

LEP - Growth Deal Management Board

Wednesday, 13th April, 2016 in Cabinet Room 'D' - The Henry Bolingbroke Room, County Hall, Preston, at 1.30 pm

Agenda

Part I (Items Publicly Available)

- 1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Declarations of Interest**
- 3. Revised Terms of Reference (Pages 1 - 6)**
- 4. Minutes of the meeting held on 9th March 2016 (Pages 7 - 16)**
- 5. Matters Arising**
- 6. Social Value**
 - "Turning the good intentions into reality" - Presentation by Balfour Beatty.
 - Update on Social Value within Growth Deal (Pages 17 - 18).
- 7. Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group Update (Pages 19 - 52)**

Part II (Private and Confidential)

- 8. Growth Deal Finance Summary (Pages 53 - 62)**
- 9. Report on relevant issues from LEP meeting. (Pages 63 - 66)**
- 10. Local Growth Fund Agreements (Pages 67 - 70)**
- 11. Growth Deal Implementation (Pages 71 - 98)**

Part I (items publicly available)

12. Reporting to the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Board.

- Identification and agreement of any recommendations for consideration/approval by the LEP Board
- Identification and agreement of issues for inclusion in the feedback report for the LEP Board

13. Proposed Programme of Meetings 2016/17 (Pages 99 - 100)

14. Any Other Business

15. Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be held at 1.30pm on Wednesday 8th June 2016 in Cabinet Room 'C' – The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston.



LEP – Sub Committee

Growth Deal Management Board

Private and Confidential: No

13 April 2016

Revised Terms of Reference.

(Appendix 'A' refers)

Report Author: Mike Neville, Company Services Officer, (01772) 533431,
mike.neville@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The report updates the Committee on changes to the Terms of Reference for the Committee which were agreed by the LEP Board on the 5th April 2016.

Recommendation

That the revised Terms of Reference are noted.

Background and Advice

On the 17th March 2015 the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Board (LEP) approved a LEP Assurance Framework which was subsequently submitted to Government as final in April 2015. The Assurance Framework is available to view on the LEP website at <http://www.lancashirelep.co.uk/about-us/about-the-lep.aspx> and includes the Terms of Reference for the Growth Deal Management Board and other Committees of the LEP.

As a matter of good governance it is intended to review the Assurance Framework in order to ensure it is up to date and relevant, with an updated version of the Framework to be presented to the LEP Board on the 14th June 2016 for approval.

With that in mind a review of the current Terms of Reference of the eight Committees of the LEP has been undertaken and a number of suggested minor amendments to the Terms of Reference of the following Committees were presented to the LEP Board on the 5th April 2016.

- Business Support Management Board
- EZ Governance Committee
- Growth Deal Management Board (see attached Appendix)



- Lancashire Skills and Employment Board
- Performance Committee

The main changes to the Terms of Reference relate to clarification on the use of substitute representatives on some of the Committees where substitutes have previously attended, the inclusion of wording to state that any observers that attend Committee meetings are subject to the LEP Assurance Framework protocol on observer attendees and some minor revisions to the quorums required for each Committee to be able to conduct business.

The proposed changes are intended to provide enhanced consistency and flexibility across all the Committees to ensure business can be conducted effectively.

Growth Deal Management Board

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Composition

1. Unless otherwise agreed by the LEP, the Growth Deal Management Board shall comprise a minimum of 6 members and a maximum of 10.
2. The Chair and membership of the Growth Deal Management Board shall be appointed by the LEP.
3. The Chair of the Growth Deal Management Board shall be a Director of the LEP Board and a member of the LEP's Performance Committee.
4. The Members of the Growth Deal Management Board, as at the date of adoption of these Terms of Reference, are as follows:

<i>Graham Cowley (Chair)</i>	<i>LEP Director, Executive Director Local Government, Development and Regulatory Services, Capita Local Government, Health and Property</i>
<i>Sue Procter</i>	<i>Director, Programmes and Project Management Lancashire County Council</i>
<i>Alan Cavill</i>	<i>Director of Place, Blackpool Council</i>
<i>Brian Bailey</i>	<i>Director of Growth and Prosperity, Blackburn with Darwen Council</i>
<i>Dr Michele Lawty-Jones</i>	<i>Director, Lancashire Skills Hub</i>
<i>Gareth Smith</i>	<i>Project Director and Head of Regeneration, Barnfield Investment Properties</i>
<i>Professor Robert Walsh</i>	<i>Director of Research and Innovation, UCLAN</i>
<i>Julie Whittaker</i>	<i>Economic, Housing and Regeneration Manager, Pendle Borough Council</i>

Members can nominate substitute representatives, with written notification provided to the Clerk in advance of the meeting. Substitutes will be counted towards the quorum and will be entitled to vote. The use of substitutes shall be by exception rather than rule.

5. The Growth Deal Management Board may invite any persons it sees fit to attend meetings as observers. Observers shall be subject to the LEP Assurance Framework protocol on observer attendance at meetings.

Chair and Deputy Chair

6. The Chair of the Growth Deal Management Board will be a private sector representative and be a member of the LEP Board.
7. The Chair shall not have a casting vote.
8. The Growth Deal Management Board may appoint one of its number to act as Deputy Chair ("Deputy Chair").

Quorum

9. The quorum for Growth Deal Management Board meetings shall be 3, including the Chair.
10. If within 15 minutes from the time appointed for the holding of a Growth Deal Management Board meeting a quorum is not present, the meeting shall be adjourned. The Secretary shall arrange for the meeting to take place within 2 weeks and if at that meeting a quorum is not present within 15 minutes from the time appointed for holding the meeting the Members present shall be a quorum.

Secretary

11. The Company Secretary of the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (or their nominee) shall serve as the Secretary ("The Secretary") to the Growth Deal Management Board.
12. The Secretary shall produce minutes of all meetings of the Growth Deal Management Board and will maintain a list of conflicts of interests, in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework. Growth Deal Management Board agendas will include a standard item requiring declarations to be made in relation to specific items of business.

Meeting Frequency

13. The Growth Deal Management Board shall meet according to operational need.

Decisions in Writing

14. A resolution in writing signed by the majority of the members of the Growth Deal Management Board for the time being shall be as valid and effectual as if it had been passed at a meeting of the Growth Deal Management Board.

Remit

15. The Growth Deal Management Board's primary responsibility is to ensure the implementation of the Growth Deal and to make strategic recommendations to the LEP Board in this regard.
16. The Growth Deal Management Board shall:
 - (i) Implement and monitor the Growth Deal in accordance with the Growth Deal Implementation Plan and Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Framework;
 - (ii) Ensure that the Growth Deal Implementation Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework are updated according to operational need, and annually as a minimum;
 - (iii) Oversee the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group, receive quarterly reports from the same and approve the submission of quarterly monitoring reports;
 - (iv) Ensure that any conditions attached to Local Growth Fund funding agreements are discharged appropriately;
 - (v) Refer to the LEP Board any issues arising if project sponsors are unable to comply with the Growth Funding principles agreed by the LEP Board;
 - (vi) Make recommendations to the LEP Board on any proposed material changes to funding profiles, including redirecting significant resources in year and between projects; and
 - (vii) Make recommendations to the LEP Board (who in turn would need to seek approval from Government) on any proposed material changes to project funding in the event of non-delivery, and / or the withdrawal of grant offer.

