

# BOARD AGENDA AND BOARD PAPERS

**DATE AND TIME:** 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016, 15.00 – 17.30

**VENUE:** CLUB ROOM 4, THE CLUB BUILDING, ALCONBURY WEALD ENTERPRISE CAMPUS, ALCONBURY, CAMBS PE28 4WX

Item	Brief description	Time	Access/circulation prior to board meeting
1. Welcome and Introductions	From Chairman, Mark Reeve	15.00 5 mins	
2. Chief Executive Update	Verbal update Update by Neil Darwin	15.05 10 mins	Board & Corporate Members
3. Must Farm Proposal	To receive a presentation on Peterborough's Must Farm opportunity by Vivacity	15.15 20 mins	Board & Corporate Members
4. Growth Deal 3	To agree GCGP's final Growth Deal submission Paper by Adrian Cannard	15.35 30 mins	Board & Corporate Members
5. Growth Programmes Decisions	To agree updates on Growth Deal projects and Growing Places Fund proposals i) EZ Lancaster Way (Harvey Bibby in attendance) ii) Collusion (Rachel Drury/Simon Poulter in attendance) iii) iMet Advisory Board	16.05 15 mins 15 mins 15 mins	Board & Corporate Members
6. Greater Cambridge City Deal – GCGP Engagement	To receive a paper outlining how GCGP will engage with the City Deal Paper by Neil Darwin	16.50 15 mins	Board & Corporate Members
7. Cambridge – Milton Keynes – Oxford: 'growth corridor' call for evidence	To receive an update on National Infrastructure Commission activities Paper by Adrian Cannard	17.05 15 mins	Board & Corporate Members
8. Minutes from Board Meeting held on 23 June 2016	To agree Minutes	17.20 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members
9. AOB		17.25 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** 15:00 on Tuesday 13 September 2016

**VENUE:** BOARD ROOM, KING'S LYNN INNOVATION CENTRE, INNOVATION DRIVE, KING'S LYNN, NORFOLK PE30 5BY

## Item 4: Growth Deal – Round 3 Update

### Recommendation

That the Board

- **note and comment on emerging proposals for Growth Deal Round 3 bid;**
- **agree the recommendation of the Local Transport Panel on the Large Local Transport Majors schemes for bidding**

#### i) Introduction

This report provides an update on the current round of £1.8bn Growth Deal funding being made available to LEPs for projects in the period 2017/18 – 2020/21. A ‘pitch’ presentation will be made at Board.

#### ii) Progress to Date

The deadline for submission of Growth Deal Round 3 bids is 28<sup>th</sup> July.

At the last Board meeting an update was given on the bid progress. Of critical importance was the impact of the ongoing Devolution discussions affecting the majority of the GCGP area. As the Board endorsed the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Devolution Deal, along with all the local authorities in that area, the Government has now confirmed that GCGP is eligible to submit a ‘programme’ based Growth Deal bid, rather than a list of projects. This also takes into account that GCGP authorities in Lincolnshire, Norfolk and Suffolk are also covered by proposed Deals. The bid document is therefore being prepared around blocks of funding, and will not need to include a prioritised list of projects. This is important given comments on the appraisal process below.

However, there is an anomaly for the three local authority areas not covered by any Devolution Deal (Rutland County Council, North Hertfordshire District Council and Uttlesford District Council) where Government requires a separate list of projects. These are addressed later in the report.

A presentation will be made to Board on the 19<sup>th</sup> setting out the ‘pitch’ to Government. Feedback on that will inform the Ministerial challenge session confirmed for the 21<sup>st</sup> July and the final submission.

#### iii) Relationship of Project Appraisal to Bid

The development of GCGP’s project pipeline is ongoing, in parallel with Growth Deal negotiations and Devolution consultation. As part of this, consultants (SDG) are being used to provide technical appraisal (their appraisal is based on the EAST transport tool) alongside internal analysis for fit and deliverability. Expressions of Interest submitted by partners were in many cases at an early stage of development and

the view is that almost all projects require further work against the Growth Deal criteria should they proceed to full Business Case. The Local Transport Panel considered the emerging work on the transport schemes and recommended that ranking against different criteria be replaced with a risk rating instead. That recommendation has been extended to all schemes.

