



Public Policy Institute for Wales
Sefydliad Polisi Cyhoeddus i Gymru

Governing for Success: Reviewing the Evidence on Enterprise Zones

February 2015

Governing for Success: Reviewing the Evidence on Enterprise Zones

Professor Peter Tyler

University of Cambridge

This report and the information contained within it are the copyright of the Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO, and are licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence [<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3>].

For further information please contact:

Dan Bristow

Public Policy Institute for Wales

Tel: 029 2087 0325

Email: info@piw.org.uk

Contents

Summary	2
Introduction	3
Overview of the available evidence	4
Lessons from previous Enterprise Zones	5
Emerging lessons from Enterprise Zones in England	8
Conclusions	13
Annex: The English Enterprise Zones	15
References	26



Summary

- There is only limited evidence available on effective governance arrangements for Enterprise Zones. What there is comes from the evidence generated by the extensive evaluation of the British zones established in the 1980s. This provides clear messages about how important good governance is to the success of zones, and the ways in which zones need to be managed if they are to be effective.
- Well-managed zones are those where:
 - The Enterprise Zone is a coherent part of a broader local economic strategy that: considers the most appropriate sectors and companies that should be attracted to the site; identifies the barriers inhibiting growth in the zone and how these could be overcome; and ensures that the necessary infrastructure is in place to connect the zone to the local and wider economy.
 - The management and delivery structures ensure that the actions of a large number of relevant agencies and organisations are integrated to meet the challenges and exploit the opportunities facing the zone.
- The current governance model for Welsh Enterprise Zones is considered to have achieved what was needed to establish a firm base on which to build. There are a number of governance models that could be adopted going forward, but the evidence suggests consideration should be given to the following:
 - Property-led economic development takes time to yield results, especially when sites need heavy remediation or have infrastructure deficiency. Zones should, therefore, be seen as part of the long-term economic development of an area, and their governance should reflect this.
 - As the zones differ considerably in the opportunities and constraints that they face, the chosen model needs to allow for a customised and reactive response as circumstances change; and ensure that the right partners are involved and can be mobilised to access funding opportunities.
- An initial review of the governance arrangements for English zones suggests that they might provide valuable insight as to how the Welsh zones could proceed. Zone management in England is overseen by a body with responsibility for developing and implementing a strategy for local economic development that includes, but is broader than, Enterprise Zones. Membership of the governing body can also reflect the nature of the site and challenges and opportunities it faces.

Introduction

The Minister for Economy Science and Technology asked the Public Policy Institute for Wales to provide a review of the evidence on effective governance arrangements for Enterprise Zones. Enterprise Zones (EZs) in Wales are currently overseen by task and finish groups appointed by the Minister. They are led by the private sector and their composition reflects the objectives and sectoral focus of each EZ.

New governance arrangements need to be put in place from 2015 and the Minister asked the PPIW to review the evidence on effective governance arrangements for Enterprise Zones. She is clear that EZs should continue to be led by representatives of local private business. But it may be that different instruments, incentives and governance models are needed for different EZs because they are operating in very different contexts. Two EZs have a strong existing base of businesses; some are dominated one or two large employers/sectors; some have very little economic activity at present.

The objective of this report is to review the evidence on governance of comparable economic development areas, and advise the Minister on options for governance of Enterprise Zones in Wales. Key questions that it would be desirable to answer are:

- What models are there for the governance of comparable economic development areas? What is known about the relative effectiveness of different models?
- Given the differing foci, challenges, and stages of maturity of the zones, how might the governance arrangements be tailored to reflect this?
- How can the governance framework be designed so as to allow for a modulation of Welsh Government control and influence (to reflect the differing maturity of the existing zones)?
- What processes might the government consider for selection and appointment of board members given that many business people may be deterred by a full public appointments process?

This report is in four parts. The first provides an overview of the evidence base. What follows is a summary of the key findings from the evaluation of the 1980 EZs because it still has relevance for the designation, operation and de-designation of the new zones. It then considers the governance arrangements that exist across the English zones at the present

time. The note concludes by reflecting on what the implications are from the existing body of evidence on how governance arrangements in the Welsh zones might now be tailored to reflect their different foci, challenges and stage of maturity.

Overview of the available evidence

It should be emphasised at the outset that there is only limited evidence available with which to answer the questions posed. Enterprise Zones in the United Kingdom found a new lease of life in the 2011 Budget and the accompanying Plan for Growth that announced the creation of 24 Enterprise Zones in England (subsequently increased to 25). These formally began operational in April 2012. Zones were also announced by the Devolved Administrations and Wales has seven zones announced in September 2011. The Welsh zones are in Anglesey, Central Cardiff, Deeside, Ebbw Vale, Haven Waterway, Snowdonia, St Athan-Cardiff Airport. Scotland now has 15 operational zone sites (The Scottish Government, 2011). A pilot Enterprise Zone was established in Northern Ireland in 2014.

