



Greater Cambridge
Greater Peterborough
Enterprise Partnership

LEP BOARD MEETING

Minutes from the meeting held on
24th July 2012 from 15.00 to 17.20
at Genzyme, Haverhill

Board Members Present

Mark Reeve (MR) Interim Chairman
John Bridge OBE (JB)
Cllr Nick Clarke (NC)
Cllr Terry King (TK)
Dr Lynn Morgan (LM)
Allan Arnott (AA)
Prof Mike Thorne PhD (MT)
Trevor Ellis (TE)

Apologies

Dr Robert Swann
Cllr Marco Cereste
Prof Sir Richard Friend FRS FREng
Cllr Jason Ablewhite

Also in attendance

Alex Plant (AP)	Board Advisor
Neil Darwin (ND)	Board Advisor
Glenn Athey (GA)	Interim Executive Director
Laura Welham-Halstead (LWH)	Communications and Engagement Lead
Mark Cooper (MC)	Skills and Business Growth Lead
Natalie Blaken (NB)	Infrastructure and Funding Lead
Jan Pinkerton	BIS Local

1. Item 2 - Welcome and previous board minutes

MR welcomed the Board, and noted apologies and scheduled late arrivals, as well as outlining the new approach to Board papers and meetings under his interim Chairmanship.

The Board approved the previous minutes with no amendments.

2. Item 3 – Corporate Governance and Scheme of Delegation

MR introduced the paper.

The Board discussed the importance of having ownership over



Greater Cambridge
Greater Peterborough
Enterprise Partnership

major decisions regarding funding, and the requirement to plan ahead to the future with regards to where and how LEP capital funds are held.

The Board agreed that the limit for Project Funding that can be approved by the Investment Sub Committee should be changed to £100,000, and all decisions for financial commitments over £100,000 must come to Board for a decision at the meeting or electronically. Decisions relating to rental agreements of five years or more must also come via the Board, and activities with prior Board approval can be agreed by the Executive Director up to the value of £10,000.

A rewording of the section relating to contract variance was also requested to read “to be maximum 10% variance up to a maximum of £10,000 for the Chair/Vice Chair; and for staff to approve contract variance of 5% up to a maximum of £5,000.

It was also agreed that two signatures should be required for any payments. GA

The Board requested the paper is redrafted to make the authorisation levels for the Executive Director clearer, and to take into account the change in authorisation limits. GA

A brief budget update will be taken to all future Board meetings.

The Board then discussed the requirement for a Vice Chair. It was agreed the VC should be a business representative to ensure the Board remains fully business-led. A proposal from JB that MR should take on this role once a new Chair is recruited for continuity, to be formally discussed once new Chair in place.

It was agreed by the Board that the Investment sub-group should be renamed as the Investment Sub Committee, and that the Mem & Arts should be updated to reflect this. GA/ ND

GA and ND to review Mem & Arts, update and circulate to the Board.

3. **Item 4 – Enterprise Zone Business Rates**

MR introduced the paper, which outlined a draft overview of how Governance of Enterprise Zone Business rates revenue could be managed by the LEP. Whilst no revenue is expected prior to 2014, a



Greater Cambridge
Greater Peterborough
Enterprise Partnership

draft outline is required by CLG this week.

The Board had a full discussion about the implications of setting out a draft Governance arrangement in advance of further information and discussions regarding the priority projects requiring funding from this revenue stream.

It was agreed that whilst we need to submit a draft statement of intent to CLG with regards to Governance, that the decision was not made on the wider evidence given within the Board paper. Therefore, point 17 'based upon this paper' was not agreed by the Board. The three first statements, with a small amendment, were agreed.

ND was also asked to look into the potential to set up other areas outside of the EZ that could benefit from a similar Business Rates scheme. ND

4. **Item 5 – Growth Prospectus**

AP arrived.

The Board discussed the draft document and welcomed the analysis of the LEP area, which they felt was strong. It was felt that the list of projects and activities was too long and would not be achievable given the current resource levels available to the LEP.

With regards to the Prospectus itself, it was recommended a short Executive Summary was produced highlighting the key consultation questions, and that the wording of the document was edited to reinforce the scope of the consultation and the context within which the LEP works (low funding, few staff). It was noted that the VC and SE sector also needed referencing within the document, which was agreed by the Board. GA

Businesses should be shown the long list of potential projects and interventions, and be asked to prioritise the most important to genuinely shape the future work of the LEP.

It was agreed that the approach to work with Business Representative Organisations and others to gauge local opinion via the consultation process was sound, and that a great deal of effort should be put into the supporting campaign. LWH

GA to redraft document and then share it electronically with the GA



Board before the consultation commences.

5. Item 6 – Skills subgroup recommendations

AA introduced the paper which outlined key actions identified by the Skills subgroup.

The Board then discussed the importance of reviewing work that is already underway to avoid duplication. MC agreed that the next step was to review what was being delivered and how effective that delivery is/was. MC

There was agreement amongst the Board that the role of the LEP is to act as a conduit for businesses to reach the services provided by others, e.g. Local Authorities, Social Enterprises, Colleges etc... MC is due to meet with LM shortly to discuss the role of the voluntary sector and social enterprises in skill delivery. MC/LM

AA wrapped up the conversation by thanking the Board for their inputs that will shape with work of MC. He agreed there was no “one size fits all” approach, and that smaller skills groups based around specific areas would be set up in time. MC

The Board made the decision to approve and ratify the recommendations outlined within the Skills paper.