The EoI appraisal provides one aspect of the ongoing development of the pipeline, other aspects which will be taken into consideration include Government policy (which may change now post Brexit), national infrastructure priorities and SEP strategic priorities. The LEP will not be in a position to make a contractual commitment to individual projects until 2017 at the earliest (and most of the funding only becomes available in 2020/21). We are therefore still at very early stages within the programme's development.

#### **iv) Relationship between Growth Deal and Devolution**

There is significant overlap between submitted to GCGP for Growth Deal funding and those specifically highlighted within the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough (C&P) Devolution document as part of the proposed Single Pot for infrastructure and growth. It is therefore crucial that the LEP and its partners ensure the proposals for Growth Deal are made in the context of the emerging Combined Authorities and Deals, both in terms of strategic context and the more practical relationship between projects proposed for Single Pot funding and Growth Deal. For example, GCGP's bid for a block of funding under the theme of Transport & Infrastructure would complement the £48m capital proposed over the same period in the Devolution deal.

As the Single Pot includes revenue funding then this would provide a solution to the problem of Growth Deal funding only being capital funding, particularly as partners have submitted many projects that are reliant on revenue.

#### **v) Growth Deal – proposed programme approach**

Under Growth Deal 3, it is proposed that GCGP bid for £70m towards a flexible programme worth around £250m which will run over four years from 2017-2021. The investment blocks are shown on the following figure.



The investment blocks reflect the Board’s existing priorities as expressed in the SEP and builds upon previous rounds of Growth Deal. Examples of projects from the pipeline that fit under each of these will be included in the Board presentation. Each of these blocks is likely to be individually over-subscribed (subject to projects passing appraisal process) so the whole programme is scalable should more funding become available.

**vi) Projects in non-Devolution areas**

As set out above, projects in three council areas have to be prioritised and specifically drawn out. Only Rutland County Council has proposed specific projects at this stage, with Uttlesford and North Hertfordshire looking to generic area-wide programmes (such as agri-tech or innovation support within the programme blocks above). It is worth noting that these three Councils will not have the same potential to access revenue funding for infrastructure schemes as the rest of GCGP area – it is proposed that this become part of the ask of the Growth Deal.

Rutland has proposed 4 projects: Rutland Incubation Centre; Station Road Industrial Estate; Feasibility/Modelling Oakham Level Crossing; Housing (affordable) site, Oakham. Although the risk assessment appraisal is still underway and will be reported to the Board, the following observations are made:

A - Rutland Incubation Centre £500k grant – provision of incubation office space is one of the programme themes for the bid and this could link with other proposals (such as South Kesteven Incubation Centre Network). Likely to be a candidate scheme.

B - Station Road Industrial Estate transport access study £61k– concerns over outputs and revenue ask, although cash matched. Unlikely to be a candidate scheme at this time.

C - Feasibility / modelling re Oakham Level Crossing – concerns over revenue ask and Growth Deal 3 timescales, as need an early decision to fit with Local Plan review. Unlikely to be a candidate scheme.

D - Flood mitigation at potential development site Oakham, also involving relocation of Council depot £127k- could unlock Starter Homes on a brownfield site in a market town (albeit in relatively small numbers circa 55). Likely to be a candidate scheme.

#### vii) Local Transport Majors Fund

- a. The aim of the Government’s separate Local Transport Majors Fund is to provide funding for those exceptionally large, potentially transformative, local schemes that are too big to be taken forward within regular Growth Deal allocations and could not otherwise be funded. Government define this as schemes over £59m for GCGP area. LEPs are invited to submit prioritised bids for funding for either working up Outline Business Cases or scheme construction.
- b. Three proposals (all for Outline Business Case Funding) were received from partners. The Local Transport Panel considered the three proposals and the **recommendation** of the Panel is to submit two schemes to DfT, in the following priority order: the A505 Transport Study (Cambridge/Royston); the A15 Dualling Study (Peterborough/Market Deeping).