Recent Enterprise Zone policy

Enterprise Zones reflect a long standing interest by HM Government in the use of property led initiatives to encourage local economic development. The 2011 Budget indicated that businesses moving to an EZ location before April 2015 could benefit from a business rate discount worth up to £275,000 per business over a five year period. Zone sites would typically be in the range of 50-150 hectares. Local authorities could also adopt simplified planning approaches for zone sites building on existing Development Order powers. Government would also, wherever possible, ensure that high speed broadband was available to companies on a zone site. Support for inward investment or trade opportunities was also made available from UKTI. A further benefit was that HM Treasury stated that it was prepared to allow all growth in the local business rates *within the zone* to be retained in the local area and used for the purposes of economic development for a period of at least 25 years. Additional assistance was also made available for zone sites where it was felt the policy package needed further strengthening and some zones received enhanced capital allowances for plant and machinery to encourage investment specifically in manufacturing activity.

The 2014 Budget extended the availability of business rate discounts and Enhanced Capital Allowances on zones until March 2020. The deadline for a company having to locate on a zone to be eligible to claim these benefits was also extended to 31st March 2018.

It has also become necessary for HM Government to provide funds to help zones to overcome deficiencies in local infrastructure. In England these have been provided through the Local Infrastructure Fund.

The new zones are more limited in their scope than the original Enterprise Zones first established in the UK in 1982. These earlier zones had a ten year life and provided capital allowances for investment in buildings at a rate of 100% in the first year.

Evidence on achievement

At the present time there is not any research that has examined the performance of the more recent zones. This partly reflects the short time that has elapsed since their creation and the time it takes to establish them and for them to gain traction, particularly given the relatively weak economic environment that has existed. There has been a report from the National Audit Office (Parliament, 2014) and a House of Commons Library Standard Note (House of Commons, 2014) that has merely stated the current position.

In the absence of any new research on the performance of the new British zones most attention has focused on what is known from the evaluation of the British zones established across the United Kingdom in the 1980s. A fairly extensive body of evidence was assembled on the factors that affected the performance of these zones but the research is still quite limited when it came to issues relating to governance (Tyler,2012). To augment the evidence base somewhat during this assignment a survey was undertaken of the governance arrangements that have now been put in place across the English zones.

Lessons from previous Enterprise Zones

According to a recent House of Commons Report (House of Commons, 2014) the most authoritative study on the evaluation of the effects of the first two rounds of EZs was that commissioned by the then Department of Environment in 1995 (DoE, 1995). It related to 22 of the 25 EZs designated over 1981-1984. More recent reports have tended to draw on the findings of this earlier work (Sissons and Brown, 2011; Larkin and Wilcox, 2011). There is also an extensive literature on the achievements of EZs in other countries where there is a rich and diverse array of EZs. A recent study by Bond, Gardiner and Tyler (2013) provides an overview of this. The evidence presented in the 1995 evaluation have been summarised in a recent report by Tyler (2012) undertaken for DCLG. The main findings from the Tyler study are as follows:

- **Key factors in determining economic performance:** Zones sites varied considerably in their access to new economic opportunity and also the extent to which it was necessary for them to overcome market failures before much economic development could occur. Zones with good economic access (relatively high economic opportunity) and low need (low existing market failure) were best positioned to exploit the benefits that zone designation gave them. Zones with low existing market opportunity and high need (i.e. high remediation cost, poor infrastructure etc.) were less likely to benefit and take more time to reap the benefits of zone support. Although access to market opportunity was a key factor in the economic performance of zones, other factors were also important; particularly:
 - The assembly of the site:
 - whether there was a large number of relatively fragmented sites or one or two large sites;
 - the size of the zones and the availability of land for future expansion;
 - the extent of dereliction and land contamination that had to be tackled before development could occur;
 - the split of land ownership between the public and private sector with public sector ownership often being desirable in the early stage of the zones life so as to avoid problems in site assembly and a tendency for the private sector to hold land in anticipation of later speculative gain.
 - Interaction with the wider local economic development plans:
 - the importance of infrastructure strategy for the local area that ensures that the zone is connected into the local economy and the wider economy. In some case substantial up-front infrastructure is required before the zone sites can become competitive locations for new investment;
 - the importance of the zone authority having a development strategy in place for zones sites that was a coherent part of a wider development plan for the area that considered the most appropriate sectors and companies that should be attracted to build the areas long-term competitive advantage and where ever possible, maximise additionality and minimise the displacement of economic activity in the area;