Governance Relationship with the LEP

17. The LEP is responsible for agreeing the Terms of Reference of the Growth Deal Management Board and has the power to vary the same.
18. The Growth Deal Management Board shall review its Terms of Reference from time to time as necessary and report their findings to the LEP.
19. Minutes of the Growth Deal Management Board meetings shall be submitted to the LEP Board at the LEP's request.
20. The Chair shall provide update reports to the LEP Board at the LEP's request.
21. The Chair of the Growth Deal Management Board shall sit on the LEP's Performance Committee.

Relationship with Lancashire County Council

22. Lancashire County Council, as accountable body to the LEP, shall provide programme management, economic development, financial, administrative and legal support to the Growth Deal Management Board.

23. The Growth Deal Management Board will be supported by consultants appointed to advise on the implementation of the Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.
24. Lancashire County Council shall maintain an official record of the Growth Deal Management Board proceedings and a library of all formal Growth Deal Management Board documents.

Publication of Papers

25. The agendas and papers of the Growth Deal Management Board will be published on the LEP's website in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework.

LEP - Growth Deal Management Board

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 9th March, 2016 at 12.30pm at the Cabinet Room 'C' - The Duke of Lancaster Room, County Hall, Preston.

Present:

Mr G Cowley (Chair)

Mr B Bailey

Mr A Cavill

Ms Lawty-Jones

Mrs S Procter

Mr G Smith

Professor R Walsh

Ms J Whittaker

Observers

Mr M Allen – Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.

Councillor P Rankin – Preston City Council (member of the LEP Performance Committee).

In attendance

Mr R Hothersall - Head of Service, Programme Office, LCC.

Mrs A Moore - Programme Manager, Programme Office, LCC.

Ms N Adams - Project Manager, Programme Office, LCC.

Mrs J Johnson Subject Matter Expert/Specialist Adviser Legal, Programme Office LCC.

Ms A Parkinson – Programme Manager, LCC

Mr A Swain - Media Manager, LCC.

Ms K Molloy, Head of Service LEP Coordination, LCCI.

Mr D Gordon, Project Officer - Strategic Development, LCDL.

Mr M Neville - Company Services Officer, Democratic Services, LCC.

Mr E Kirby – Director at The Making Rooms.

Ms K Hedland - Ekosgen.

Mr C Crow - Regeneris.

Ms K Downes - Regeneris.

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

Having welcomed everyone to the meeting the Chair noted that apologies for absence had been received from Ms J Turton, Chief Executive and Miss J Ainsworth, Subject Matter Expert/Specialist Adviser Finance, Programme Office LCC.

The Chair noted that Councillor Rankin was attending the meeting as an observer in his capacity as a member of the LEP Performance Committee.

As this was her last meeting the Chair also took the opportunity to thank Mrs Moore for her contribution to the work of the Committee and presented her with a small gift.

2. Declarations of Interest

Mr B Bailey declared an interest in relation to item 5 on the agenda as he was the project sponsor for two of the projects which had submitted applications for Growth Deal Funding and would feature in the presentations.

Professor Walsh and Mr G Smith both declared interests as they represented organisations which were either involved in making applications for or were in receipt of Growth Deal funding. In response to a query from the Chair Mr Smith also confirmed that Barnfield Construction did not have any connection with the Burnley Vision Park project which would be the subject of a presentation later in the meeting.

The Chair informed the meeting that he would take item 6 as the next item of business to enable Mr Cavill to give his presentation and then leave to attend another commitment.

3. Presentation - Framework for Growth in Blackpool and the Fylde.

Not for publication – exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It is considered that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information).

Mr Cavill, the Director of Place from Blackpool Council gave a brief presentation on the Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Economic Development Company's (EDC) Framework for Inclusive Growth and Prosperity.

He highlighted that the overarching objective for the EDC was to deliver growth and prosperity for the area and drive improvement in the quality of life/health of local people and business both now and in the future. This would be done through three mutually reinforcing priority action areas

1. Jobs, Sites and Connectivity – focussing on those actions and projects which would act as the catalyst in enabling job creation/growth in the existing and future key economic sectors.
2. Skills, Workforce Rediness and Business Support – focussed on actions and projects that will equip residents/business to take advantage of new opportunities that are generated.
3. Urban Quality, Image and Marketing – to focus on the essential intervention required to ensure the development of a living offer which supports growth and the retention of talent, as well as tackling entrenched disadvantage and negative perceptions.

In considering the presentation the Board noted that delivery of the Framework would be overseen by the EDC and would help to put existing and future projects

into context. The Chair also suggested that similar Frameworks for other parts of Lancashire would help to inform any Devolution Ask which would be made to Government in the future.

Resolved: That the presentation is noted.

4. Minutes of the meeting held on the 18th January 2016

Resolved: That the Minutes of the meeting held on the 18th January 2016 are confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

5. Matters Arising

No items were raised under this heading.

6. Business Cases due for LEP Approval

As the presentations contained exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It was considered that in the circumstances the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information and the meeting moved into Part II for the next item.

Presentation 1 – Burnley Vision Park

Ms K Hedland from Ekosgen gave a presentation on the above project which had been the subject of an independent appraisal. Details of the findings of the appraisal were circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

It was reported that the assessment gave the project a score of '2' which was that the requirements had been substantially met and the project could progress with certain issues to be resolved. The project would focus on advanced manufacturing/engineering and the professional sector and would be implemented in 3 phases. Growth Deal funding was being sought to enable delivery of phase 1 which would then unlock subsequent phases which would be partially funded by the Borough Council together with a significant package of investment from the private sector. The Committee noted that the majority of jobs to be created as a result of the development would be from the development in the later phases of the project.

It was highlighted that the business case has been appraised against an allocation of £1.7mn from Growth Deal whilst the funding allocation for the project had only ever been £1.2mn. The Board was advised that the project could not be delivered with only £1.2mn and that the assessor was convinced that this was the case. In the interests of transparency and auditability it was agreed that the assessor should assess viability of the project with a £1.2m allocation in order to formally record that the project cannot be achieved without an additional £500k of resource. With this in place it was agreed that the LEP would be asked to consider approving a funding allocation of £1.7mn for the project.

Resolved:

1. That in the interests of transparency and auditability the independent assessor be requested to determine whether the project would be viable with a £1.2m allocation in order to establish whether the additional £500k was essential to the delivery of the project.
2. That subject to the confirmation of the project allocation specified at 1 above the LEP Board be recommended to approve the allocation of £1.7m of Growth Deal funding for Project GF02-28 BVP (Burnley Vision Park) with a condition to incentivise the developer to complete all phases of the development.

Ms Hedland left the meeting at this point.

Presentation 2 – GF02-30 Making Rooms – Lancshires First Fab Lab.

