

# BOARD AGENDA AND BOARD PAPERS

**DATE AND TIME:** 29<sup>th</sup> September 2015, 15.00 - 17.30

**VENUE:** British Society of Plant Breeders, Unit 114, Lancaster Way Business Park, Ely, B6 3NX

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 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members
3. Becoming a Leading LEP	To agree recommendations on LEP development Paper by Neil Darwin	15.10 20 mins	Board & Corporate Members
4. London Stansted Cambridge Consortium (LSCC) - Overview	Overview of LSCC Presentation by John McGill, Director & Dr Stephen King, Deputy Director	15.30 20 mins	Board & Corporate Members
5. City Deal Update	To receive an update on the City Deal Presentation by Andrew Limb, Cambridge City Council	15.50 15 mins	Board & Corporate Members
6. Growth Deal Funding	To note progress on Growth Deal Paper by Adrian Cannard	16.05 20 mins	Board Members
7. Internet of Things (IoT) - Bid Update	To agree GCGP's submission(s) to IoT Update by Neil Darwin	16.25 10 mins	Board & Corporate Members
8. GCGP Skills development a) Careers Enterprise Company – approach b) Peterborough Regional College Curriculum Development	To agree approach to the Careers Enterprise Company and approve Peterborough Regional College Curriculum a) Paper by Mark Cooper b) Presentation by Terry Jones, Principal, PRC	16.35 20 mins	Board & Corporate Members
9. Governance review	To discuss Board representation Neil Darwin/Michael Tolond	16.55 10 mins	Board & Corporate Members
10. Minutes from Board Meeting held on 29 <sup>th</sup> June 2015	Minutes attached.	17.05 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members
11. AOB		17.10 5 mins	

**DATE/TIME OF NEXT MEETING:** 15:00 ON TUESDAY 27<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2015

**VENUE:** THE INCUBATOR, ALCONBURY WEALD ENTERPRISE CAMPUS

## **ITEM 3: Chief Executive's update**

### **Alconbury Weald study – Executive Summary**

#### **Background**

This paper sets out the Executive Summary of the report conducted by Breeze Inward Investment for GCGP and makes a series of recommendations on how to take Alconbury Weald forward.

#### **1. Context**

Cambridgeshire has traditionally been an attractive business location but it cannot afford to rest on its laurels. It must compete with a growing and diverse set of location rivals if it is to create, attract and retain the wealth it needs to deliver the economic growth outlined in the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan. It is not clear that a focussed inward investment offering and proposition currently exists, either for the LEP area or for the Enterprise Zone.

Internationally, the UK is consistently ranked as number one in Europe and top five globally for the attraction of foreign direct investment. In 2014/15, UKTI recorded 1,988 projects (up from 1,773 in 2013/14) creating almost 85,000 new jobs (an increase of 28%), the highest number since records began in the early 1980s.

In terms of most prolific sectors and industries, Automotive delivered a record 120 successful projects in 2014/15, an increase of around 20% on the previous year. Project successes in Financial Services were up 22%; and Software and IT Services delivered over 300 project successes, up 20% on 2013/14. The 2014/15 UKTI results showed a significant improvement for the GCGPEP area with almost double the number of projects (42) and more than twice the number of jobs (872) attracted compared with the previous year. GCGPEP ranked 7th of the English LEPs for projects, but only 19th for jobs attracted (or 20th when measured on a per capita basis). The jobs-per-capita ranking doesn't compare favourably with comparator LEPs such as Coventry & Warwickshire (1st), Worcestershire (3rd) and Northamptonshire (6th).

#### **2. Focus on Alconbury Weald**

Between January 2012 and June 2015, projects resulting in a new site or location that created more than 20 jobs in the East of England/South East Midlands/East Midlands/West Midlands amounted to 664 inward investments. These took place largely within a 75 mile radius of Alconbury Weald (excluding London). More than a quarter of projects were logistics and distribution; which is not currently considered a target for Alconbury. Without the flexibility to offer sites with appropriate planning permission for logistics projects, GCGPEP could be missing out on some of the biggest inward investment opportunities in the coming months and years.

The inward investment success of the West Midlands has been driven by automotive projects, many related to the growth and success of Jaguar Land Rover. There is a growing concern in the region that they could become victims of their own success in the next few years, as a result of a shortage of sites and skills. The lack of available development sites across the Midlands will force inward investors to search beyond traditional parameters opening up opportunities for Alconbury.