- The management of the site:
 - the articulation and adoption of a development strategy that identified the critical barriers inhibiting the growth of the zone and how they could be overcome;
 - ensuring that the physical land use development was delivered alongside the delivery of a wider business support package to the companies that were locating on the zone;
 - creating zone management and delivery structures that ensured that the actions of a large number of relevant agencies and organisations were coordinated and integrated to meet the challenges and exploit the opportunities facing the zone;
 - the importance of promoting and marketing the zone;
 - the value of a joined-up approach to the promotion and the need to avoid fragmented delivery;
 - the role for monitoring and eventually evaluation to chart progress and ensure that those responsible for the development of the zone could react in a timely and effective manner to changing economic circumstances.

- **Site development:** The original zones had a ten-year life span. By the end of their designated period around 80% of the available land had been developed. Some 52% of all zone floorspace was industrial.

- **Impact on employment:** The average number of people employed per hectare (HA) was 37.2 but was higher in the high opportunity, low need zones at 43.3. It was lower in the relatively lower economic opportunity zones at 24.3 per HA. These estimates are based on the gross area of the zone and since some of the total land available is used for landscaping, access and supporting infrastructure the estimates per HA are around 20% higher if this element is removed. Thus, an average zone generated around 45 jobs per HA.

- **Impact on economic activity:** The percentage of economic activity that was found to be additional to the local area was 45% overall. The weakest additionality was 36% in the low economic opportunity, high need zones. The best additionality in the high opportunity and low needs was 50%. On the basis of these results Tyler (2012) estimated that the largest of the new zone sites in England that had relatively good access to market opportunity and relatively low need in terms of land remediation might be capable of generating some 6500

jobs (once the site has been fully developed) with around 50% of these additional to the local area.

There are some key messages that emerge from this brief review for the present assignment and its focus on the future governance arrangements of the Welsh zones as they build economic momentum. Firstly, to state the obvious, good governance will be reflected in the quality of outcome. Those zones that are managed so as to build on the features of good practice discussed above can expect this to be reflected in their performance. Secondly, zones differ considerably in the amount and type of economic opportunity they can access and the constraints on economic development they face. The governance model adopted should be such as to ensure a customised and reactive response as circumstance change but it also must ensure that the right partners are involved and that they can be mobilised to access funding opportunities that arise from government to assist in developing their zone.

Emerging lessons from Enterprise Zones in England

There is very limited information available at the present time on the progress of the British zones. As of December 2013, the DCLG reported that there were 4,649 jobs on the English zones (and 2,965 construction jobs) (House of Commons, 2014). A recent report produced by the Welsh Assembly Government indicated that Enterprise Zones in Wales had created 2,159 jobs and safeguarded a further 2,983 and attracted £70.2 million of private and Welsh Assembly Government support for projects (Welsh Assembly Government, 2014). The report referred to a target to create another 1,900 jobs by the end of 2014/15 and attract a further £50 million worth of investment, from both private and public sources.

The performance to date of the zones in England has attracted some criticism from the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts that has been examining measures used by HM Government to promote local economic growth in England (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2014). The attainment of around 4,600 job created on the English EZs is compared with an initial Treasury assessment of 54,000 and thus the Committee sees attainment thus far as 'particularly underwhelming' (ibid). The procedure used to estimate the number of jobs that zones might create and by when has been criticised by the Committee because it was based on the views of the Local Enterprise Partnerships that oversee individual zones development in England and was not subject to any independent verification. HM Government has promised to do better in the future in assessing the job creation potential of zones.

Clearly, attention should be given to developing a better and more realistic understanding of the job creation potential of EZs. However, it is hardly surprising that job creation so far has been relatively weak. The torrid economic climate since the Credit Crunch and the associated banking crisis stopped speculative, property-led development in its tracks. The market has only recently begun to revive, although as is the way with these things it looks to be coming back quite quickly. However, market conditions aside, it is always the case that local property-led economic development takes time. And, as was discussed extensively in the previous section, the greater the problems of site remediation and infrastructure deficiency the longer it will take to attract and accommodate the new investment that ultimately creates new jobs.

Moreover, building on lessons learned from earlier EZ policy, it has been emphasised by HM Government that those responsible for developing zones should give particular attention to building for the longer-term rather than simply accepting whatever investment might come along (DCLG, 2011). The focus is to minimise the degree to which zones simply displace local economic activity at the local level ('boundary-hopping'). It is argued that the development of the zone should be a coherent part of a local economic strategy that builds on local areas of opportunity and has a strategic fit with wider economic priorities (ibid). In recognition of these issues those responsible for the EZ development at the local level have adopted a sectoral focus to the marketing and development of their zone. In December 2013 HM Government also introduced four 'University Enterprise Zones' with the intention that these zones should harness the power of knowledge based local economic development as it manifests itself in clusters of business activity around Knowledge Based Institutes (BIS, 2013).