Mr C Crow from Regeneris gave a presentation on the independent appraisal of the above project. Details of the findings of the appraisal were circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

It was reported that the project consisted of a Fab Lab which would provide access to a range of technology and equipment to local business/general public together with provision of office space, artistic space and exhibition area and catering facilities.

Following a Q&A session Mr Bailey and Mr Kirby left the meeting while the Committee considered the findings of the appraisal.

The Committee noted that the overall score for the assessment was '3' which reflected that a number of requirements had only been partially met and there remained issues with the submission which needed to be resolved urgently. The specific areas highlighted by the Board for attention included:

- Further development of the options assessment and economic analysis presented in the economic case to support the assumption that there is a gap in the existing provision and a need for a facility of this kind.
- Clarification of how the project will work with existing educational institutions, other providers and link with local employers.
- Confirmation that other funding associated with the artistic elements of the development would not be in conflict with the objectives of the Fab Lab and affect the long term viability of the project.
- Provision of more information associated with projected costs/revenues and evidence of the demand for the different aspects of the project to provide an assurance as to its the long term viability/sustainability.

Mr Bailey and Mr Kirby returned to the meeting and were informed of the view of the Committee.

Resolved: That project GF02-30 Making Rooms – Lancashires First Fab Lab is not referred to the LEP Board for consideration until the sponsor has addressed the various issues highlighted in the independent assessment in relation to the viability and sustainability of the project.

Presentation 3 – GF01-40-S - Café Northcote

Ms K Downes from Regeneris gave a presentation on the independent appraisal of the above project. Details of the findings of the appraisal were circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

In considering the information presented the Committee noted that the independent assessment had given the project an overall score of "3" and concerns were expressed that in relation to the economic and financial cases a score of "4 2 had been given which indicated that requirements had not been met and that critical issues existed with the submission. In considering the assessment the Board highlighted the following areas:

- A clearer and more detailed explanation was required in relation to the number of jobs which the project would generate both directly and indirectly.
- More information was required in relation to the likely scale and source of demand and revenue to be generated by the project.
- Detailed projections of annual operational costs and revenues were required.
- No strong justification had been provided for the level of proposed grant funding.

Resolved: That project GF01-40-S - Café Northcote@Cathedral Quarter is not referred to the LEP Board for consideration until the sponsor has addressed the various issues highlighted in the independent assessment.

Mr Crow and Ms Downes left the meeting at this point.

Having considered the three presentations the meeting then returned to Part I of the agenda (items publicly available).

7. Communications

Mr Swain, Media Manager for Lancashire County Council, updated the Committee in relation to the various communication strategies and action plans submitted by individual Growth Deal projects.

It was reported that promotional work was planned to coincide with the approaching first anniversary of the signing of the Growth Deal and meetings were scheduled to take place with SKV and Marketing Lancashire to develop

communications about the progress of the Growth Deal. Mr Allen suggested that the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills should also be involved in any communications relating to the anniversary.

Resolved:

1. That the report is noted and the number/nature of communications around local Growth Deal projects welcomed.
2. That the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills be involved in any communications strategy planned to coincide with the first anniversary of Growth Deal funding.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group - Update.

Mr R Hothersall, the Head of Service for the Programme Office updated the Committee on the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group in relation to Social value, growth Deal metrics and the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework which was being refreshed and reviewed prior to submission to the Committee.

It was reported that following a review it was considered that the current membership of the Sub Group was predominantly representatives from the accountable body with only a small number of representatives from external organisations. The attendance of certain members was also highlighted as a concern.

Resolved:

1. That the report is noted.
2. That membership of the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group be reviewed and the Committee be kept informed of any developments.

9. Social Value Update.

Mrs A Moore, Programme Manager, informed the Committee that following positive initial discussions with a project sponsor social value would be raised with all sponsors as part of ongoing monitoring meetings. It was noted that many developers saw the inclusion of social value as an opportunity to celebrate certain aspects of projects which may not otherwise be promoted.

Resolved:

1. That the report is noted and a further more detailed report, including details of the indicative commitments made by individual projects, be presented to the next meeting.
2. That a representative from Balfour Beatty be invited to attend the next meeting to give a presentation about social value in respect to a growth deal project.

Councillor Rankin left the meeting at this point

10. Growth Deal Finance Summary.

Not for publication – exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It is considered that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information).

In presenting the report the Chair Highlighted the following points

- Spend to date and anticipated for 2015-16 is as in the circulated papers.
- With regard to project GF01-11 Lancaster Health Innovation Park it was noted that a £2m for 2015-16 would not be realised as the project is yet to submit a business case for LEP approval. The spend profile will be moved accordingly and reported to the next meeting.
- The spend for GF01-09 Blackpool Integrated Traffic Management has formally been reported by the sponsor as slipping into 2016-17 financial year which is reflected in the summary
- It was noted that following the LEP approval of GF02-29 Engineering and Innovation Centre – Uclan work had commenced on developing a Growth Fund Agreement. As part of this it has emerged that the funding requirement for the project was not in line with the allocation to the project.

Work is underway to resolve this. To date Miss Ainsworth had been unable to match the allocation to the funding requirement in full, but had managed to align the first two years funding and would continue to attempt to align future years as the programme developed, with the cumulative position for the project being no worse off than the original allocation at all times.

It was reported that work was underway to develop a pipeline of potential projects which could be referred to in the light of further information regarding the availability of future funding. Whilst it was not considered appropriate to have an open call for pipeline projects it was suggested that some promotional work be done to highlight the funding and support available from the LEP.

Mr Allen informed the meeting that that an announcement regarding future Growth Deal allocation from central government was expected shortly.

Resolved:

1. That the Growth Fund Profile, as set out in the report presented, is

accepted following adjustments from the last meeting.

2. That both the spend to date and the spend to be made in 2015/16, as set out in the report presented, are noted.
3. That the 2015/16 in year spend be balanced to the funding as set out in the report presented and the unallocated skills monies of £2.1m moved from 2018/19 to 2020/21 to accommodate the acceleration of spend on project GF02-29 EIC.
4. That the allocations of the skills programme of £12.63m to individual projects be noted and that those individual projects form part of the Growth Deal programme.
5. That further consideration be given to the profiling of funding for projects in order to ensure it is as accurate as possible at initial stages of project development.
6. That a list of pipeline projects be identified for consideration in relation to any underspends in growth deal together with large projects to be ready for Growth Deal 2 if announced as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review.

11. Report of relevant issues from the LEP

Not for publication – exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It is considered that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information).

Ms Molloy informed the Committee that the LEP Board on the 2nd February 2016 had approved Growth Deal funding of £10.5m for project GF02-29 EIC and £4.2m to project GF02-27 BM, subject to certain conditions.

It was also reported that GF01-35-S, GF01-17-S and GF01-38-S which all related to fast tracked skills projects had also been approved and project GF01-39-S had recently been withdrawn by the applicant.

Resolved: That the decisions on the LEP Board on the 2nd February 2016 in relation to the management and delivery of Lancashire's Growth Deal are noted.

12. Local Growth Fund Agreements.

Not for publication – exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It is considered that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information).

