position regarding the governance arrangements of the LEP.

**Action 6: Gavin Poole to pursue the completion of the Constitution for the LEP.**

**BOARD EVALUATION**

(Agenda No. 8)

LEP60 The Board considered a paper tabled at the meeting regarding the summary of the Board Evaluation Survey undertaken early in 2013.

**Action 7: The Board noted the Board Evaluation Summary,**

**Action 8: The LEP executive to take account of the comments and follow up the issues raised**

**Action 9: SR/MR to explore the suggestion of a Board “Away Day”**

**LONDON OFFICE**

(Agenda No. 9)

LEP61 Roland Tiplady provided the Board with an update on the current position regarding the feasibility and interest in setting up a London Office for Cornwall to
support inward investment activity and tabled an options paper for discussion. He said that there was good evidence from other areas including Scotland, Wales and Liverpool, that having an office in London yield new investments.

The Board discussed the options paper and feasibility of setting up such an office based in London and the potential benefits it could provide. Directors expressed interest in the concept and discussed the relative importance of the building/co-location versus the staff teams as well as the financial costs. It was noted that there was something symbolic about having a London presence.

It was the view of the Board that the idea was worth exploring further.

**Action 10: Roland Tiplady to continue to explore options for a London Office with particular emphasis on wider options that may be available and what could be achieved in terms of results.**

Further to the above, it was suggested that the Chief Executive of UK Trade and Industry be invited to a future meeting to make a presentation to the Board on their role in inward Investment.

**OTHER BOARD BUSINESS**
(Agenda No. 10)

LEP62
Performance and Risk Review
(Agenda No. 10.1)

LEP62.1 The Board noted the progress being made on the Regional Growth Fund, Growing Places Fund and Enterprise Zone.

Sandra Rothwell informed the Board that a programme re-profile of the Regional Growth Fund had been undertaken to redistribute job outcomes between Strand 1 and Strand 2 and submitted for consideration by DCLG.

The Board commented on the current position regarding Superfast Cornwall.

**Action 11: Sandra Rothwell to discuss with Cornwall Development Company the issues relating to the Superfast Cornwall.**

Letters of Support
(Agenda No. 10.2)

LEP62.2 The Board considered a request for a LEP view on a project idea as detailed within the Agenda.

**Action 12: It was agreed that MR would provide a Letter of Support in respect of the request as detailed within the Agenda.**

Board Feedback
(Agenda No. 10.3)
LEP62.3 Directors were reminded to provide Board feedback.

**LEP Management Meetings**  
(Agenda No. 10.4)

LEP62.4 The Board considered a report tabled at the meeting regarding the introduction of LEP Management meetings to support LEP Board meetings with a clear operational rather than strategic focus as outlined in the paper.

The Chairman outlined the background to the report, advising that since the decision to hold LEP Board meetings on a bi-monthly basis, the workload attributed to the LEP had grown meaning that there was a need to reconsider the frequency and purpose of meetings. Given the need for both strategic and operational discussions and the need to ensure that both Board directors and the executive team could manage workloads and priorities, the paper proposed the introduction of management ‘operational’ meetings whilst maintaining the bi-monthly LEP Board ‘Strategic’ meetings.

The Board discussed the frequency of the LEP Management meetings and concluded that bi-monthly meetings would be more appropriate alternating between LEP Board meetings, it was however acknowledged that where necessary more frequent meetings maybe required and that they should commence immediately particularly in view of the work required in respect of the EU Investment Plan.

*Action 13: that LEP management meetings were introduced on a bi-monthly basis to support the LEP Board meetings, with a clear operational rather than strategic focus as outlined within the Board paper.*

**Monthly Briefing**  
(Agenda No. 10.5)

LEP62.5 The Board noted the monthly briefing outlining the key messages for the month.

**City Deal**  
(Agenda No. 10.6)

LEP62.6 Sandra Rothwell outlined proposals to engage with Plymouth City Council for a City Deal to stimulate growth. Plymouth City Council was keen to work with the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership and Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership.

It was acknowledged that having a strong City was important for the economy and it was noted that Plymouth played in an important economic role for the County particularly for the eastern part.

The Board recognised the importance of the City Deal for Plymouth and was supportive of the proposal provided that there was a clear alignment with the LEP Strategy.

**NEXT MEETING**  
(Agenda No. 12)
LEP63 The next meeting of the Board would be held on 11 September 2013 at a venue to be confirmed. Further to the discussions earlier in the meeting it was agreed that the September meeting should be on the mainland and not on the Isles of Scilly as originally proposed.

It was however noted that the Board were committed to visiting the Isles of Scilly for a future event/meeting/networking opportunity.

The meeting ended at 3.50pm.

[The agenda and reports relating to the items referred to above are attached to the signed copy of the Minutes].