Enterprise Zones are thus at a key stage in their development. What happens in the next three years will largely determine the contribution that they will be able to make to local economic development. The factors that will influence relative success are fairly well-understood by those who manage and direct zone development and much has been documented from previous research as discussed in the last section. Clearly, the growth of the national economy is of fundamental importance and at the present time the economic outlook looks more favourable than it has since 2007.

Alongside this, there are two key requirements. The first is that successful outcomes require that the actions of a significant number of local agencies, developers, investors, business and departments of government are coordinated and integrated in a way that allows the zone sites to achieve their economic potential. These actions cover the full range of infrastructure provision, business support services, skills and training, zone marketing and promotion and

much more besides. The challenge is to find a governance structure that can bring together the relevant agents of change in a timely and effective manner.

The second is that those responsible for the development of a zone can obtain the resources required to provide the infrastructure, land remediation and local economic capacity building necessary for the longer-term success. These resources will often only be available from central government and those with oversight of zone development increasingly have to bid for the funds. To be successful they have to be recognised by government as competent agencies to both bid and hold such funding. Zone authorities and the bodies responsible for their strategic oversight have to ensure that they have the capacity to deliver what is required.

At the present time the governance of the EZs in Wales has reflected a model where the managing body in the case of all seven of the zones contains representatives from both the public and private sectors in each of the local areas concerned, with a chair from the private sector. The general feeling is that these partnership structures have delivered what was required to get things moving on the ground and that across all seven areas a firm base has now been established on which to build, although it is clear that the underlying opportunities and challenges vary considerably across the zones and achievement reflects this.

There are a number of possible governance models that could be adopted to take the Welsh zones forward. To provide some insight on how best to go forward it is of value to consider the position in England. The comparison is of particular value at the present time because Enterprise Zone policy in England has been introduced at a time of quite rapid change to the institutional landscape in which local economic development is taking place.

The local growth agenda in England changed significantly in 2010 when HM Government introduced the White Paper on Local Growth: Realising Every Place's Potential (BIS, 2013). The White Paper introduced the idea of Local Enterprise Partnerships. LEPS are 'partnerships between local authorities and businesses. They decide what the priorities should be for investment in roads, buildings and facilities in the area' (DCLG, 2014). Over the period since the White Paper the Government has introduced three new initiatives to assist in stimulating local development. These are the EZs announced in 2011 (DCLG, 2011a), the Growing Places Fund in 2011 (DCLG, 2011b) and City Deals in 2013 (Deputy Prime Minister's Office, 2013).

As the Local Enterprise Partnerships have become more firmly established the Government has provided funds to assist in their work through Growth Deals. These have been agreed with each of the LEPs. The resources for the Growth Deals have, in the main, come from the

Local Growth Fund (LGF). The LGF is a funding pot that was created by taking part of the capital budgets of a number of different central government departments, particularly DfT and the capital skills budget of the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. By 2015 it will become the main source used to fund local growth initiatives delivered by the LEPs across England.

Growth Deals have now been agreed with all of the 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships in England. Projects that can be funded by the LEPs through the Growth Deal allocation range across transport, site development, skills, innovation, business support and other things including investment in digital infrastructure. The development of the local EZ might require project support under any of these categories and thus it is the LEP and its members that will help to secure the required funds from the appropriate government funding initiative.

Oversight of the broad economic development of EZs in England has been assigned to the Local Enterprise Partnerships. The LEPs are not statutory bodies and have been established as voluntary partnerships between local business and local authorities. They are thus in a somewhat odd position and rely on their Accountable Body to bear the financial responsibility for their actions. In practice the Accountable Body tends to be the relevant local authority or authorities. One other aspect of LEPs is that their Chair is expected to be a lead figure from the local business sector or certainly what would be considered to be a 'Captain of Local Industry'. In most cases the Chair is from a major business but there are also examples of the person being from a local university.

LEPs are only of recent origin. They vary considerably in their geography, the number of partners that they have and the nature of the economic opportunities and challenges they are required to address. They are at a relatively early stage in their development and still assessing how well their procedures and governance structures are delivering what is required of them. They also vary considerably in the resources that they have available to them which is something that has been the subject of particular attention (Pike, McCarthy O'Brien, Marlow and Tomaney, 2013, BIS Committee, 2013).

