



Meeting: County Durham Economic Partnership+ Board meeting:
UK Shared Prosperity Fund – County Durham Investment Plan

Date & Time: Friday 24th June 2022 at 10.30am

Venue: Durham Business School & Zoom

	Name	Organisation
Present:	Sue Parkinson	Vice Chair, CDEP
	Cllr. Elizabeth Scott	Portfolio Holder for Economy & Partnerships, Durham County Council
	Jenny Taylor	Head of Economic Development, Durham University
	Paul Howell MP	Member of Parliament
	Sarah Slaven	Managing Director, Business Durham
	Claire Williams	Funding and Programmes Manager, Durham County Council
	Lindsay Bell	Impact Project Support Coordinator, Durham University
Attended Via Zoom:	Andy Broadbent	Principal, New College Durham
	Michell Cooper	County Durham Community Foundation
	Prof Jon Gluyas	Durham University
	Grahame Morris MP	Member of Parliament
	Mary Foy MP	Member of Parliament
	Elaine Armstrong	Strategic Manager, DWP
	Rob Carr	Environment Agency
	Cllr. David Bell	County Durham Association of Local Councils
	Jim Cokill	Chair of Environment & Climate Change Partnership
	Andy Bailey	Partnership Team, DCC
	Nicole Roe (minutes)	Partnership Team, DCC
	Michael Shannon	Public Health Strategic Manager, DCC
	Richard Holden MP	Member of Parliament
Apologies:	Glyn Llewellyn	Chair
	Alison Gittins	Durham Business Group

	Geoff Paul (Amy Harhoff)	Durham County Council
	Joanna Laverick	Durham Community Action
	Reshma Begum	Federation of Small Business
	Bill Fullen (BF)	Believe Housing

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
1.	Welcome and apologies	SP welcomed everyone to the inaugural meeting and thanked everyone for their time.		
2.	United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund presentation	<p>SP introduced the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), the purpose of the meeting and role the Group with regard to the Fund. SP delivered a presentation which outlined the aims, governance and DCC allocation of the UKSPF. SP also set out progress undertaken to date in developing the UKSPF Investment Plan for Durham, a summary of the evidence base that has been collated, guiding principles to inform the development of the Investment Plan, the emerging areas of focus and proposed next steps.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>ES asked where the proposals have come from. SP informed they have come from information provided by stakeholders in the thematic working groups and the statistical evidence base that has been collated.</p> <p>JC asks should there be a link around strategic fit and the county council's recent and ecological emergency declaration and whether the aspiration for net zero should be accompanied an aspiration for net gain. SP informed that this is being taken on board and clarified that the recommendations are suggestions at this point and are not finalised, and welcome further input from the group.</p> <p>RH asked that in terms of the stages of this fund nominal projects will not come until after September. SP confirmed that is the case and clarified that in the Investment Plan submission, that at this stage it needs to identify areas where the investment will be made and provide the justification for that, showing where there is the need and opportunity, based on evidence. It was also explained that the reason we are not</p>		

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>putting projects into the investment plan at this stage was so as not to raise expectations which we cannot deliver yet.</p> <p>RH stated that youth unemployment in his constituency and mental health are the two areas he would like to be slotted into any of the shared prosperity projects/objectives.</p> <p>JG referred to the Investment Plan paper, which was received prior to the meeting, and that it nicely outlines with evidence where the key gaps are and which we should be able to shuffle around to meet the e-numbers.</p> <p>RC asked as evidence is important will there be a call out for such evidence to other organisations to help support the investment plan development. SP informed that the working groups continue to collect evidence and asks if anyone has evidence to be used to submit it.</p> <p>MC – the summaries in the paper have been good, commenting that community and place is at the heart of everything we do. It is good to see the revenue vs capital split because all too often there is a lot of money going into capital,- Also referring to the good quality jobs – this is open to definition, it is not just about green and higher skills but about jobs at every level. The charity sector is now seeing an increase in-work poverty, which involves earning money just to survive. The wellbeing aspect is absolutely key and we should not underestimate the role of the third sector in helping to deliver this, but need to ensure that this is accurately costed, to ensure third sector is not operating below contract value levels as is often expected.</p> <p>MS – referred to the points raised by Rt. Hon. Holden regarding mental health in particular, and it would be good to see the capitalisation of existing projects and assets to further strengthen the planned work of the levelling up fund and the public health investment. Good examples of this are Health Employment Link workers in Durham Works, Durham Enable, and also the investment for providing good quality free employee assistance programmes for small businesses and the voluntary and community sector organisations and free mental health training. We need to see the</p>		

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>links between health and productivity through all of the plans as they are developed.</p> <p>SP pointed out again that we are not talking about projects at this point or having any pre-determination of the how the accountable body and the partnership spend the money, however agreed that the work being undertaken by Durham Enable is a good example as they work with those people who have the most physical and mental disabilities and what is a good job for them may not be what is a good job for a PhD graduate. MS emphasised that he felt it is important when looking at the “what” we take into consideration that health considerations are woven through as they are interdependent on the 3 areas of the UKSPF.</p> <p>PH agreed and endorsed with what has been said so far, we need to look at getting people access to jobs in different ways i.e. bus routes. He informed that he visited a company in Newton Aycliffe who deal with access of people who are deaf into work and educating employers how they can work with people who are deaf, these are the sort of projects we could also consider at the time.</p> <p>SP asked if members agreed with everything that has been stated throughout the meeting. ES stated that she’d welcome a focus on volunteering and opportunity as a lot of volunteers have not returned post covid. ES queried whether support for the economically inactive to start their own business should be included, this may not be cost effective as these people are far away from the ability of running their own business, so we need to consider a different starting point for them. MC stated that from her previous employment that she is aware of this area of work and that this is an admirable aim but also hard to achieve as other organisations have struggled to gain investment.</p> <p>AB stated he agrees and supports the investment proposals as outlined in the paper and in particular the points raised by MC and MS.</p> <p>MF stated that there is nothing that she disagrees with but would like to reiterate that</p>		

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>we need to tackle the health inequalities, support local communities and volunteering.</p> <p>PH finally commented that we need to be careful and consider who the impact and outcomes of this funding is for and ensure is it not central government but for local communities and residents.</p> <p>SS asked if there was anything that would be useful for the Partnership + Board to do between this and the next meeting. It was agreed that the discussions today had highlighted a number of areas which the Technical Funding Group would work on and ensure were incorporated into future papers submitted to the CDEP+ Board Other working groups do continue to meet and if anyone would like to submit any information please communicate with the chairs of the thematic groups, Sarah Slaven and Jenny Taylor for Business Support and Innovation. For skills and communities please direct communication to Claire Williams.</p> <p>Next steps include further stakeholder engagement and gathering of evidence to inform the plan. The next meeting of the CDEP+ is 22nd July where the results of this will be presented in the investment plan.</p> <p>Open invitation was given to everyone at the meeting to attend the wider stakeholder event to beheld on 4 July at the Ramside Hall hotel.</p> <p>SP thanked everyone for their involvement and input today and closed the meeting.</p>		
	Date and time of Next Meeting	22nd July at 10.30am - at Salvus House, Durham/Zoom		