6. Item 7 – Subgroups roundup

LM informed the Board that the next VSE group meeting will be held once a new Chair is in place.

JB updated the Board on progress with the Banking Group. An event is being scheduled for early October to help businesses connect with banks and financial providers, coupled with 1-2-1 sessions to discuss specific funding issues they may have.

The Board then discussed issues relating to the banking sector, including the closure of banks in rural towns and the lack of personal contact and judgement applied to loan decisions. JB said these issues were being raised with the Banking group.

NB provided an update on the Greater Cambridge group, which had reviewed the draft Growth Prospectus and the Cambridge City Local Plan. A joint response to the Cambridge City Local Plan is being draft that the LEP can sign up to as required. NB to keep Board informed. NB



Greater Cambridge
Greater Peterborough
Enterprise Partnership

7. Item 8 - Campaigns

LWH and AP introduced the campaigns paper, providing further information about the partners involved in the “Make it here” campaign.

The Board were supportive of the campaign, particularly given the high level of external support offered, but requested further consideration was given to the name and marketing. AP/
LWH

Other campaigns on hold for now.

8. Item 9 – Growing Places Fund

NC joined the meeting.

NB introduced the paper and discussed a request from Peterborough City Council to vary the percentage of grant vs loan whilst not increasing the overall amount required from the fund.

The Board carefully debated the issue, focusing on the impact the project would have on the local economy, the reasons for the variance request and the position of the overall fund.

The Board agreed that they are not minded to change the balance between grant and loan at this stage, and have requested further information about additional spend request once new contractor quotes had been firmed up.

NB then requested the Board’s approval to continue with supplying funding for the Future Business Centre, which is unable to offer the LEP security against the loan.

The Board discussed the situation, and agreed that a charge to secure the loan is needed, heads of terms could be agreed in principle. The Board felt they had a sufficient understanding of the risks involved, and the benefits that the scheme could deliver. The Board also agreed a firm limit on our liability with regards to this scheme.

The final project discussed was the Haverhill Research Park proposal, which is being co-funded with New Anglia LEP. New Anglia LEP is happy to provide up to £2m of funding if we agree to match fund. The LEP had originally agreed £1.8m and the Board agreed (after clarifying the cash flow position of the fund) that we



should increase our allocation to match that of New Anglia LEP.

NB

NB to feedback to individual schemes and bring an update to the next Board meeting.

9. **Item 10 – HR & Contracts**

MR introduced the paper.

The Board agreed to extend the contracts of two of the LEP core team until 31st March 2013 to bring them in line with the other contracts (keeping in mind a one month notice period can be actioned by the new Chair if required). GA to action.

GA

MC updated the Board on the Skills Funding Agency money to support skills mapping and development around the Enterprise Zone. The Board agreed that as this was allocated funding and therefore consultancy work up to the value of £40,000 excluding VAT could be commissioned as required.

MC

10. **Update**

MR reviewed the key Board decisions to date, and NC agreed all of them. The Board was then quorate and therefore all decisions officially passed.

11. **A14**

NC gave a verbal update to the Board regarding the recent DfT announcement that the A14 scheme is back on the agenda, if funding can be provided from three sources:

1. Tolling
2. Government
3. Local partnerships, including CIL payments, Local Authorities (across the LEP area and beyond) and the LEP

The Board then discussed the implications of the decision, welcoming news that there is progress with regards to the proposed improvements, with a keenness to see further details relating to the scheme and proposed tolling structure, as well as the announcement's impact on local housing plans.

The Board agreed that the LEP required more detail about the scheme, but in principle positively supported it (depending on the financial contributions required and the toll levels being agreed).

12. **Any other business**



Greater Cambridge
Greater Peterborough
Enterprise Partnership

GA informed the Board that the LEP has been invited to appear at the BIS Select Committee into LEPs again. MR as acting Chair will give evidence (subject to the recruitment of a new Chair). AP appeared at the last hearing and this provides us with a chance to follow up on the issues first raised then. MR

The Board agreed that papers should be shared with Local Authority Chief Executives only in advance of the meeting, minus any confidential items.

TK requested we double checked the distribution list for papers. TK

MR updated the Board on the recruitment of a new Chair. Eight expressions of interest were received and a date is being set for the Selection Committee to meet to discuss the candidates and progress as appropriate. MR will update the Board electronically following the meeting. MR

The Board were keen to review the position with regards to payment of an Honorarium. This has not yet been agreed and will be discussed further with any suitable candidates.

JB raised the issue that the next LEP Board meeting takes place on the same day as the CBI Dinner and requested a venue is selected that takes this event into consideration as many Board members will be attending. LWH to organise. LWH

The Board also agreed that from November onwards they wished to meet at Alconbury EZ for Board meetings, with trips out to other locations if there were items of special interest to review. LWH to approach Urban&Civic with request. LWH

Item 11 – The future shape of the LEP – was held over until the next Board meeting.

Genzyme were thanked for hosting the meeting.

Meeting closed at 5.20pm.