In relation to EZs a recent House of Commons Standard Note (House of Commons, 2014) observed that:

'The LEP will need an agreed position on the location, sectoral focus and range of incentives within a zone it hosts. This will be an important means through which to minimise local displacement of business. The LEPs role will be to identify the barriers which are impeding

the growth of the local economy and the necessary options from the menu on offer to overcome such barriers. LEPs will also be able to bring together a wider package of support by working with local colleges and Work Programme providers and linking Enterprise Zones to current and planned infrastructure (Department of Business Innovation and Skills)'.

The table in the Annex summarises the current EZ position in England describing the relevant LEPs responsible for the zones and the local authorities that are involved. For the purposes of the present assignment we wanted to find-out how the English zones are managed and how they relate to the LEPs as the institutions that oversee their governance. A survey of all the English zone authorities was undertaken and a number of very helpful and insightful responses were received.

The key findings are:

- The general approach is to have an Enterprise Zone Managing Body that is responsible for the day-to-day running of the zone. It may have separate committees responsible for specific aspects of zone development like promotion and marketing. This Body varies in the size and extent of its membership. Members include representatives from HM Central Government and DCLG (as the zone sponsoring agency), The Department of Business, Innovation and Skills, the Housing Corporation Agency (HCA) who may be the land owner of a significant part of the zone site and the principal central government agency responsible for the facilitating local land based economic regeneration. In some cases there may be representatives from the Department of Transport and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), particularly where there are significant road and telecommunication issues to be addressed. There will also be representation from the main developers/ land owners as appropriate;
- The Enterprise Zone Body may answer to another local economic development body or equivalent that has been created to facilitate local economic development particularly with a land and property edge;
- The zone managing authority is responsible for reporting progress on the development of a zone to the Department of Communities and Local Government. They are required to report on around ten main indicators;
- In all cases the LEP will have put in place procedures to allow representation/ reporting from the EZ Management body to the main board. LEP members will often be nominated to be on the EZ management body or one of its operational committees;

- In most cases an EZ is overseen by only one LEP but there are exceptions. There may be two or three LEPs associated with an individual zone;
- In all cases examined there is usually a progress report on zone development on a quarterly basis to the main LEP Board;
- The LEP governance structure has a private sector Chair and its members are drawn from the public and private sector. Members are nominated and only one LEP at the present time has members that are elected. Membership of the main LEP Board varies considerably in size and membership. LEPs with a relatively large geography may have a significant number of local authorities and other public agencies on their Board. The Board will also tend to have a representative from a leading Knowledge Based Institution. The table in the Annex shows that extensive variation that exists in the size of the LEP partnership Boards.
- During 2014 all 39 LEPs in England went through a process of establishing Growth Deals with HM Government. The process required the LEPs to submit a draft Strategic Economic Plan in January 2014 to HM Government. Final Strategic Economic Plans were submitted in March 2014 after consultations between LEPs and HM Government. The quality of the Plan was assessed on the basis of published criteria that including strategic fit and value for money. The final Growth Deals were published in July 2014 and these plans list the interventions that LEPs are seeking assistance from government funds. Discussions are currently underway in relation to the most appropriate monitoring arrangements and each LEP will produce an Evaluation Plan in 2015;
- From 2015 onwards the Local Growth Fund will be the prime source from which LEPs will secure funding to pursue their economic development initiatives in line with their Growth Plan. Funding to help facilitate the on-going development of the EZs will come from this as set-out by a LEP in its Growth Plan

Conclusions

Given the need to establish new governance arrangements for the Welsh EZs from 2015 onwards it is important to reflect on the factors that have been shown to influence successful EZ development in the past and also how EZ policy is evolving in England where there is a relatively large number of EZs across a range of quite different locations.

Although the evidence base is relatively limited, success in the past has been helped by ensuring that there are governance arrangements that can coordinate and integrate the activities of those agencies, government departments and private sector stakeholders who can provide the key inputs required to deliver strong land-use development, particularly as they relate to infrastructure, land remediation, marketing and training. Previous experience has also shown that the incentives offered on EZs will not be sufficient in themselves to deliver strong and sustainable development because there are often infrastructure shortfalls and a number of other constraining factors that have to be overcome. Zones deployed across the United Kingdom in the 1980s were relatively well-provided for in this respect because there were a number of funding sources available (i.e. like Derelict Land Grant). In the present age of relative austerity this is not the case.

The governance arrangements in the English LEPs are of interest because they situate management of EZs within a wider economic development plan, and their governance is centred on a business led partnership model. The private sector led partnership model being adopted by the LEPs and the way in which each has set-up its respective EZ managing arrangements varies across the 39 LEPs in England although the basic approach is much the same. The overall model provides valuable insight as to how the Welsh zones might proceed in the future and it would be useful to undertake further research to understand more about the basic structures and how they might be adapted or shaped in the light of the specific foci, challenges and stage of maturity of each of the seven Welsh zones. Further research would also help to understand more about the processes that can be used to select and appoint board members. It would also seem that the recent moves by HM Government to establish Growth Deals with each LEP, which include funds for each of the respective EZs as appropriate, offers a possible way forward in Wales.