There is a challenge for GCGPEP around the relative geographic perceptions of Alconbury Weald. Whilst being close to Cambridge plays well for technology projects, many intermediaries and partners (including UKTI) would

not readily include Alconbury in site searches across the Midlands for automotive and other manufacturing projects.

### 3. Competitors and Comparators

Highly organised and well-funded England's major cities and nascent LEPs are increasingly active in targeting both London and overseas markets for inward investment. There are around 50 inward investment teams in England, each with between 2 and 20 staff, and annual budgets of between £250,000 and £2 million.

Case studies of other major employment sites and Enterprise Zones, shows that across the country LEPs, councils, land-owners and developers are working together in a number of innovative ways to attract new jobs to their sites. This includes developing sector-specific marketing and investor targeting activities; creating innovative forward-funding packages of support beyond the standard EZ incentives; speculative developments for both office and industrial units.

For the future marketing of Alconbury Weald, there should be a clear proposition for manufacturing and office-based projects as a minimum. These two propositions should include: detailed skills and workforce data within 30 and 45 minute drive-times; examples of the property options which could be developed; local and regional supply-chains mapped; cost comparisons with Cambridge, Milton Keynes, Coventry and London.

GCGPEP can learn from the proven approach of successful inward investment agencies like IDA Ireland and adopt a high-value sales team approach, with clearly researched named companies from well-defined sectors, followed by a customised plan of contact, engagement and follow-ups.

Existing companies within 30 miles of Alconbury should be identified and researched in terms of their recent growth and their position in industry supply-chains. It should be noted that this research-led approach is categorically not an exercise in compiling mailshots. The research process should be rigorous and bespoke. Each target deserves customised research, approach and follow up.

Regular and ongoing engagement with UKTI and partners including Automotive Investment Organisation and Life Science Investment Organisation should be part of an ongoing partner programme which ensures that those responsible for engaging with inward investors have an accurate idea of the Alconbury message.

### 4. Key Recommendations

**1. Proposition Development** - Create clear propositions for Manufacturing and Office projects. Crucially these should include detailed independent workforce catchment data

**2. Intermediary Targeting Plan** - A plan should be devised and implemented to engage with key inward investment intermediaries. Ideally this would be managed internally with external guidance on planning and tactics. It would include regular London meetings and engagement with leading property agents across the Midlands, East of England and South East.

**3. Investor Targeting Support** - Once the propositions have been developed, there needs to be a concerted campaign to target potential occupiers. Focus should be on automotive related occupiers on the manufacturing side; and on potential relocations from London by IT and internet firms looking for new headquarters.

4. **Partner Programme** - A programme of actions and activities to make partners more aware of the Alconbury propositions should include visits and meetings with UKTI teams and specialists; Automotive Investment Organisation and SMMT; Tech City partners and other agencies which would be beneficial in changing the perceptions of the site and the area. This could also include better 'cross-border' networking with organisations and LEPs in neighbouring areas, especially Northamptonshire.

## ITEM 3: BECOMING A LEADING LEP

### Decision required

This Board is asked to approve measures set out that would help elevate the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGP) into a recognised national leader amongst the Local Enterprise Partnerships.

### Recommendations

GCGP Board is asked to agree:

- to mechanisms that will help develop a single voice in Board and amongst local stakeholders
- the structure of geographic sub groups as set out in this report and in Annex A and; revision to the Business representative group into a 'Business Advisory Group'

### 1. Background

The GCGP Board considered a paper at its July 2015 meeting on how GCGP could become a 'Leading LEP'. Recommendations were made based on existing best practice that is operation around England. Much of the focus at the July 2015 meeting and subsequent Leaders Committee focused on Local government engagement with the LEP. A positive step was made at the Leaders Committee with recognition that GCGP should reflect the wider economic footprints around Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough with any devolution deal recognising the current geography rather than seeking reform of GCGP. As the focus became quite narrow this paper presents further proposals on how GCGP can improve its reputation and performance. It begins by citing some of the issues that still hinder the optimal operation of GCGP.