A505 Transport Corridor Study	CCC	1) A strategic transport and growth study which will incorporate an Options Appraisal Report and an Appraisal Specifications Report covering the Large Local Major Transport Scheme, and potentially several further Local Major Transport Schemes; 2) Outline Business Case development for a A505 Duxford to Granta Park scheme and for any other schemes that emerge from the strategic study.
A15 Dualling	PCC	The scheme comprises two lane dualling of the A15 Ginton Northborough Bypass in each direction from Junction 23 (at grade roundabout with the A15 Werrington Parkway / Paston Parkway) to the north of Peterborough to Junction 26 (at grade roundabout with the A1175 / B1525) to the west of Market Deeping.
A16 Dualling	PCC	The scheme comprises two lane dualling of the A16 in each direction from the A16 / A47 at grade roundabout (located to the north-east of Peterborough) northwards to the junction of the A16 / Peterborough Road at grade roundabout to the south of Crowland.

## **Item 5: Growth Programme Decisions**

This item presents projects for consideration under both Growth Deal (Round 1) and the LEP's Growing Places Funding.

### **Item 5i: Lancaster Way - Enterprise Zone Investment (commercially sensitive)**

## Item 5ii: Collusion

### Recommendation

That the Board approve the funding requested, subject to revised Business Case appraisal. It is also proposed that the LEP take a proactive role in developing a governance structure for the project, by becoming a member of a partnership board alongside Arts Council England and key private sector partners. This will include agreeing the process and mechanism for payments and well as project performance monitoring.

#### i) Background

Location: LEP-wide

Funding Requested: £325k revenue (Growing Places Fund)

Risk: Medium (to be assessed through Business Case appraisal)

#### ii) Purpose

To consider a proposal for £325k grant investment as part of a £905k project to provide targeted cluster development and support to creative industries across the GCGP area. Collusion will work with around 200 individuals and enterprises to include at least 30 SMEs.

#### iii) Previous Approvals

The LEP provided £9,000 to Collusion in 2015 to develop the project. Collusion presented to the LEP Board in March 2015. The Board gave support for the outline approach.

Collusion presented their proposal for Growing Places funding to Investment Committee in May 2015, following which the LEP requested further clarification of direct outputs, SME / business outcomes and exit strategy. The LEP's Growth Team has also met with Collusion to articulate the project benefits to the creative industries sector and discuss potential arrangements for governance and scrutiny should the project be awarded funding.

A revised summary of the proposal is attached as Appendix 1.

An appraisal of the Business Case based on the additional information provided will be required prior to funding agreement. Due Diligence would also include details of Collusion's proposal to the Arts Council for match funding to ensure no conflicts or risks for the LEP.

#### iv) Project Outline

**In collusion** will be a three year creative industries programme based on a partnership between Collusion, GCGP, Arts Council England, local government, universities (University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin) and partner businesses.

Its objective is for the GCGP area to become a national creative technology centre of excellence generating new jobs, digital skills, new products and businesses. The project will accelerative innovation by bringing creative individuals and enterprises together with emerging areas of technology – for example working with ARM and Nokia on virtual reality technology, and supporting the engagement of creative talent to provide content for that new technology.

#### **v) Project Outcomes**

Business Improvement and outcomes from this programme across the creative industries:

- Engagement with around 200 creative individuals and companies including at least 25 SMEs.
- 30 jobs (estimated)
- 80 events including labs, technical workshops, and seminars exploring practical issues such as rapid prototyping, co-developed with regional colleges - College of West Anglia, Huntingdon Regional College, Peterborough Regional College
- 30 small-scale R&D projects (games, software, commissions, IOT devices)
- 13 major projects/commissions utilising new technologies, ideas etc, e.g. Investment in young people -
- Minecraft Huntingdon project based on Collusion's Minecraft Cambridge.
- 10 public events showcasing R&D projects/outcomes
- Online resources including films covering key learning from tech workshops, information about opportunities and funding, and project updates
- Connecting international businesses into the sub region e.g ARM, Cambridge Consultants.
- Engagement with two universities - University of Cambridge, Anglia Ruskin University
- Shared R&D in themed areas - augmented reality, virtual reality, data security
- Impact on capital capacity and infrastructure
- National and local media coverage - aiming for a reach of 10 million +
- April 2019 - a major public showcase in Cambridge with connections across the LEP area
- Programme value £905,000 (2016-2019) including £90,000 from local businesses and £325,000 bid to Arts Council England.