Annex: The English Enterprise Zones

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
Aire Valley Leeds	142 HA	4 sites	Bus serv, energy, pharm and healthcare	Leeds City Region	Chair and 16 other directors, 8 from the private sector and 8 from the public sector	Zone management team from Leeds City Council. Zone team work with Leeds City Region (LEP). LCR Director and Director of City development sit on EZ Project Board.	Sth Yorkshire (part) Nth Yorkshire (part) West Yorkshire (all) York (unitary)
Alconbury Enterprise Campus	150 HA	1 site	Adv manf/eng, ict, indust biotech, low carb	Gt Cams and Gt Peterbrgh	Chair and 10 other directors, 5 from the private sector and 5 from the public sector.	LEP Board is the oversight body and delivery is a project advisory board that includes private sector, LEP and local authorities	Cambs (all) Essex (part) Herts (part) Norfolk (part) Suffolk (part) Peterb (Unity)

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
							Rutland (unitary)
Birmingham City Centre	68 HA	26 sites in seven clusters	Ad mnf/eng, bus serv, fin serv, ICT, pharm and healthcare	Gt Birmgha and Solihull	Chair and 18 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 9 from the public sector.	Specific planning and regeneration team has been set-up to deliver Big City Plan of which EZ sites are part. EZ officer attends LEP meetings. LEP Board oversees zone development.	Staffs (pt), Lichfd, Tamworth, West Mids (part) Worcs (part) Forest
Black Country	120 HA	2 sites	Ad manf/engineerg, aerospace, automotive	Black Country (jointly with Stoke and Staff LEP).	Chair and 8 other directors, 4 from the private sector and 4 from the public sector.	EZ Implementation Group with regeneration lead from 4 LAs (Wolverhampton, Walsall, Dudley and Sandwell). Meet bi-annually. Report directly to LEP Board.	West Mids (part) Wolverhampton

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
Bristol Temple Quarter	70 HA	3?	Bus serv, creative, fin serv	West of England	Chair and 10 other directors, 6 from the private sector and 4 from the public sector.	EZ overseen jointly by LEP and Bristol City Council.	Bath and NE Somerset (unitary) North Somerset (unitary) South Gloucs (unitary)
Discovery Park	99.4 HA	1 site	Agrifood, bus serv, energy, industrial biotech, pharmacy and healthcare	South East	Chair and 3 vice chairs, with 43 other directors (spread across East Sussex, Essex and Kent), 25 from the private sector and 22 from the public sector.	Zone manager acts as link to relevant LA service departments and reports to the LEP through Kent and Medway Economic Partnership that feeds directly to LEP Board.	East Sussex, Essex, Kent (all) Medway (unitary) South-end-Sea (unitary) Thurrock (unitary)
Enterprise West Essex @Harlow	51 HA	2 sites	Advan manf/engineer/ aerospace, creat ind, pharma and healthcare.	South East	Chair and 3 vice chairs, with 43 other directors (spread across East Sussex, Essex and Kent),	EZ Zone management board that has reps from Council/ Central; Gov/ HCA and	East Sussex, Essex, Kent (all) Medway (unitary)



Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
					25 from the private sector and 22 from the public sector.	private sector. Oversight by West Sussex Alliance (mix private and public sector). Oversight LEP Board.	South-end-Sea (unitary) Thurrock (unitary)
Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft	121 HA	6 sites	Bus serv, construction and built environ, energy, retail and logistics	New Anglia	Chair and 13 other directors, 6 from the private sector and 7 from the public sector.	LEP responsible for strategic oversight and responsible for strategic overview of its delivery.	Norfolk (all) Suffolk (all)
Hereford	72 HA	1 sites	Adv manf/engine, aerospace, agrifood; bus serv,; constr and built environment, security	The Marches	Chair and 8 other directors, 4 from the private sector and 4 from the public sector.	Enterprise Zone Board with membership from the wider LEP as well as Herefordshire Council and relevant land owners and developers. LEP Board oversight body.	Herefordshire (unitary) Shropshire (unitary) Telford and Wrekin (unitary).