### 2. Positioning GCGP into the future

If GCGP is to achieve the ambition of being a leading LEP there are a number of core issues that need addressing in the short term. These are addressed below:

#### i) An agenda shared by all

GCGP still struggles to present a strategic list of priorities that can be turned into campaigns. GCGP has been developing a 30 year strategy which surface major priorities that can effectively be turned into propositions that the entire area can support. The four schemes that are of most interest to Government are:

Delivery of the A14  
Delivery of Ely bypass  
Felixstowe to Nuneaton Rail  
Birmingham to Stansted Rail

At present GCGP is unable to present this position as every areas has a 'top priority', with some projects gaining traction through the MP community, despite GCGP not necessarily prioritising the scheme, or indeed technical work suggesting that they are a top priority. There are a number of other priorities that GCGP and its partners can address by working together to attract additional funding, either through Growth Deals, Europe or the private sector. There are numerous of these, however GCGP invariably ends up being criticised when more worthy priorities gain support or focus, irrespective of their strategic importance. Most importantly is the need to talk with a single voice to Ministers and Senior Officials about GCGP priorities. It is evident that we do not do this, and other LEP areas have managed to achieve this and receive financial support in excess of GCGPs previous settlements.

The simple recommendation is that GCGP and its partners need to define a discrete list of priorities and focus on delivery of these. It is clear that the area has numerous priorities, however, unless private sector funds can be attracted the best we can achieve is a strong pipeline that has appropriate technical detail and full support of the wider partnership. Crudely, once one priority is delivered we then promote a new scheme.

## **ii) An improved form of governance**

The July 2015 Board received a recommendation to establish two geographic sub groups. The Board requested further detail to flesh these out further. It should be noted a group exists around Greater Cambridge (although on a reduced geography) which brings together the private and public sector. There is opportunity to shape this group having recently changed chair, with Claire Ruskin of Cambridge Network taking on this role.

### **a) Establishing two geographic sub groups**

The new proposal sets out that the Board will be supported by two geographic sub groups representing the economic footprints of Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough. The sub groups will be business-led and bring together all constituent local authorities in each sub-region, alongside business leaders and key stakeholders. The sub groups will be manageable in size, but determined locally in partnership with the LEP. The sub groups should be chaired by a member of the private sector. The geographic sub groups will be tasked with;

1. Identifying and evidencing 30 year priorities for the sub region
2. Prioritising the investment requirements before presenting to the GCGP Board
3. Developing an evidence base for Skills requirements amongst the business community
4. Identifying areas where the GCGP 'Signpost' Growth Hub can support local businesses
5. Identify, develop and where necessary convene partnerships to develop European projects
6. Providing GCGP Board with economic data and intelligence that informs LEP decision making

### **What would be involved with the sub groups?**

It is proposed that the two sub groups are coordinated by the GCGP Executive supported. GCGP will coordinate the meetings of these groups and be responsible for commissioning papers from other partners as necessary. This practice already exists between GCGP executive and the current Cambridge sub group. The only additional requirement beyond the GCGP Executive would be attendance at meetings by key politicians. GCGP is not seeking to impose a requirement for Council officers to be involved, however it would be advantageous for both areas to determine key operational leads. Clearly the most important factor is to make the groups relevant and focused on making decisions that will help formulate local policy and LEP wide policy. It is not envisaged that any funding would be made available to these sub groups, with any future request being made to the GCGP Board for their decision. Proposed Terms of Reference for the two sub-groups are detailed in the supporting Board papers.

In addition to the sub groups it is proposed that GCGP develops the current Business Representative group that brings together a range of business facing organisations such as IOD, FSB, Chamber, NFU, Cambridge Ahead and Cambridge Network. The proposal is to turn this group into a 'Business Advisory Group'. The Group will be tasked more formally with sharing evidence, reflecting their member's priorities and promoting schemes that the private sector see as priority. This would then enable a more joined up conversation with the Local authority Sponsors group that meets to discuss public sector priorities for growth.