#### **vi) Strategic Fit**

The In Collusion project addresses the following GCGP priorities;

- to expand the impact and benefit of Cambridge across the wider LEP area; and
- support the dynamism and expansion of Market Towns.

It is aimed directly at business growth and productivity within the digital and creative sector, a key sector for GCGP.

**vii) Risks and Deliverability**

A key risk is Collusion securing Arts Council funding. Collusion has bid for £325k from a national Arts Council award under their 'Ambition for Excellence' programme and has been through the first stage of competition. There is only one other project currently under consideration. Should the bid fail, Collusion will be invited to consider whether the project can be re-scaled and re-focused under the LEP investment and private sector / other match funding only.

It is recommended that the LEP provides a 'champion' to become a member of a project partnership board for the In Collusion project, to provide scrutiny and direction in support of delivery of key outcomes.

**viii) Exit Strategy / Future Sustainability**

Collusion has identified key areas to support future sustainability for activities delivered through this project;

- SELF SUSTAINING APPROACH: Collusion will support and grow groups of businesses as self-sustaining clusters, working together to generate new activities and outcomes. The project will provide businesses with the tools to continue their own development path.
- ENHANCED CONNECTIVITY, GROWTH & INWARD INVESTMENT: increased connectivity between businesses, industries and sectors will support continued growth and opportunities. It will mean the area is working coherently and able to act when major funding opportunities arise (eg Innovate UK).
- INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING: Collusion will input to the LEP and other partners plans to identify the need for key infrastructure and provide guidance to businesses/clusters on how to move things forward.
- LEGACY ACTIVITY: Collusion and other partners will develop legacy activities that provides continued support for creative businesses. This could take a variety of forms, e.g. other publicly funded activity, business to business support on a commercial consultancy basis, sponsored packages.

## **Item 5iii: Board representation on iMET Advisory Board**

### **Recommendation**

That the Board nominate a member to sit on the iMET Advisory Board

#### **i) Introduction**

The iMET Centre, Alconbury Weald is a Growth Deal Round 1 skills project. It has reached an advanced stage of delivery, with ground preparations under way and building construction planned to commence in August. The project governance has been reviewed to reflect the role of the Corporation Board of Huntingdonshire Regional College in steering the project as it moves from construction into an operational skills and learning centre. This has led to the creation of a new Advisory Board.

#### **ii) New governance**

A review of the governance of the iMET project has been undertaken to set in place the ongoing structure that will oversee the operation of the centre. As recipients of GCGP grant funding the Corporation Board of Huntingdonshire Regional College is ultimately responsible for the successful delivery and operation of the centre (as set out in the funding agreement). However, to advise on the operation of the centre and to continue the valuable partnership working of the bid partners, an Advisory Board is being established. It is proposed that the GCGP Board is represented on the Advisory Board.

Terms of reference of the Advisory Board are attached (and also includes a number of working groups). Of the two Advisory Board places for GCGP, it proposed that one be taken up by an officer of GCGP (currently Adrian Cannard, Director of Strategy) and one by a Board member.

Under the previous governance arrangements GCGP was represented on a project board by the previous Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council in his capacity as a GCGP Board member. In the Advisory Board Terms of Reference there is separate provision for 2 representatives directly from HDC, so members have the opportunity to vary this arrangement without impacting on local representation if they so wished.

## Item 6: Greater Cambridge City Deal – GCGP Engagement

### Re-basing GCGP’s engagement with the Greater Cambridge City Deal

#### i) Recommendations

GCGP Board is asked to support:

- i) Improved mechanisms set out in the report to deliver a more coherent, coordinated voice into the Greater Cambridge City Deal
- ii) Agree a route through which a successor can be identified to join the City Deal Executive Board
- iii) Agree to review the outcome of proposed improvements set out in 6 months-time.

#### ii) Background

The Greater Cambridge City Deal is an agreement set up between a partnership of local organisations and Central Government, to help secure future economic growth and quality of life in the Greater Cambridge city region. It is the largest of several City Deal programmes taking place in the UK.