Resolved: That the updates in relation to the development of Local Growth Fund Agreements, as set out in the report presented, is noted.

13. Growth Deal Implementation

Not for publication – exempt information as defined in paragraph 41 (Information provided in confidence relating to contracts) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It is considered that in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information).

Mrs Moore presented an updated report on implementation of the Growth Deal together with details of the metrics for those projects which had a Growth Deal Funding Agreement/Memorandum in place.

Resolved: That the updates in relation to the implementation of the Growth Deal and the Metrics Summary, as set out in the report presented, are noted.

14. Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM).

The Board considered a report which highlighted a disparity between the BREEAM accreditations required in connection with Skills Capital Bids and Growth Deal bids which did not insist on any accreditation above building regulations.

Resolved:

1. That in order to achieve a standardised, equitable, approach the requirements for future Skills Capital bids should be no different than those required for Growth Deal and that this be referred to the LEP Board for determination.
2. That further work is undertaken with LCC Building Design Team and LCC Estates Team in order to:
 - a) develop a form of words to include in the standard Growth Fund Agreement that will ensure quality robust buildings are funded by public money but projects remain Value for Money and
 - b) compare growth deal priorities with BREEAM priorities and give advice where the two standards conflict.
3. That the Programme Office undertake to create a form of words for inclusion in Growth Fund Agreements/Memorandums of Understanding that reflects (as now) an employer's agent to certify standard of build standards or GDMB reserve the right to insist on inspection of designs and / or completed buildings by an independent assessor at the projects sponsors costs .

15. Reporting to Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Board

Resolved:

1. That the views of the Committee in relation to the following projects are reported to the LEP Board for consideration.
 - GF02-28 - Burnley Vision Park.
 - GF02-30 - Making Room – Lancashires first Fab Lab.
 - GF01-40- Café Northcote@Catherdral Quarter.
2. That in view of the disparity between the BREEAM accreditations required in connection with Skills Capital Bids and Growth Deal bids (which did not insist on any accreditation above building regulations) the LEP Board are recommended to agree that in future the requirements for Skills Capital bids should be no different than those for Growth Deal.

16. Any Other Business

With regard to the earlier discussion in relation to the pipeline of potential future projects it was suggested that consideration be given to establishing some form of framework in relation to the time/resources to be spent of developing such projects in order to clarify what was required from applicants.

17. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would be held at 1.30pm on the 13th April, 2016 in Cabinet Room D – The Henry Bolingbroke Room at County Hall, Preston.



LEP – Sub Committee

Growth Deal Management Board

Private and Confidential: No

13 April 2016

Update on Social Value with the Growth Deal

Report Author: Anne-Marie Parkinson, Economic Development, Lancashire County Council, 01772536644, Growthdeal@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of progress made since the last meeting of the Growth Deal Management Board

Recommendation

The Board are invited to receive, consider and comment on the update.

Background and Advice

The Growth Deal Management Board are committed to maximising the Social Value benefits of the individual projects that form part of the Growth Deal Programme, and the Social Value benefits across the Growth Deal Programme.

In order to progress towards realising this aspiration the Growth Deal Management Board, on 21 October 2015, agreed to produce a “Toolkit for Wider Economic and Social Benefits for Growth Deal Projects in Lancashire. The Board also decided to establish a small working group to include: Graham Cowley, Dr Michele Lawty-Jones, Richard Hothersall, Alison Moore and Martine Winder.

Activity since 9 March 2016

Since the last meeting of the Growth Deal Management Board blank copies of the social value template have continued to be provided to projects for consideration and completion.

A number of projects have submitted responses that can easily be included on the social value metrics template. However, the very diverse and often qualitative information that has been submitted means that some information cannot be captured in this way. Training 2000 have been unable to identify any social value outcomes that



can be directly attributed to their projects. This is not to say that there has been a lack of co-operation. Instead it reflects that owing to the diverse nature of the suite of projects that form the Growth Deal programme some just don't naturally lend themselves to achieving social value.

Discussions, during project monitoring, will ensure that any social value outcomes that do emerge will be captured and attributed.

Proposed Way Forward

It is proposed that progress/realisation of social value outcomes is considered during project monitoring rather than being linked to the reporting/claims process.

This allows for the distinction between what projects are legally obliged to undertake (as per their individual Growth Fund Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding). It also allows for the rich narrative that is likely to emerge in terms of social value outcomes to be fully captured and celebrated.



LEP – Sub Committee

Growth Deal Management Board

Private and Confidential: No

13 April 2016

Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation Sub Group Update (Appendix 'A' refers).

Report Author: Richard Hothersall, Programme Office, 01772 535430
growthdeal@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The information below updates the GDMB on:

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
2. Membership of the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation Sub Group

Recommendation

The Growth Deal Management Board is invited to note the contents of this report.

Background and Advice

Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – refresh

At the last meeting of the Growth Deal Management Board it was reported that the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation Framework was being refreshed. At that point the refreshed document was being reviewed by the sub-group prior to submission to the Board. The review has now taken place and a copy of the latest version of the Framework is attached as an Appendix to this report.

Membership of the sub-group

At the last meeting of the Growth Deal Management Board it was acknowledged that the membership of the sub-group should be reviewed to ensure that the balance between accountable body and non-accountable body representatives is appropriate.

As responsibility for the Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group will move from the Programme Office from 1 April 2016 it is opportune for the review of membership (including chairing arrangements) to be undertaken at that point.



Lancashire
Enterprise Partnership

GROWTH DEAL MONITORING & EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

March 2016



1. Introduction

2. Monitoring and Evaluation Requirements

- Government
- Lancashire Enterprise Partnership Board, Growth Deal Management Board and LEP Performance Committee
- Lancashire County Council (acting as Accountable Body)

3. Development of the Monitoring Framework

- Development activity and methodology
- Agreed Approach
- Implementation Arrangements

4. Development of the Evaluation Framework

- Development activity and methodology
- Agreed Approach
- Implementation Arrangements

5. Glossary

Appendices

Appendix A	Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Form)
Appendix B	Core and Supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions

The Lancashire Growth Deal aims to realise the growth potential of the whole of Lancashire, building on key local economic assets including the universities and colleges, the Lancashire Advanced Engineering and Manufacturing Enterprise Zone, the Preston, South Ribble and Lancashire City Deal and high value business clusters in Central and East Lancashire, and the development of a renewal strategy for Blackpool.

The Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP) secured one of the country's most significant Growth Deals with over £250m competitively secured from the Government's Local Growth Fund (LGF). The Growth Deal programme has an investment value of over £500m, with the capacity to generate nearly 8,000 jobs and create over 3,300 new homes.

Monitoring and evaluation of the Growth Deal programme and the projects that sit within it is required by Government and the LEP in order to understand what has been spent and what has been delivered, to provide information for reporting back to Ministers and the public, and for influencing future policy. It is in this requirement for transparency that the LEP agreed the need for a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. The LEP and its Performance Committee will use the monitoring process to manage performance to ensure that the planned delivery is achieved.

Monitoring (at programme and project level) enables all relevant parties to track momentum towards the achievement of milestones and progress towards the creation of outputs.