## b) Evolving the Board

Through the development of the geographic sub groups the GCGP Board will be able to take a more strategic role. The establishment of two fully functioning geographic sub groups would enable the Board to evolve further. The proposed structure for the GCGP Board is as follows;

### *Board membership*

#### Current

7 Business leaders	7 (6 with option to recruit 7 <sup>th</sup> through governance process)
5 Local Authority	5 (currently 4 with Election underway to determine 5 <sup>th</sup> )
1VSE	1 (as current)
1 Education	2 (a place for both Cambridge and ARU)
	1 Further Education – drawn from FE Sub group
<b>Total: 14</b>	<b>16</b>

The new proposition results in a slightly increased Board, however it does better reflect the interests of the area. There will however be a need to ensure that the Board reflects the ‘sum of the parts’ rather than local interests.

By transferring into this structure GCGP will need to be able strong business leadership that Government anticipates LEPs will deliver. This approach makes recommendation that remove ‘inconsistencies’ that GCGP accommodated during its formation. For example, the Board should reflect the interests of both Higher Education institutions rather than just one. Equally the Board should also reflect the interests of Further Education. With the rapid change and challenges being experienced by Further Education, it would be appropriate to seek a voice from the sector to help support GCGP’s development. There is no change proposed to the Voluntary Sector representation.

A further paper is being tabled at the Board meeting to consider making the rotational policy agreed in GCGPs Articles live. This will enable the Board to bring in new private sector representation to strengthen it operation.

### **Final remarks**

GCGP should perform as a leading LEP, not least as we have the assets and credentials within the area, and one of the most growth lead agendas in the country. It is however clear that with these core ingredients GCGP struggles to provide a singular narrative to Government and effectively prioritise its financial ‘asks’ will not perform well in financial terms. Work is needed to be undertaken to develop all aspects of GCGP, it is hoped that Board will accept these recommendations and help underpin GCGPs improvement.

## ITEM 4: LONDON STANSTED CAMBRIDGE CONSORTIUM (LSCC) – GROWTH COMMISSION

### 1. SUMMARY

This paper will be presented by Dr Stephen King and John McGill, on behalf of the LSCC.

The LSCC is writing to request financial support for the LSCC Growth Commission.

The London Enterprise Panel has committed £20,000 to support the Commission. LSCC are seeking a similar contribution from other LEPs in the region.

### 2. BACKGROUND

The London Stansted Cambridge Consortium (LSCC) was launched in June 2013 as a strategic partnership of public and private organisations covering the area north from the Royal Docks, Tech City, the City Fringe, Kings Cross, and the Olympic Park, north, through the Lee Valley, the M11, A1 and A10 road, the East Coast and West Anglia Mainline rail corridors to Stevenage, Harlow and Stansted, and through to Cambridge and Peterborough. The consortium brings together over 40 public and private sector organisations which have the common aim of seeking economic growth, higher employment rates, providing places for people and business while preserving the quality and character of the corridor.

The consortium has now completed its start-up phase and is building on the strong relationships it has with the four LEPs within which it sits<sup>1</sup>. It has identified some of the key economic features of the corridor:

- An economy of £161bn and economic output 4% higher than UK average;
- 20% England's life sciences jobs and similar % for digital economy;
- 37 world-class life science research institutes;
- The only London airport with capacity to grow, adding 15 million passengers within the current planning agreement;
- A planning pipe line that can deliver commercial floorspace equal to 4 Canary Wharfs in the next 20 years.

The corridor has a high-tech, knowledge based economy and we need to understand how we facilitate this growth over the medium and long term: up to 30 years ahead. The consortium has identified its priority growth sectors as:

- Life sciences;
- IT, digital and media;
- Clean Tech, low carbon goods & environmental services;
- Food production and 'agritech';
- Logistics and distribution;
- Engineering with specific focus on transport and process plant.

The presence of these sectors mark the corridor as having a significant importance to the UK as they are strongly future orientated and are essential for the growth and function of a modern, inter dependent economy.

---

<sup>1</sup> These LEPs are: Greater Cambridge, Greater Peterborough LEP, Hertfordshire LEP, South East LEP and the London Enterprise Panel



### 3. THE NEED FOR THE LSCC GROWTH COMMISSION

Despite the obvious strength and diversity of the economy of this corridor it is clear that there is a need for a stronger, more ambitious, more rigorous and objective case to be made for the corridor if it is to realise its potential and deliver strong economic growth for the UK. This evidence of this need has arisen through several sources:

- Business leaders within the corridor advise that that they believe the corridor is of international significance and that the mix of technology, knowledge institutions together with an under-used international airport suggests that the **vision and ambition should be far higher**: as a leading international/world centre for knowledge/tech sector-led growth;
- Making the case for **infrastructure investment** (e.g. West Anglia and Crossrail 2) and discussion with major utilities providers tells us very clearly that our evidence base to support our growth story needs greater rigour to give decision makers in government and its agencies confidence that they will see a return on their investment in terms of jobs, homes and support for a fast growing economy;
- **London Stansted Airport has capacity to grow** but convincing the long-haul carriers we wish to operate from the airport that they would be investing in an area which is one of UK and Europe's most important economic regions requires objective analysis by 'outsiders' who have eminence and independence.