The agreement set up with Central Government will provide up to £500 million worth of funding over the next 15 years. We have secured an initial £100 million investment over the five years to 2020, to progress the first tranche of City Deal projects.

A further £200 million will be available from April 2020 and a final £200 million in 2025, if we can prove success in driving economic growth from each tranche of the City Deal programme. We aim to generate a further £500 million through other funding streams, bringing in a total investment of £1 billion.

Focusing on transport, housing, skills and innovation, the City Deal will bring immediate and long-term benefits to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire region, by:

- Delivering projects to improve local transport networks, to reduce traffic congestion and provide more sustainable travel options between key residential and employment areas.
- Speeding up planned housing development to deliver 33,500 new and affordable homes.
- Working with young people and employers to create more training opportunities, 44,000 new jobs and 420 apprenticeships.
- Capitalising on our region’s innovation and technological capability to make Cambridge a world-leading Smart City.

#### iii) City Deal Governance

The Greater Cambridge City Deal is governed by an Executive Board consisting of the 5 signatory organisations (Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District

Council, GCGP and the University of Cambridge. As an interim measure, GCGP is represented on the Executive by Mark Reeve.

Supporting the Executive Board is a Joint Assembly. The Assembly provides advice to the Board and consists of 15 members drawing 3 representatives from each of the 5 signatories GCGP's representative on the Assembly are:

- Claire Ruskin, Chief Executive, Cambridge Network
- Andy Williams, Vice President, Astra Zeneca
- Sir Michael Marshall, Marshalls Aerospace

The business voice is seen by Government as a key input into the City Deal by Government and Local partners. GCGP was identified as the route through which this voice would be coordinated.

Beneath this structure supporting Executive Groups include;

Chief Executives meeting – attended by Neil Darwin

Programme Board – attended by Adrian Cannard

#### **iv) Analysis of the issues**

The headline issues facing GCGP in support of the City Deal include

- Ensuring GCGP can offer a coherent, coordinated single voice
- Keeping up with the City Deal's paperwork
- Influencing decisions when the business voice has no formal decision making role

##### ***i) Ensuring GCGP can offer a coherent, coordinated single voice***

To date GCGP has not undertaken briefings of representatives on a formal basis, conversations have been more ad hoc. This has led to comment from other stakeholders that the business voice does not look joined up and seems to represent individual business issues. To address this, it is proposed that we hold a face to face session at the beginning of each meeting cycle with GCGP's business representative on the Assembly, to ensure that common messages and positions are adopted before each meeting. This will bring coherence to our voice.

##### ***ii) Keeping up with the City Deal's paperwork***

The City Deal generates a significant weight of paper for each of its meetings. Not least due to the technical issues being dealt with on a number of key schemes. To date GCGP's Executive has only be able to provide ad hoc briefing notes on key issues. A simple way of providing common information will be to develop regular briefing notes, these can then feed into the business representative meeting set out in (i).

##### ***iii) Influencing decisions when the business voice has no formal decision making role***

It is clear that neither GCGP nor the University of Cambridge are entitled to have a vote on the Executive Board, this restriction is set out in the Local Government Act (1972). However local partners and

Government recognise the role the business voice needs to play in shaping the delivery of the City Deal. Moving forward GCGP needs to draw together views from a complex number of networks within the Greater Cambridge City Deal geography. We will utilise future briefing notes to ensure that organisation such as Cambridge Network and Cambridge Ahead are aware of current issues and utilise their own routes to secure further business input. By drawing and testing the impact of (i) and (ii) and the additional route set out here, we will be able to better test the impact of our voice in time.

***iv) Recruiting a new representative onto the Executive Board***

John Bridge originally represented GCGP on the Executive Board. Since John's resignation Mark Reeve has taken on the position on an interim basis. To date we have three expressions of taking on the Board role on a more formal basis. The GCGP Board therefore need to decide how best to identify a process through which a new GCGP representative can be identified. None of the three individuals expressing an interest sit on the GCGP Board. Again, thought needs to be given on how we build this connection rather than lose communication through an individual outside of the GCGP structure. It should also be noted that taking on this commitment requires considerable personal input. Current estimates suggest that the role of supporting GCGP on the City Deal could equate very closely to a 1 day a week commitment.