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
Humber Green Port Corridor	484 HA	16 sites	Agrifood, energy, retail and logistics and transport.	Humber	Chair and 17 other directors, 11 from the private sector and 6 from the public sector.	EZ management through an officer working group from each Local Authority. Strategic oversight by LEP.	East Riding (unitary) Kingston upon Hull (unitary) North East Linc (unitary) North Lincoln (unitary)
Humber Renewable Energy Super Cluster	“	“	Agrifood, energy, retail and logistics and transport.	Humber	“	Strategic oversight LEP board.	East Riding (unitary) Kingston upon Hull (unitary) North East Linc (unitary) North Lincoln (unitary)
Lancashire	147 HA	2 sites	Advanced manufacturing/engineering, aerospace, automotive.	Lancashire	Chair and 15 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 6	Strategic oversight by LEP.	Lancashire (all) Blackburn with

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
					from the public sector.		Darwen (unitary) Blackpool (unitary)
Manchester Airport City			Advan manf/ engineering, aerospace bus serv, construction and built environ, industrial biotech, pharm and healthcare.	Greater Manchester	Chair and 13 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 4 from the public sector.	Strategic oversight by LEP Board.	Greater Manchester (all)
Mersey Waters	198 HA	23sites	Advanc manf/ engineer; automotive, business serv, energy, pharm and healthcare.	Liverpool City Region	Chair and 14 other directors, 8 from the private sector and 6 from the public sector.	EZ management body comprising private and public sector. Strategic oversight by LEP.	Halton (unitary) Merseyside (all) which includes Knowsley, Liverpool, ST Helens, Sefton and the Wirral.
MIRA Technology Park	87.5 HA	1 site	Advan manf/ engineering, automotive, low carbon	Leicester and Leicestershire	Chair and 14 other directors, 7 from the private sector and 7 from the public sector.	LEP Board has strategic oversight of EZ. EZ management body has reps from LEP, DCLG, BIS, DfT	Leicester (unitary), Leicestershire (all)

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
						and HCA and owner of site	
Newquay Aerohub	139H A	6 site	Adva manf/ engineering, energy, transport	Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly	Chair and 13 other directors, 8 from the private sector and 5 from the public sector.	Cornwall Development Company (owned by Cornwall Council) is commissioned to deliver the Enterprise Zone on behalf of the LEP, via the Aerohub Enterprise Zone team. LEP is the lead governing body of the zone.	Cornwall (unitary) Isles of Scilly
North Eastern	117 HA	2 sites	Advan man/ engineering, energy, low carbon, transport.	North Eastern	Chair and a board of 17 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 8 from the public sector.	LEP has strategic oversight.	County Durham (unitary), Northumberland (unitary) Tyne and Wear (all)
Northampton Waterside	120 HA	31sites	Automotive, construction and built environment, retail and logistics.	South East Midlands	Chair and 12 other directors, 6 from the private	There is an EZ steering board. LEP has	Bedford (unitary), Bucks

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
					sector and 6 from the public sector.	strategic oversight.	(part) central Beds (unitary). Luton (unitary), Milton Keynes (unitary), Northamptonshire (part), Oxfordshire (part)
Nottingham	58 HA	4 sites	Advanced manf/ engineering, creative industries, energy, industrial biotech,; pharm and healthcare.	Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire		EZ managed by Nottingham Regeneration Ltd. LEP has strategic oversight.	Derby (all), Derbyshire (all) Nottingham (unitary) and Nottinghamshire (all)
Royal Docks			Energy.	London	Chair, two Deputy Chairs and 12 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 3 from the public sector.	LEP has strategic oversight.	Greater London

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
Sci-Tech Daresbury	28 HA	4 sites	Advanced manf/ engineering, aerospace, energy, ICT, pharm and healthcare.	Cheshire and Warrington, Greater Manchester and Liverpool City Region	Cheshire and Warrington: Chair and 11 other directors, 7 from the private sector and 4 from the public sector.	EZ management through a Joint Venture with members from 3 LAs and business and reps from Science and Innovation Campus reps Three LEPs responsible for strategic oversight(GM, Liverpool and Cheshire and Warrington) and Sci-Tech Daresbury.	Cheshire East, Cheshire west and Chester (unitary), Warrington (unitary) and also Gt Manch and Liverpool LEPs as above.
Science Valley UK	113 HA	2 sites	Adv manf/ engineering, aerospace, energy, ICT, pharm and healthcare.	Oxfordshire	Chair and 12 other directors, 5 from the private sector and 7 from the public sector.	Science Vale UK responsible for overseeing and monitoring performance. LEP has strategic oversight.	Oxfordshire (all)