Put simply, the consortium believes that this corridor has great importance for the future growth of the UK economy and that the return on investment in terms of improved productivity and the resulting economic growth will be greater, and realised more quickly, than in any other part of the UK. **But this needs to be tested objectively by people separate from the consortium.**

This is the basis for setting up the LSCC growth commission which will comprise 5/6 people who will be independent and eminent in their own field and will be advised by Michael Enright, a world-renowned economist, 20 years at Harvard and now based in Hong Kong, who specialises in the economics of growth corridors. The commission will conduct its own research and will convene 4 or 5 hearings which gather evidence and will be the opportunity to bring in a wide range of local, national and international views to:

- Provide comment on the potential of the corridor to drive growth of the UK economy particularly in key sectors;
- Discuss the type of growth and how this can be accommodated within the corridor;
- Examine the case for investment and the return to the UK economy;
- Give advice on what needs to be done for the corridor to realise or even exceed its potential.

The commission will take approximately one year and will report to the LSCC board with its findings. It is important to stress the independence of the commission but the LSCC board will require it to contain the following:

- Vision of LSCC for now and the future (30 years) for the corridor.
- Statement of advantage and value for UK of the corridor – now and in the future.
- Analysis and assessment on how more growth can be fostered and accommodated.
- Return on investment statement for UK Govt at National and Local levels.
- Comparison with other relevant corridors across the world.
- Outline prospectus for private, institutional, and other non-Governmental investment.

The LSCC board will have a ‘client’ group comprising Greg Clark as chair of the board plus three or four other board members including Andrew Harrison MD of London Stansted Airport and Cllr Doug Taylor as the deputy chair who leads on planning and employment spaces. The client group will be supported by LSCC officers and there will be opportunities for other funders of the commission to have input through, for example, suggesting sources of evidence and commenting on interim reports.

The commission will be funded by the consortium members with additional contributions from private sector stakeholders who have a long-term interest in the corridor. Clearly it is important to preserve the independence of the commission and to be able to demonstrate transparency. However, we would encourage the commission to invite views and evidence from those with a long-term interest.

#### 4. RETURN ON INVESTMENT

The business case for the consortium, its members and funders in setting up this commission is that it will:

- provide a stronger, more rigorous evidence base which is seen as credible and reliable because it is externally driven and should therefore lead to greater investment;
- be a process for developing a joint vision for the corridor for the next 30 years and therefore strengthen the co-ordination, this will also lead to greater confidence for investors;
- raise the profile of the corridor as a place for high growth in science and technology but also as a place to live

#### 5. OUTLINE TIMETABLE

June 15	Commission launched at the LSCC annual conference
October	First meeting of Commissioners
October to March	Series of 4 hearings, plus data gathering and primary research.
June 2016	Launch at LSCC Annual conference

#### 6. KEY ROLES

##### Commission Chair:

- Harvey McGrath, Deputy Chair, London Enterprise Panel

##### Commissioners:

- Ian Mather, Chair, Cambridge Ahead
- Alexandra Jones, CEO Centre for Cities
- Professor Peter Tyler, University of Cambridge
- Dr Gerard Lyons, Economics Advisor, Mayor of London

##### Project Manager

- Glenn Athey, Cambridge based consultant, involved in the set-up of the GCGP LEP

##### Client Group Chair

- Professor Greg Clark CBE

## **7. BUDGET**

The overall budget for the commission is projected at £200,000.

The majority of this will be delivered via sponsorship from the private sector, with significant contributions confirmed by Stansted Airport, Hill Group, Commercial Estates Group and Places for People.

The London Enterprise Panel have confirmed a contribution of £20,000.