## Item 7: Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Corridor

### Recommendation

That the Board note the approach to National Infrastructure Commission consultation

#### i) Introduction

This report provides an update on the National Infrastructure Commission's Call for Evidence into the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford "growth corridor".

#### ii) Progress to Date

On 16 March 2016, the Chancellor asked the National Infrastructure Commission to make recommendations to government to maximize the potential of the Cambridge – Milton Keynes – Oxford corridor. The commission has launched a 12 week call for evidence with a deadline of 5<sup>th</sup> August. The Call for Evidence and the specific questions are here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/cambridge-milton-keynes-oxford-growth-corridor-call-for-evidence/cambridge-milton-keynes-oxford-growth-corridor-call-for-evidence> .

The Chancellor asked the NIC to "...make recommendations [to government] to maximize the potential of the Cambridge – Milton Keynes – Oxford corridor as a single, knowledge intensive cluster that competes on the global stage, whilst protecting the area's high quality environment and securing the homes and job the area needs. The commission will look at the priority infrastructure improvements needed and assess the economic case for which investments would generate the most growth."

GCGP, along with local government leaders and officers has engaged with the Commissioners. The broad thrust of our response so far has been that each of the growth locations within the 'corridor' (such as Cambridge) need to function effectively, not just making the transport links between them better. This leads to a position about a range of local connectivity and infrastructure improvements required. However, key aspirations around East-West Rail, the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and A428 improvements are seen as a pre-requisite to driving future growth in the corridor.

Two pieces of work are underway to inform a response. Six LEPs along the corridor (Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire Thames Valley, Hertfordshire, GCGP and Northants) have commissioned work to draw out any shared position on the over-arching strategic asks. More locally, GCGP is working with local authority colleagues on a joint response focusing on the Cambridge part of the corridor.

## Item 8: Minutes from Board Meeting held on 23 June 2016

### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE AND GREATER PETERBOROUGH ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP LTD HELD AT ALCONBURY WEALD ON THURSDAY 23<sup>RD</sup> JUNE 2016

Present: Mark Reeve (Chairman)  
John Bridge  
Cllr Steve Count  
Terry Elphick  
David Gill  
Claire Higgins  
Cllr John Holdich  
Cllr Terry King  
Mark Read  
Cllr James Waters

In attendance: Adrian Cannard – Director of Strategy  
Neil Darwin – Chief Executive  
Pete Northover – BIS  
Alex Francis - GCGP  
Michael Tolond – Company Secretary  
Laura Welham-Halstead – Head of Communications and Connectivity  
Steve Bowyer – Observer  
Graham Bull - alternate for Jason Ablewhite representing Hunts District Council

MINUTE NO.		ACTION
2016/34	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> Apologies for absence were received from Trevor Ellis, Prof Iain Martin, Prof Nigel Slater and Cllr Lewis Herbert (Observer).</p>	
2016/35	<p><b>PROPOSAL FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH DEVOLUTION</b> The Chairman introduced the proposal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution and stressed the significance of the proposal in terms of funding, local control, infrastructure, housing and transport. Mark Reeve introduced the summary of the devolution deal between Government and the seven local authorities, the Governance structure including the election of a local Mayor, Finance and Funding, new homes and sustainable communities, transport and digital connectivity, learning and skills provision, employment, business support, public service reform and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Commitments.</p>	

	<p>Mark Reeve stated that the Board would be asked to clarify and confirm their leadership in Learning and Skills matters within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the Board would need to consider its role in this area after July 4<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>In relation to transport issues, Mark Reeve confirmed that the LEP was in discussion with other LEPs and other bodies on regional transport issues in the light of the creation of a Sub-National Transport Body.</p> <p>The Board reviewed the Scheme of Delegation contained within the Devolution Scheme which included the establishment of the Combined Authority, its membership, the Directly Elected Mayor and the detailed operational provisions including specific functions of the Mayor and the Combined Authority, overview and scrutiny.</p> <p>Mark Reeve stressed the need for collaboration between the Combined Authorities and the Mayor to ensure that the devolution proposal worked effectively.</p> <p>There would be a period of consultation on the scheme before the election and appointment of a Mayor in May 2017 with the constitution and operational provisions being agreed by January.</p> <p>The Board confirmed that on the basis of the proposed Scheme of Governance they considered that the devolution scheme was deliverable and stressed the need for the LEP to remain fully engaged despite having only one vote on the Combined Authority.</p> <p>James Waters confirmed that if the New Anglia LEP did not proceed with the Norfolk and Suffolk devolution deal, his local authority West Suffolk District Council could join the Cambridgeshire/Peterborough devolution proposals. However, the Chairman confirmed that given the current fairly rigid time requirements for agreement to the scheme, this was considered unlikely until 2017.</p> <p>The Board considered the Statutory Governance Review which had examined alternative models of governance which were the status quo, an Economic Prosperity Board, a Combined Authority and Mayoral Combined Authority. The review had concluded that the latter model would provide the optimum model for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.</p> <p>The Board fully supported the devolution proposal and the Combined Authorities in ensuring the most economically beneficial deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and congratulated those members of the Board in securing the deal from Government.</p> <p>A draft press release would be circulated for comments prior to publication.</p>	ND
2016/36	<p><b>GROWTH DEAL 3 UPDATE</b></p> <p>Adrian Cannard presented an update on the current round of £1.8bn Growth Deal funding being made available to LEPs for projects in the period 2017/18 – 2020/21. The LEP's proposals were at an indicated cost of £70m.</p> <p>Expressions of interest (EOLs) had been invited during April and May and bidders had received checklists stating the core criteria for funding, strategic priorities, key sectors and likely funding profile. 49 EOLs had been received and sent to independent consultants for appraisal. The GCGP Growth Deal submission deadline was 28<sup>th</sup> July and the outcome of Devolution discussions would impact in Growth Deal both in terms of scale of proposals and process. LEPs progressing to a devolution deal would be able to submit a Growth Deal proposal based on a flexible programme allocation rather than detailed project proposals.</p> <p>However, for areas not covered by the devolution proposal e.g. Rutland, would require detailed project proposals.</p> <p>The separate Local Transport Majors Fund was outside regular Growth Deal allocations and had been defined as scheme over £59m for the GCGP area and three proposals had been received for development funding: £750,000 revenue for study/overseas business case for ASOS Transport Corridor Study; £1.63m revenue for Outline Business Case for A15 dualling and £1.51m revenue for Outline Business Case for A16 dualling.</p>	

	<p>GCGP's Local Transport Panel will meet on 5<sup>th</sup> July to consider all transport schemes submitted as EOLs and to provide advice to the July Board on the relative priority order of the three Local Transport Majors Fund bids.</p> <p>A snapshot of the LEP's proposal would be submitted on 24<sup>th</sup> June based on infrastructure and housing, innovation eco-systems, business growth, enterprise zones and a package involving skills and the outcome of the Area Based Reviews of further education.</p> <p>The date of the Ministerial Challenge to the LEPs on their Growth Deal bids would be notified shortly and the LEP would be represented by Board members with details and names to be agreed. The importance of ensuring local MP support for the various projects was emphasised to ensure the best outcome.</p>	
2016/37	<p><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2016 were approved and the matters arising were noted as having been actioned. The July meeting would review the Cambridge City Deal, the Growth Deal Update and the Collusion proposal.</p>	
2016/38	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p>1. <u>Growth Deal Scheme Junction 20 A47</u> [John Holdich and Terry Elphick declared an interest in this item]</p> <p>Adrian Cannard presented the details of the reallocation of grant funds between two approved Growth Deal transport schemes in Peterborough. The proposal would switch £1.3m from Bourges Boulevard Phase 2 to Junction 20 A47 improvements which would increase the junction 20 grant to £6.3m and decreasing the Bourges Boulevard Phase 2 to £9.2m.</p> <p>John Bridge confirmed that the Transport panel was fully supportive of the principle of the reallocation of the grant funds and have recommended that the grant offer be approved by the Board.</p> <p>After due discussion the Board agreed the recommendation from the Local Transport Panel.</p>	
2016/39	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>The date of the next meeting was fixed for Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at 3pm at Alconbury Weald.</p>	