The approach to monitoring encompasses consideration of a core set of metrics covering the activities, outputs and outcomes associated with the main typologies of intervention.

The purpose of evaluation is to allow more accurate judgements to be made of the effectiveness of projects and the programme as a whole and to understand and learn "what works" in different areas and why. Evaluation commences towards the completion of the projects, whereas monitoring is ongoing throughout their implementation.

The LEP is committed to ensuring that monitoring and evaluation add real value to its Growth Deal programme and that project sponsors are fully engaged in the process. As such, the monitoring and evaluation information collected will be used to further inform the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and future investment proposals and to identify opportunities to achieve enhanced outcomes and impacts.

The control and management of the Growth Deal projects is the responsibility of the Growth Deal Management Board (GDMB). It is the responsibility of the Board to:

- I. Oversee the implementation of the Growth Deal Programme and make recommendations to the LEP Board.



- II. Oversee the operation of a Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group and will approve all monitoring reports for submission to the LEP Board and Government (HMG).
- III. Use an Implementation Plan to track progress against the planned milestones, including key financial and output information, milestones and risks.
- IV. Ensure that the LEP's arrangements for Monitoring & Evaluation will be implemented in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework.

This GDMB oversees the work of Lancashire County Council, the accountable body for the LEP, who will ensure that the LEP's arrangements for monitoring and evaluation of the Growth Deal is implemented, in accordance with the LEP's Assurance Framework. The GDMB also oversees the work undertaken by the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Sub Group. The M&E Sub Group has numerous responsibilities which include:

- I. Implement the delivery of the Monitoring & Evaluation Framework;
- II. Monitor the progress of the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation consultant commissioned in accordance with the delivery of the Growth Deal Monitoring & Evaluation Framework and the consultant contract;
- III. Update the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework according to operational need, and annually as a minimum;
- IV. Provide quarterly monitoring reports to the GDMB in respect of the activities being carried out in pursuance of the Monitoring & Evaluation Framework;
- V. Support the GDMB in ensuring that any conditions attached to Local Growth Fund funding agreements are discharged appropriately;
- VI. Approve project material changes where compliant with the parameters of the Growth Deal Change Notice Procedure;
- VII. Advise the GDMB of any issues arising if project sponsors are unable to comply with the Growth Funding principles agreed by the LEP Board;
- VIII. Advise, provide context and recommendations to the GDMB in respect to any proposed material changes to funding profiles, including redirecting significant resources in year and between projects; and
- IX. Advise the GDMB of any proposed material changes to project funding in the event of non-delivery, and/or the withdrawal of grant offer.

The LEP and Government recognise that this Monitoring & Evaluation Framework needs to be a "living" document that needs to be revised periodically with flexibility built-in to ensure it remains fit-for-purpose throughout the Growth Deal period. The progress and success of the monitoring and evaluation framework is reviewed annually by the Growth Deal Management Board and periodically by the Growth Deal Performance Committee.



Information Dissemination

The LEP's Assurance Framework sets out a clear commitment by the LEP to publish Agendas and reports on the LEP website. This MEF will be published on the LEP website along with key evaluation and monitoring findings reported to the LEP Board over the course of the Growth Deal Programme.

2. Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting Requirements

There are three distinct audiences/parties who require monitoring and evaluation information:

(a) Government

Government have specified that on a quarterly basis, for the lifetime of the Growth Deal programme, a suite of specified monitoring information must be submitted on retrospective basis.

This monitoring information incorporates detail about individual project spend, draw down of growth deal monies and realisation of agreed project outputs and metrics. The electronic mechanism for providing this information (LOGASNET) is maintained and managed by Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

(b) Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board

The LEP Board and two sub-committees of the Board (Growth Deal Management Board and LEP Performance Committee) require regular monitoring and evaluation information.

The mechanism for provision of this information is via formal reports tabled, as required, at the scheduled meetings of each forum. This enables an appropriate level of scrutiny and also affords the opportunity to take remedial action should it be required.

(c) Accountable Body

In order to effectively discharge their responsibilities in relation to the programme management of Lancashire Growth Deal, the Accountable Body requires monitoring information on a pre-determined frequency in support of claims for funding from individual projects. This is determined during the development of the formal Growth Fund Agreements/Memorandums of Understanding for individual projects.

This ensures that the Accountable Body is satisfied that funding is being released appropriately against agreed project milestones. It also provides the mechanism for the Accountable Body to track the achievement of agreed project outputs and outcomes.

The mechanism for collecting project monitoring information is the "Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Report)". This is provided as an appendix to this document (Appendix A)

The core and supplementary monitoring metrics for projects and their definitions can be found at appendix B.

3. Development of the Monitoring Framework

Development activity and methodology

In September 2014, the LEP asked Growth Deal project sponsors to review the expenditure and output information included in the SEP (following an initial consultation exercise to inform this plan) and to identify any additional outputs appropriate to their project from those highlighted in the August 2014 BIS report/presentation on Monitoring and Evaluating Growth Deals.

A list of monitoring metrics was forwarded to all project sponsors who were asked to identify which were relevant to their project. Projects were therefore ideally placed to respond to the publication on 30th September 2014 by Cabinet Office of a comprehensive draft list of core and supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions.

This second consultation exercise culminated in the submission to Government of a completed monitoring matrix in October 2014. A parallel exercise was also undertaken with the Further Education Skills Capital projects and a monitoring matrix, containing details of all projects, was submitted to Government in October 2014.

A third consultation exercise was then undertaken with all project sponsors being asked to forecast targets against each of the metrics they had identified as being relevant to their project, profiled over the project lifetime. This exercise was completed in November 2014. The same process is being applied to projects in the Growth Deal extension, which was announced in February 2015.

Government officials have expressed that they were comfortable with the monitoring matrix submitted and were satisfied with the progress that had been made.

Agreed Approach

Monitoring Framework

Following the meeting with Government officials, the LEP reviewed the metrics which project sponsors had identified as being relevant to their individual projects. This was completed in the context of those originally included within the SEP and existing good practice. Discrepancies and ambiguities were worked-through with project sponsors.

All projects agreed to report on a pre-determined frequency on the top 3 metrics. These are "Expenditure", "Funding breakdown" and "In-kind resources provided." The remaining metrics are split into "Core Metrics" and "Project Specific Outputs and Outcomes"

Implementation arrangements



It was agreed that Lancashire County Council, as the accountable body, should be responsible for the collection and collation of all monitoring data from Growth Deal projects. Lancashire County Council is responsible for ensuring that outputs and milestones are met according to agreed timescales; that projects spend according to the agreed framework and can evidence both progress and spend. This evidence can be used to satisfy all parties that projects are progressing as per the agreed business case and that the accountable body is acting in a transparent and neutral way.

All ongoing monitoring of projects was agreed to be undertaken by the accountable body at the agreed timescales set out in each project's Growth Funding Agreement. It was agreed that monitoring should comprise routine checks of project outputs, milestones, risks and issues, along with the required financial validation to support payment.

Monitoring Frequency

As data owners, project sponsors are responsible for collecting and submitting their monitoring data to the accountable body (Lancashire County Council) in accordance with pre-agreed timescales. The accountable body then analyses and collates data for submission to the Growth Deal Management Board, the LEP Board and to Government.

All project sponsors are required to identify a named monitoring lead and have agreed to ensure the LEP is kept informed of personnel changes.

The LEP, via its Performance Committee may choose to undertake periodic auditing of the monitoring and evaluation information provided by project sponsors to ensure accuracy and consistency.

4. Development of the Evaluation Framework

Development activity and methodology

Introduction

Lancaster University was asked by the LEP to work alongside Lancashire's wider higher education institutions in developing the principles for an evaluation framework to sit alongside and compliment the monitoring plan for the county's Growth Deal.

As a result Lancaster University provided advice and guidance on the development of an Evaluation Plan and the development and management of a formative evaluation process of the whole Evaluation Plan.

Review of Evaluation Options

All project sponsors were invited to an Evaluation Workshop arranged on behalf of the LEP by Lancaster University. This event, held in January 2015, provided an opportunity to bring together project sponsors to share ideas about evaluation options at an early stage in the Growth Deal programme.

The programme for the workshop included sessions on mapping the growth deal projects' Inputs, Outputs and Outcomes, the use of Logic Models to create Project and Programme Evaluation Frameworks; and the use of Evaluation Tools to deliver and demonstrate success. Following the Evaluation Workshop, all projects submitted completed Logic Model Templates to Lancaster University and these will form a core part of project management and implementation arrangements.

It was recognised at this Workshop that there would be particular merit in undertaking more detailed formative evaluation on a number of selected projects. The purpose of this, and benefit to the Growth Deal programme, would be to;

- Identify exemplar projects to help promote the activities and achievements of the Growth Deal;
- Support the management of risk, especially of large scale and complex projects;
- Support the transfer of knowledge and learning between projects clusters, for example skills;
- Generate innovation within sector;
- Provide knowledge and expertise for the use of new and emerging projects.



Determination of Evaluation Options

The LEP agreed that all projects within the Growth Deal should be subject to evaluation, with a selection of projects (as yet to be decided) that should be evaluated in more detail. These will be chosen to represent the breadth of activity being supported through the Growth Deal as well as its wide geographical spread. Along with the individual projects, the LEP also agreed that a full evaluation of the Growth Deal Programme should be undertaken, therefore allowing for both project and programme level evaluation.

Agreed Approach

The evaluation approach is threefold:

All Projects: For all projects a general evaluation will be required.

Exemplar Projects: for 6 specific projects (to be chosen as exemplar or high risk projects) a more detailed evaluation and assessment will be undertaken.

Programme: an overall evaluation is to be undertaken of the entire Growth Deal programme.

Implementation arrangements

The LEP agreed that the implementation activity for evaluation should be undertaken by an external body. An initial allocation of £100,000 was set aside from within the LEP's existing core funding budget to ensure that these consultancy costs of evaluation can be met in the first years of the Growth Deal Programme. It should be noted that additional resources are likely to be required over the life-time of the Growth Deal Programme.

Government have not confirmed future core funding allocations for LEPs, however once there is further clarity on this position the LEP will make further investment decisions on the resources available for monitoring and evaluation.

In accordance with the requirements set out by the LEP, a tender exercise was undertaken by the accountable body in order to procure a consultant to complete the evaluation of the projects and Growth Deal programme. The winning applicant will commence the evaluation process (working with the accountable body) in April 2016.



5. Glossary

BIS:	Department of Business, Innovation and Skills
DCLG:	Department for Communities and Local Government
GDMB:	Growth Deal Management Board
HMG:	Her Majesty's Government
LCC:	Lancashire County Council
LEP:	Lancashire Enterprise Partnership
LGF:	Local Growth Fund
M&E SG:	Monitoring and Evaluation Sub Group
MEF:	Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
SEP:	Strategic Economic Plan

Appendices

Appendix A: Lancashire Growth Deal Claim – Part B (Progress Form)

Lancashire Growth Deal Claim PART B (PROGRESS REPORT)

1. Project Name:	
2. Project Reference:	
4. Reporting Period (From – To):	

5. Financial Claims	Amount claimed to date	
	Amount claimed in this reporting period	
	Indication of claim for the next period	

6. Milestones

Milestone Description	Target Contract Date	Planned Date	Achieved Date

7. Progress

Please refer to the Project Plan and confirm what activity has been delivered. Describe what activity will be undertaken in the next & future periods and detail plans to mitigate any delay to the programme/planned activity

This period	
Next period	
Future periods	

8. Risks, Issues and Changes

8a. KEY RISKS

Please provide your **RISK REGISTER** with this claim – and detail below the current **key** risks for the project. (Indicate impact, probability and how the risk can be mitigated)

8b. EMERGING ISSUES

Please use this section to note any obstacles, issues or interruptions to the progress of your project, particularly in relation to assumptions and inputs as noted in your Logic Model.

8c. CHANGES REQUIRED

Detail any significant changes to the project and the effect upon project deliverables, programme and budget. e.g. relevant dates (detailed in section 6), spend, activity, funding, outputs, results. *(Note: these may or may not constitute "Material Alterations" requiring the consent of the Council under clause 5.*

9. Outputs and Results

							CURRENT YEAR									
Metrics, Outputs & Outcomes	2016/17 Target	2017/18 Target	2018/19 Target	2019/20 Target	2020/21 Target	TOTAL	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual	Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Q3 Target	Q3 Actual	Q4 Target	Q4 Actual	2016/17 Actual	2016/17 Variance
CORE						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
PROJECT SPECIFIC	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
ADDITIONAL MONITORING	0	0	0	0	0	0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0
						0						-			0	0

9. Signature

Project Manager

Signed:..... Date :

Print Name:.....

Position:

Completed forms should be submitted to growthdeal@lancashire.gov.uk

Appendix B – Core and supplementary monitoring metrics and definitions

1. CORE METRICS - to be collected for all projects and programmes					
Inputs	Unit	Frequency	Definition	Data source	Issues / further information
Expenditure	£, by source	Q	Expenditure defrayed directly on the intervention, broken down into LGF funds, other public sector funds and private funds. Where expenditure takes the form of grant support to applicants (e.g. skills capital, some business support), the amount of grant paid to successful applicants should be reported (not the amount approved).	LEP MI	
Funding breakdown	£, by source	Q	Non LGF Funding delivered - including public, private and third sector match funding, broken down by source. This should not include in-kind contributions	LEP MI	
In-kind resources provided	qualitative	Q	Land, buildings or other assets provided to resource the intervention	LEP MI	
Outcomes					
Jobs connected to the intervention	FTEs	A	Permanent paid full time equivalent jobs that are directly connected to the intervention, measured by FTE at predetermined "impact sites". This includes: - Employment on occupied commercial premises (in the case of site development)	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work. Employment is counted gross - no account of deadweight or displacement at the monitoring stage.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment in supported enterprises (in the case of business or innovation support) - Employment in FE space directly improved or constructed by the intervention <p>"Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of Growth Deals projects (e.g. transport, skills capital) - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting. Excludes jobs created solely to deliver the intervention, e.g. construction jobs.</p>		
Commercial floorspace constructed	sq m, by class	A	<p>For both direct employment sites and "impact" sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace completed. "Impact" sites are defined as for jobs created above. Floor areas should be measured in accordance with the RICS Code of measuring practice (6th edition) 2007. A building should be classified as completed once it is on the non-domestic rating list.</p>	Scheme sponsor	<p>Need to define and agree "impact" sites in advance - can we articulate some criteria relating to planning or access? Need to demonstrate the credibility of that outcomes can be attributed (on balance) to the project. Likely to require primary survey work. Does not take account of refurbished floorspace.</p>
Housing unit starts	#	A	<p>For both direct housing sites and "impact" sites, the number of housing units completed. "Impact" sites are</p>	Scheme sponsor	<p>Same issues as defining commercial floorspace above around</p>