We are in discussion with Hertfordshire LEP and Essex County Council (representing South East LEP) about similar contributions.

## **8. COMMUNICATIONS PLAN**

Part of the business case for this project is that it raises the profile of the corridor and the consortium, therefore this should be part of the measurement of the outcome of the project. It is anticipated that there will be a number of news stories which will be of interest arising from the launch of the commission, the hearings and the final report.

Without wishing to pre-judge the commission's final findings we would hope that findings would have strong evidence to support the key messages around:

- a) The importance of the corridor to UK's future economy and increasing productivity,
- b) The need to invest in this corridor to ensure its continued growth, specifically infrastructure,
- c) The global significance of the corridor,
- d) The attractiveness for international investment

As the Commission is independent communications must support the differentiation between the Commission's and the Consortium's position. The LSCC may for example develop a response to the commission's findings.

## **9. ANTICIPATED AUDIENCE:**

- UK government, LEPs, Network Rail, Highways Agency, utilities;
- Private investors and their advisors: making the case to potential investors, from airlines to our key sector businesses, why they should be interested in the region;
- International investors and potential businesses: working with and through agencies such as UKTI, FCO and regional bodies with an interest in inward investment;
- Members and potential members of the LSCC.

## ITEM 8A: CAREERS ENTERPRISE COMPANY - APPROACH

### DECISION REQUIRED

1. **The Board is asked to agree an approach to utilise funding secured as part of the Governments Careers Enterprise Company Project to deliver support across the GCGP geography.**

### 2. BACKGROUND

Government announced in December 2014 an approach to delivering a careers strategy in schools called the Careers Enterprise Company (CEC). This built on the work of Lord Young (Enterprise for All) and leading LEPs in the field of skills (including GCGP). During June 2015. LEPs were invited to bid for monies made available. GCGP secured £150,000 (plus match in cash and in-kind) as part of this process based on delivering the core objectives of the Company and the leading work already being carried out.

This paper seeks to confirm agreement to build an integrated model that utilises existing Skills activity to create a strategy and delivery based approach to the aspiration agenda.

### 3. PROPOSED OUTLINE MODEL

The CEC model focuses on a strategic intervention in schools designed to allow a more effective connection to the world of work through the use of an Enterprise Advisor Network (EAN). The EAN will enable high calibre volunteers to work directly with the senior leadership team in secondary schools and colleges to support more effective connection to the world of work and develop, shape or add value to the school or college's careers, enterprise and employer engagement strategy. Through the Enterprise Adviser Network and existing relationships with employers, the offer from employers to schools will increase so that in time every young person should be able to access work related interventions at multiple points as they progress through their schooling.

The GCGP Skills Service delivers a range of activities in order to inform young people of the careers opportunities available locally and increase the numbers of those that aspire to them. It now covers: Rutland, Peterborough, Fenland, Kings Lynn & West Norfolk, Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, with support into Huntingdonshire. Whilst delivery of activities is generally good, strategic relationships with schools and key businesses have been difficult to build effectively.

GCGP has a unique opportunity to, not only, deliver aspirational activities but to also enable strategic relationships with schools and businesses in order to drive our delivery consistently across the GCGP area. With school and business leaders a key part of an overall strategy, furthermore, we can shape real change in attitudes and deliver the actions to support that change.

The proposed model, therefore, will seek to join up strategy and delivery whilst enabling coverage of the wider LEP area.

### 4. NEXT STEPS

Assuming the Board is content to move forward a detailed business plan will be put forward that takes into account the following: One, the experience developed during the Local Skills Teams Pilot project in the north of the GCGP area. Two, the revised Skills Service model now in place as part of the Greater Cambridge City Deal. Three, the deliverables that form the CEC project. It is envisaged that a plan, including financial projections, will be available to present at the November board meeting to enable implementation in April 2016.

## ITEM 9: GOVERNANCE REVIEW

### DECISION REQUIRED

1. Board is asked to take decisions regarding Directors appointments.

2. BACKGROUND

GCGPLEP was formed in March 2011 with John Bridge as the initial sole Director until the company appointed a number of Directors representing the various Public and Private sector interests in 2012 and commenced trading.

A number of Directors have now served their initial 3-year term and the Board will need to consider their re-appointment. Article 10.8 of the Company's Articles of Association enables the Board to re-appoint Directors after their initial term of 3 years for a further 3 year period until 2018. However, Directors have discretion to shorten or extend this period of appointment in exceptional circumstances.