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
Sheffield City Region	130 HA		Adv manf/ engineering, aerospace, creative indust, low carbon ind, pharm and healthcare.	Sheffield City Region	Chair and 18 other directors, 9 from the private sector and 9 from the public sector.	An Enterprise Zone Collaborative Group which reports to LEP Board as body with strategic oversight.	Derbyshire (part), Derbyshire, Nottingham (part), South Yorkshire (all)
Solent	82 HAs	1 site	Advan manf/ engineer, aerospace, energy and low carbon energy.	Solent	Chair and 13 other directors, 7 from the private sector and 6 from the public sector. Solent is the first LEP to have an elected board, with the 8 business representatives being elected by a panel of local businesses affiliated with the LEP.	EZ Delivery Group with the CExs of Fareham and Gosport on it, Hampshire represented by their assistant director for economy, plus the HCA area manager and their project manager. LEP responsible for strategic oversight.	Hampshire (part), IoW (part), Portsmouth (unitary), Southampton (unitary).
Tees Valley			Adv manf/ engineer, chemicals, creative industries and energy.	Tees Valley	Chair and 12 other directors, 6 from the public	Governance is an EZ project manager and	Darlington (unitary), Hartlepool

Enterprise Zone	Size	Sites	Sectors	Local Enterprise Partnership	Board LEP	Zone governance	Local Auth Areas
					sector and 6 from the private sector.	Steering Group. LEP has strategic oversight.	(unitary), Middlesbrough (unitary), Redcar and Cleveland (unitary) and Stockton-on-Tees (unitary).

References

- Bond, S. A., Gardiner, B., & Tyler, P. (2013). **The impact of enterprise zone tax incentives on local property markets in England: who actually benefits?** *Journal of Property Research*, 30(1), 67-85.
- Department of Communities and Local Government. (2014). **Housing – policy: Supporting economic growth through local enterprise partnerships and enterprise zones.** Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/supporting-economic-growth-through-local-enterprise-partnerships-and-enterprise-zones/supporting-pages/local-enterprise-partnerships>
- Department of Communities and Local Government. (2011a). **Enterprise Zone Prospectus.** Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6274/1872724.pdf
- Department of Communities and Local Government. (2011b). **Growing Places Fund Perspective.** Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7521/2024617.pdf
- Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. (2013). **Local Growth: Realising Every Place's Potential.**
- Department of Business, Innovation and Skills Committee. (2013). **Business, Innovation and Skills Committee – Ninth Report: Local Enterprise Partnerships.** Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmbis/598/59802.htm>
- Deputy Prime Minister's Office. (2013). **Policy: Giving more power back to cities through City Deals.** Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/giving-more-power-back-to-cities-through-city-deals/supporting-pages/city-deals-wave-1>
- Larkin, K. and Wilcox, Z. (2011). **What would Maggie do? Why the Government's policy on Enterprise Zones needs to be radically different to the failed policy of the 1980s.** Centre for Cities.

- House of Commons. (2014). **Enterprise Zones-Commons Library Standard Note**. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/SN05942/enterprise-zones-commons-library-standard-note>
- House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts. (2014). **Promoting Economic Growth Locally Sixtieth Report of Session 2013-14**. HC 1110.
- Pike, A, McCarthy, O'Brien, P, Marlow, D and Tomaney, J. (2013). **Local institutions and local economic growth: the state of the LEPs in England**. Available at: http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.regionalstudies.org%2Fuploads%2FLocal_institutions_and_local_economic_growth_the_state_of_the_LEPs_in_England.pdf&ei=9tG_VICdJ4Td7QazhYGQBA&usg=AFQjCNGWhzoi7FL-XbylwnONk0NMjilMLg&bvm=bv.83829542,d.bGQ
- Sissons, A. and Brown, C. (2011). **Do Enterprise Zones Work? An Ideapolis Policy Paper**. Available at: http://www.theworkfoundation.com/assets/docs/publications/283_enterprise%20zones_24%20feb_final.pdf
- The Scottish Government (2011). **The Government Economic Strategy**. Available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/09/13091128/0>
- Tyler, P (2012). **Making Enterprise Zones Work: Lessons from Previous Enterprise Zone Policy in the United Kingdom**. Available at: <http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/directory/professor-pete-tyler>
- Welsh Assembly Government. (2014). **Department for Economy, Science and Transport Wales Enterprise Zones: Key Performance Indicators**.

The Public Policy Institute for Wales

The Public Policy Institute for Wales improves policy making and delivery by commissioning and promoting the use of independent expert analysis and advice. The Institute is independent of government but works closely with policy makers to help develop fresh thinking about how to address strategic challenges and complex policy issues. It:

- Works directly with Welsh Ministers to identify the evidence they need;
- Signposts relevant research and commissions policy experts to provide additional analysis and advice where there are evidence gaps;
- Provides a strong link between What Works Centres and policy makers in Wales; and
- Leads a programme of research on What Works in Tackling Poverty.

For further information please visit our website at ppiw.org.uk

The Author

Peter Tyler is a Professor in urban and regional economics in the Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge and a Fellow at St. Catharine's College.



This report is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence

