

## LEP Review – geography proposals

1. The Government's Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) review required LEP Chairs and local stakeholders to come forward with considered proposals for LEP geographies that 'best reflect real functional economic areas, remove overlaps and, where appropriate, propose wider changes such as mergers'. The deadline for all areas to submit their proposals was 28 September.
  2. This paper seeks to capture the emerging picture of geography proposals from LEPs across England. Of the 38 LEPs in England, details of the draft proposals considered by LEP Boards were publicly available for 26 LEP areas. Of the 26 draft proposals available, the current picture is as follows:
    - 10 areas without overlaps proposed no change to their current geography;
    - 13 areas proposed removing overlaps between LEPs;
    - 2 areas proposed not removing overlaps between LEPs; and
    - 3 areas proposed wider changes.
  3. The **first table** captures the publicly available information on LEP geography proposals considered by these 26 LEP and CA Boards in September. The information in the table and the figures above only reflect the proposals and recommendations **considered** by LEP and CA Boards in September 2018, capturing draft Board minutes where available – it does not seek to reflect the final proposals submitted by LEPs.
  4. It is also important to note that in some parts of the country, proposals for LEP geography changes differed between neighbouring areas – for example, in relation to the removal of overlaps between LEPs.
  5. The **second table** details the 12 areas for which no information is currently publicly available on the proposals considered or submitted by LEP or CA Boards.
-

**Table 1 - LEPs with publicly available draft geography proposals**

No.	LEP	Geography change proposed	Existing overlaps	Overlap removal proposed	Wider change proposed	Draft proposal(s) discussed (and decision if available)
1	Bucks Thames Valley	No	Yes (SEMLEP)	Yes	No	<p>It was agreed by a majority (that did not include district council representatives) to propose to remove the overlap with SEMLEP, with Aylesbury Vale being placed within BTVLEP. No change to wider geography was proposed.</p> <p>Draft minutes state that: “The Board noted the letter sent to Government from District Councils advising of Aylesbury Vale’s decision to wholly commit to SEMLEP; and the 3 Southern Districts’ support for this decision and request for help in finding an alternative to the BTVLEP which they felt would be left untenable if split.”</p>
2	Cambs & Peterborough	Yes	Yes (Hertfordshire, New Anglia, South East)	Yes	Yes	<p>Draft minutes from the CPCA board indicate that it was resolved unanimously to agree the position on a coterminous boundary between the LEP area and the CA area for submission to the Government.</p>
3	Coventry & Warwickshire	No	No	N/A	No	<p>Draft minutes indicate the Board unanimously agreed to respond to the Government’s recommendations on LEP geography on the basis of a ‘no change’ geography.</p>
4	Cumbria	No	No	N/A	No	<p>Agreed minutes from the LEP Board indicate the draft proposal was agreed – this proposed for no changes to be made to the existing LEP geography.</p>
5	D2N2	No	Yes (Sheffield City Region)	Yes	No	<p>October Board papers indicate that the Board unanimously agreed to re-confirm the existing D2N2 geographic footprint. In order to comply with the review recommendation to remove overlaps the board also agreed that they would wish to remove the overlap with Sheffield City Region LEP in the 5 overlap districts. In making their decision the Board acknowledged that the 5 districts had stated a preference to retain the overlap and requested further clarity from government to reach a locally agreed solution.</p>
6	Dorset	TBC	No	N/A	TBC	<p>Draft Board minutes reference work examining Dorset’s economy that concluded that Dorset is a functional economic market area of significant size and scale but it is unclear exactly what the final submission proposed as this is not publicly available. Dorset has no overlaps to remove.</p>