- a) The Articles include the following provisions in relation to the appointment of Directors:
  - Article 10.2 – the Board will appoint as Public Sector Directors such individuals who are elected in accordance with Article 11 (Article 11 states that where a vacancy arises for a Public Sector Director the Local Authority will carry out a free and fair election for the vacancy for their Democratic Services team).
  - Article 10.2.2 – the Board will ensure that there are still 5 Public Sector Directors holding office at any one time.
  - Article 10.2.3 – the Board will appoint the Non-Public Sector Directors, comprising seven Private Sector Directors, the Education Sector Director and the third Sector Director.
- b) The Board Composition is as follows with their designation and year of appointment:

Mark Reeve	Private Sector	2012
Jason Ablewhite	Public Sector	2012
John Bridge	Private Sector	2011 (company active from 2012)
Steve Count	Public Sector	2014
Trevor Ellis	Private Sector	2012
David Gill	Private Sector	2014
Claire Higgins	Third Sector	2014
Terence King	Public Sector	2012
Mark Read	Private Sector	2014
Michael Thorne	Education Sector	2012
James Waters	Public Sector	2014
Ian White	Private Sector	2014

- c) Re-appointment of Directors

Subject to their agreement to continue in office, the Board may approve the re-appointment of Private Sector Directors John Bridge, Trevor Ellis and Mark Reeve for a further 3 year period. The Board may also approve the re-appointment of Jason Ablewhite and Terence King as Public Sector Directors. Should either not wish to continue as Directors then the appropriate process under Article 11 should commence.

d) Additional issues

Following the resignation of Marco Cereste as a Public Sector Director in May 2015 confirmation of his replacement will be made via the Election Process being undertaken for GCGPLEP by Huntingdonshire District Council.

There are currently 2 vacancies on the GCGPLEP Board one for a Public Sector Director and one for a Private Sector Director and the Board may make these Appointments for an initial 3 year period. The Board may also co-opt additional Directors for a 12 month period. In any event the maximum number of Directors permitted under the Articles is 17.

## ITEM 10: Minutes of Previous Meeting

### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GREATER CAMBRIDGE AND GREATER PETERBOROUGH ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP HELD AT GRANTA PARK ON TUESDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015

Present: Mark Reeve (Chairman)  
Cllr Jason Ablewhite  
John Bridge  
Cllr Steve Count  
David Gill  
Claire Higgins  
Mark Read  
Prof Michael Thorne  
Cllr James Waters

In attendance: Neil Darwin – Chief Executive  
Adrian Cannard – Director of Strategy  
Steve Bowyer – Board Advisor  
Mark Jackson - Rawlinsons  
Graham Hughes – Board Advisor  
Pete Northover - BIS  
Michael Tolond – Company Secretary  
Laura Welham-Halstead – Head of Communications and Connectivity

MINUTE NO.		ACTION
2015/67	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Trevor Ellis, Cllr Terry King and Prof Ian White.</p>	
2015/68	<p>CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S UPDATE</p> <p>Neil Darwin reported that since the previous meeting the LEP had been advised that there would be a further round of Growth Deals made available. A paper would be provided to the September Board indicating the likely proposals for submission to Government for funding. The recent budget had indicated that there would be a greater focus on apprenticeships and also funding for Enterprise Zones activity. A meeting had been held to review investment in the rural areas from ESIF and ERDF funding.</p> <p>Mark Reeve reported on the recently issued Government document on Further Education and Post-16 Training Institutions and the likely effect on training and education locally.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2015/69	<p>GCGP ACCOUNTS 2014/15</p> <p>Mark Jackson of Rawlinsons presented the accounts for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 and confirmed that there were no issues for Rawlinsons to formally report to Directors within their Audit Report..</p> <p>The 2014 figures had been restated to reflect changes to deferred income with consequent effect on the 2015 income and balance sheet. An appropriate note would</p>	