			defined as for jobs created above.		establishing impact sites. Should we break this up into class of housing? E.g. affordable housing?
Housing units completed	#	A	For both direct housing sites and "impact" sites, the number of housing units completed. "Impact" sites are defined as for jobs created above.	Scheme sponsor	Same issues as defining commercial floorspace above around establishing impact sites. Should we break this up into class of housing? E.g. affordable housing?

2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention

Activity/Output Characteristics					
Transport					
Total length of resurfaced roads	Km	Q	Length of road for which maintenance works have been completed	Scheme sponsor MI	
Total length of newly built roads	Km	Q	Length of road for which works have been completed and now open for public use	Scheme sponsor MI	
Total length of new cycle ways	Km	Q	Length of cycle way for which works have been completed and now open for public use	Scheme sponsor MI	
Type of infrastructure delivered	drop down list	B/A	Identify what has been constructed as a result of the project - utilise units where appropriate e.g. length of cycle path	Scheme sponsor MI	Limit to how long of a list will be provided so interventions will have scope to supplement with other types
Type of service	drop down list	B/A	Identify the nature of service	Scheme sponsor	

improvement delivered			improvement as a result of the intervention e.g. improved bus service	MI	
-----------------------	--	--	---	----	--

Land, Property and Flood Protection					
Area of site reclaimed, (re)developed or assembled	Ha	Q	Area of land directly improved by the project that is now suitable for commercial development where previously it was unattractive to commercial developers. Reclaimed: making the land fit for use by removing physical constraints to development or improving the land for hard end use; providing services to open it up for development, e.g. provision of utilities or service roads	Scheme sponsor MI	
Utilities installed	drop down list and km	Q	Identify what has been constructed as a result of the project. Drop down list: water pipe; gas pipe, electric cables, internet cable. And km of cabling/piping	Scheme sponsor MI	
Area of land experiencing a reduction in flooding likelihood (ha)	Ha	Q	Area of land with a reduced likelihood of flooding as a result of the project	Scheme sponsor MI	

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband					
Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	#, by type of support	Q	Number of SMEs receiving support (inc. advice and training) with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase	Scheme sponsor MI	

			turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). Value of the support should be a minimum of £1,000, calculated at Gross Grant Equivalent (see ERDF guidance) or a minimum of 2 days of consulting advice.		
Number of new enterprises supported	#	Q	As above, but businesses that have been trading for less than three years.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of potential entrepreneurs assisted to be enterprise ready	#	Q	Number of individuals receiving non-financial support (i.e. advice or training) with the intention of commencement of trading	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of enterprises receiving grant support	#	Q	Number of SMEs receiving grant funding support with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). To be counted where the support is at least £1,000.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of enterprises receiving financial support other than grants	#	Q	Number of SMEs receiving funding support in the form of equity or repayable loan instruments with the intention of improving performance (i.e. reduce costs, increase turnover/profit, innovation, exporting). Counted where amount of support is at least £1,000.	Scheme sponsor MI	
Additional businesses with broadband access of at least 30mbps	#	Q	For broadband interventions only: number of additional commercial premises that, as a result of intervention, now have the option to access broadband of at least 30mbps (average), where this was not previously the case	Scheme sponsor MI	

Skills Capital					
New build training/learning floorspace	sq m	Q	The amount of "new build" training/learning floorspace constructed. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports (standard reports submitted to SFA on project completion) and/or project implementation reports submitted by colleges/providers	
Refurbished training/learning facilities	sq m (where FE colleges are involved, by estate grading)	Q	The amount of new training/learning floorspace refurbished to improve building condition and/or fitness for purpose. For FE colleges, this should be by estate grading. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports and/or project implementation reports submitted by colleges/providers	Unlike FE Colleges, there is no formal building condition benchmarking system for private providers – however the overall amount of floorspace refurbished will be sufficient for private providers.
Floorspace rationalised	sq m	Q	The amount of overall floorspace reduced following completion of the project through, for example, demolition or disposal. Figures to be provided following completion.	LEP to record from Post Occupancy Evaluation reports and/or project implementation reports submitted by	

				colleges/providers	
--	--	--	--	--------------------	--

Outcomes					
Transport					
Follow on investment at site	£, by source	A	For "impact" sites, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site over and above that directly associated with the Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions. "Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of the Growth Deals transport project - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting.	Scheme sponsor	Need to define and agree "impact" sites in advance - defined by LEPs so as to maintain the credibility that outcomes can be attributed (on balance) to the project Likely to require primary survey work. Deliberately constructed as a gross measure, no correction for deadweight or displacement to be applied at this stage.
Commercial floorspace occupied	sq m, by class	A	For "impact" sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace completed that is currently occupied by commercial tenants. "Impact" sites are those sites where there has been a demonstrable unlocking impact as a result of the Growth Deals transport project - these sites of "impact" are to be mutually agreed by LEP/HMG in advance of reporting.	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work Impacts are gross - no account of displacement. This outcome is a further link of the chain proceeding from follow-on investment rather than a completely separate outcome
Commercial rental	£/sq m per month,	A	The market rate for leasing	Scheme sponsor	

values	by class		commercial floorspace at the "impact" site		
--------	----------	--	--	--	--

Land, Property and Flood Protection					
Follow on investment at site	£, by source	A	For the project site, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site over and above that directly associated with the initial Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions.	Scheme sponsor	As for equivalent transport metric above
Commercial floorspace refurbished	sq m, by class	A	For project sites, the area and class of refurbished commercial floorspace. Floor areas should be measured in accordance with the RICS Code of measuring practice (6th edition) 2007.	Scheme sponsor	Likely to require primary survey work
Commercial floorspace occupied	sq m, by class	A	For project sites, the area and class of commercial floorspace constructed/refurbished that is currently occupied by commercial tenants.	Scheme sponsor	As for equivalent transport metric above
Commercial rental values	£/sq m per month, by class	A	The market rate for leasing commercial floorspace at the project sites	Scheme sponsor	

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband					
Financial return on access to finance schemes	%	A	The financial return to the scheme associated with revolving/repayable access to finance interventions - measured as a % return on initial investment.	Scheme sponsor MI	

Skills Capital					
Follow on investment at site, including revenue funding	£, by source	A	For the project site, the volume of public, private or third sector investment undertaken at the site (including revenue funding, for example for training courses) over and above that for the Growth Deals project, where there is a demonstrable link with the Growth Deals project. This should not include in-kind contributions.	College/SFA data	
Post code for new build sites	qualitative	A	Post code for new build sites, for matching with SFA database	Scheme sponsor MI This information can potentially be used by the SFA to draw out metrics on learners and qualifications at the site level, to be shared with LEPS.	