7	Greater Lincolnshire	Yes	Yes (Humber)	Yes	Yes	Draft Board minutes indicate it was agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rutland be accepted into the Greater Lincolnshire LEP in principle and be included in the LEP Review proposals.</li> <li>That the preferred option for the functioning economic geography was at a Greater Lincolnshire level.</li> <li>That a second option be submitted considering a wider geography – a merger between Humber and Lincolnshire LEPs.</li> </ul>
8	Greater Manchester	No	No	N/A	No	GMCA and LEP are already coterminous – proposed to retain current geography.
9	Hertfordshire	No	Yes (Cams & Peterborough)	Yes	No	It was proposed that the LEP retains its current geography, incorporating an existing overlap.
10	Humber	No	Yes (Greater Lincolnshire, York, North Yorkshire and East Riding)	Yes	No	The Board minutes indicate that it was agreed that no merger options or changes of membership were deemed appropriate or deliverable (though North Lincolnshire voted against the proposition).
11	Lancashire	No	No	N/A	No	Agreed to confirm to Government that the Lancashire LEP wishes to continue operating with its current pan-Lancashire geography.
12	Leeds City Region	Yes*	Yes (York, North Yorkshire and East Riding, Sheffield City Region)	Yes*	Yes*	The draft minutes indicate that the LEP Board agreed the preferred option on geography for a merger to cover the West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and York footprint. The proposal indicates that “this would see Barnsley operate with its neighbouring authorities in the Sheffield City Region and that cooperation would be retained to maintain collaboration across Yorkshire, particularly in respect of inclusive growth in Barnsley and the East Riding.”  This was subject to the caveat that the LEP would wish to review the position if the rules in respect of overlapping geography change.
13	Leicester and Leicestershire	No	No	N/A	No	Draft Board minutes indicate agreement of the proposal that went before the LLEP Board to retain its current geography.
14	London	No	Yes (Coast to Capital)	Yes	No	Proposed retaining current LEP geography and removing overlap with Coast to Capital, with LB Croydon remaining within LEAP’s boundaries (to note Coast to Capital have not published papers).
15	New Anglia	No	Yes (Cams & Peterborough)	Yes	No	Board agreed the LEP submission to Government on geography which retains the geography of New Anglia LEP, removing and incorporating existing overlapping areas.
16	North East	No	No	N/A	No	Draft minutes indicate that the Board agreed to retain its existing geographic coverage.

17	Oxfordshire	No	Yes (SEMLEP)	Yes	No	Beyond removing and incorporating an existing overlap, the proposal to the Board did not propose any further changes to the current LEP geography.
18	SEMLEP	Yes	Yes (Oxfordshire, Bucks Thames Valley)	Yes	No	The draft Board minutes indicate that the Board agreed for the proposal to remove overlaps with Aylesbury Vale DC to remain within SEMLEP and for Cherwell DC to leave.
19	Sheffield City Region	No	Yes (D2N2, Leeds City Region)	No	No	Board minutes indicate that the LEP Board agreed to propose no change to its current geography to Government and that members' were unanimous in supporting the maintenance of the current overlapping approach to geography.
20	Solent	Yes	Yes (Enterprise M3)	Yes	No	The draft Board minutes indicate the Board agreed a proposal on the Solent LEP geography which best reflects the real functional economic area, removing overlaps in the process. Consensus with Enterprise M3 LEP on some overlaps but indication that further work needed to be undertaken in relation to Winchester.
21	Swindon & Wiltshire	No	No	N/A	No	Draft minutes indicate that there was no appetite from neighbouring LEPs or the SWLEP to merge.
22	Tees Valley	No	No	N/A	No	Proposed that there is no change required to existing geography.
23	Thames Valley Berkshire	No	No	N/A	No	Draft Board minutes indicate it was agreed to propose retaining the existing LEP geography.
24	West of England	No	No	N/A	No	Proposed that there is no change required to existing geography.
25	Worcestershire	No	Yes (Greater Birmingham and Solihull)	Yes	No	The Board minutes state that: "The Board agreed that the preferred option was a single-county LEP. Although acknowledging the Northern District position of supporting the status quo, the Board felt that this did not meet the objectives of the review. Assuming agreement cannot be reached with GBSLEP, the Board noted that Ministers will decide on boundaries. The Board remained open to other potential changes."
26	York, North Yorkshire and East Riding	No	Yes (Humber, Leeds City Region)	No	No	According to the draft Board minutes, the 'unanimous decision of the LEP Board was that the model which will deliver the greatest benefits to York, North Yorkshire & East Riding, people and places and UK plc would be to retain the current geography including overlaps with neighbouring LEPs'.

\* Subject to a caveat that the Leeds City Region LEP would wish to review the position if the rules in respect of overlapping geography change.

**Table 2 - LEP areas where details on geography proposals were not publicly available at the time of writing**

<b>No.</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Existing overlaps</b>
1	Black Country	No
2	Cheshire and Warrington	No
3	Coast to Capital	Yes (London, South East)
4	Cornwall and Isles of Scilly	No
5	Enterprise M3	Yes (Solent)
6	GFirst	No
7	Greater Birmingham and Solihull	Yes (Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire, Worcestershire)
8	Heart of the South West	No
9	Liverpool City Region	No
10	South East	Yes (Coast to Capital, Cambs and Peterborough)
11	Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire	Yes (Greater Birmingham and Solihull)
12	The Marches	No