3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes (see below)

Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes involving more than £5m public funding and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention

Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak	# vehicles	B/A	Average daily traffic by direction; AM, Inter- and PM peak hour traffic flows	Automatic Traffic Counters; Manual	Data collection location depends on the
--	------------	-----	---	------------------------------------	---

periods			by direction	Classified Counts	potential impact of transport schemes. Peak/inter-peak is defined based on local traffic flows. This applies to most transport interventions.
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	hr/mile	B/A	Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes	Trafficmaster data; Automatic Number Plate Recognition	Traffic congestion statistics reported across whole intervention area and on key corridors targeted for investment
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Minutes	B/A	Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes	Journey time surveys	Data collection location depends on the potential impact of transport schemes.
Day-to-day travel time variability	Minutes	B/A	Standard deviation of AM and PM peak hour journey time	Journey time surveys; Trafficmaster data	This applies to highway/public transport intervention on key corridors targeted for investment
Average annual CO2 emissions	tonnes	B/A	Average annual CO2 emissions	Use the Local Authority Carbon Tool based on distance travelled, vehicle speed and vehicle mix	Report across whole intervention area
Accident rate	# by severity	B/A	Number of accidents and accident rate	STATS 19	Report on key

			by severity and class of road	Accident data	roads/junctions/area targeted for improvement. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on accidents.
Casualty rate	# by severity	B/A	Number of casualties and casualty rate by severity and class of road user	STATS 19 Accident data	Report on key roads/junctions/area targeted for improvement. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on accidents.
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	NO _x (tonnes); PM10 (µg/m ³)	B/A	NO _x emissions in tonnes per year; PM10 concentrations per year	Air quality monitoring survey	Affected network is defined as the existing route, the new route, or an improved route on which traffic flow changes are considered to be significant. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on air quality.
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	LA _{10, 18hr} (dB)	B/A	Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	Automatic Traffic Counters (18 hour Annual Average Weekday Traffic,	This depends on the scale of the proposed project, the site and local circumstances,

				composition of traffic - % Heavy Goods Vehicles, average traffic speeds); Noise monitoring survey	and the location of sensitive receptors. This metric applies to those schemes which are anticipated to have a significant impact on noise.
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	#	B/A	Annual average daily passenger boardings; AM, inter- and PM peak hour passenger boardings	Bus/rail ticketing data; Manual counts at stops/stations	The data collection method/location depends on the bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	Minutes	B/A	AM and PM peak bus/light rail travel time	Bus journey time surveys or Automatic Vehicle Location data; Rail journey timetable	The data collection method/location depends on the bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Mode share (%)	%	B/A	AM and PM peak proportion of trips for different travel modes	Automatic Traffic Counters; Manual Classified Counts	Need to define study area / specific site. This metric applies to bus/rail/sustainable transport package.
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	#	B/A	Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes	Manual counts; Video cameras	This applies to sustainable transport initiatives for walking.
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	#	B/A	Cycle journeys on new/existing routes	Manual cycle counts; Automatic cycling counters; Video cameras	This applies to sustainable transport initiatives for cycling.
Households with access to specific sites	#	B/A	Households with access to specific sites within 20/40 minutes using	Accessibility statistics	The specific sites targeted for transport

by mode within threshold times (#)			public transport/walking, car and cycle	published by DfT; Produce bespoke accessibility measures and travel time calculations using off-the-shelf software	schemes.
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	----------

Business Support, Innovation and Broadband - to be collected where more robust evaluation is planned and where these metrics are relevant to the intervention					
Detail of successful and unsuccessful applicants		On-going	Administrative database covering company name, address, post code and CRN - company reference number. Named contact, telephone number and email address (and consent for being contacted). This should be captured for both successful and unsuccessful applicants.	Scheme sponsor MI	Required for robust long term evaluation
Beneficiary characteristics (business age, size, sector)		On-going	Collected at the point of initial contact - Age: year of business registration / founding year - Size: turnover and employment - Sector: to SIC (2007) one digit level (or higher)	Scheme sponsor MI	
Other support provided to applicant firm	£, by scheme	On-going	Other types of support received by successful applicants; covering the scheme, timing, type and value (£) of support received	Scheme sponsor MI	
Number of entrepreneurial readiness assists progressing to trading	#	A	The number of potential entrepreneurs assisted that have subsequently progressed to full trading	Scheme sponsor	Will require a bespoke survey of beneficiaries - could do on a sample basis.

Number of enterprises assisted to cooperate with research entities/institutions	#	A	The number of treated SMEs working jointly with research entities after assistance has been given. Should be counted up to 3 years following support. Knowledge transfer is about transferring good ideas, research results and skills between the knowledge base and business to enable innovative new products and services to be developed	Scheme sponsor	
Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	#	A	The number of treated SMEs that successfully introduce a new-to-market product after assistance has been given. Product should be available for commercial purchase. Should be counted up to 3 years following support.	Scheme sponsor	
Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the firm products	#	A	The number of treated SMEs that introduce a new-to-firm product after assistance has been given. Product to be available for commercial purchase Should be counted up to 3 years following support.	Scheme sponsor	

Agenda Item 8

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 9

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 10

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Agenda Item 11

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted



LEP – Sub Committee

Growth Deal Management Board

Private and Confidential: No

Wednesday 13th April 2016

Proposed Programme of meetings 2016/17

Report Author: Mike Neville, Company Services Team, Democratic Services,
Lancashire County Council, 01772 533431,
mike.neville@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

This reports sets out a proposed programme of meetings for the remainder of 2016 and for 2017.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to approve the proposed programme of meetings as set out in the report.

Background

At the meeting on the 5th August, 2015, the Committee agreed an initial programme of meetings up to the 8th June 2016.

Using the existing programme as a starting point the proposed programme of meetings for the remainder of 2016 and also for 2017 has been developed. The dates have been cleared with the Chair and circulated to all members of the Committee for information.

Date	Time	Venue
Tuesday 6 th September 2016	1.30pm	Cabinet Room B – Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston.
Wednesday 12 th October 2016	1.30pm	Cabinet Room B – Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston.
Wednesday 7 th December 2016	1.30pm	Cabinet Room D – Henry Bolingbroke Room, County Hall, Preston.
Wednesday 18 th January 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed
Date	Time	Venue



Wednesday 8th March 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed
Wednesday 7th June 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed
Wednesday 6th September 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed
Wednesday 11th October 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed.
Wednesday 6th December 2017	1.30pm	County Hall, Preston – room to be confirmed.

The Committee is asked to approve the proposed programme of meetings.