	<p>be attached to the accounts to reflect the reason for the holding of significant sums within the balance sheet.</p> <p>A further note would be added to the accounts to identify the payment to Directors was for amounts paid to Graeme Nix a previous Director until 30<sup>th</sup> September 2014 and Mark Reeve.</p> <p>Directors approved the Directors' Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015 for submission to Companies House and approval by Members of the Company by written resolution.</p>	<p><b>ND</b></p> <p><b>ND</b></p> <p><b>ND/MT</b></p>
2015/70	<p><b>BECOMING A LEADING LEP</b></p> <p>Neil Darwin presented the proposal for GCGP to become a leading LEP and stated that following the Leaders Committee meeting these core areas were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) GCGP to represent the economic boundaries focusing on both the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough City regions</li> <li>b) The LEP Board would be supported by two sub-groups supporting the two city regions with the subgroup details being presented to the September Board meeting</li> <li>c) GCGP would support moves towards a Devolution Deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and would offer support to any other area seeking to pursue a deal within its own Local Authority boundary</li> <li>d) The Leaders Committee would retain 5 Leaders on the Board</li> </ul> <p>Cllr Ablewhite stressed the need for all parties involved in the LEP to work together for the benefit of the local business community and that retaining 5 local authority Leaders on the Board would be of significant benefit.</p> <p>John Bridge and Mark Read emphasised the need for the LEP to remain business led for the benefit of the LEP area, its businesses and community.</p> <p>Prof Mike Thorne asked if some information on benchmarking against other LEP structures, their Board members and staff numbers could be included in the next proposal to be submitted to the Board.</p> <p>It was agreed that the September meeting would consider a further proposal on becoming a leading LEP and this would reflect the comments made by Directors during the meeting.</p> <p>Mark Reeve stated that the LEP would consider appointing additional Directors from larger businesses locally to reflect the business community's needs and to stress the importance to Government of the LEP's representative businesses.</p> <p>John Bridge proposed that Astra Zeneca should be contacted with a view to co-opting one of their senior staff as a Director.</p> <p>The Board supported the proposals contained within the paper.</p>	<p><b>ND</b></p> <p><b>ND</b></p>
2015/71	<p><b>NEW ENTERPRISE ZONE OPPORTUNITY</b></p> <p>Neil Darwin reported that the Government had announced a second wave to Enterprise Zones during the Budget and parameters for Wave 2 indicated that increasing prioritisation would mean Wave 2 focuses on 'small towns and rural areas' with deadlines for full submission of proposals being 18<sup>th</sup> September. The Leaders Committee had identified South Cambridgeshire and Fenland as possible locations. Proposals would need to be deliverable and consistent with the SEP.</p>	



	<p>Details of the Enterprise Zones further bidding round were circulated including the key points contained in the bidding document. Discussions had been held with the Strategic Sponsors Group and Adrian Cannard outlined the criteria and financial models that Government would require.</p> <p>Neil Darwin emphasised the need for the LEP to submit the strongest bid within the extremely tight timescale and outlined the various multi-site projects within the LEP area which could be part of the bidding document. The need to provide a common thread through the projects and so improve the overall bid, would be of benefit to the LEP during the bidding process.</p> <p>Directors supported the multi-site approach and it was agreed that a virtual approval process by written resolution of the Board would be prepared prior to the next meeting.</p>	<b>ND/MT</b>
2015/72	<p><b>GROWTH DEAL PROJECTS UPDATE</b></p> <p>Adrian Cannard presented the two projects for GCGP Board approval. The first was for £415,000 of Growth Deal funding to create a Highways and Civil Engineering Academy within the WATA training facility in Huntingdon. The GCGP Executive team's appraisal had raised issues relating to evidence of the educational case, the increase in the overall project cost from the Expression of Interest stage, more explanation needed of the base case input/costed outline schedule and description of matched funding.</p> <p>It was agreed that subject to resolution of the issues raised during the appraisal process delegated authority would be given to the Chairman to agree the funding (with John Bridge declaring an interest as a Director of WATA).</p> <p>The second project was a loan of £500,000 to the Rutland Plastics project as part of their £2.2m project to deliver new jobs and apprenticeships. This would provide a 30,000 sq. ft. new warehouse and would increase employment and engineering apprenticeships. The loan would be at 1% above the public works borrowing rate (currently 1.7%) over 3 years and would be secured by a charge over the property. The loan was approved by the Board unanimously.</p>	
2015/73	<p><b>THE INTERNET OF THINGS INITIATIVE</b></p> <p>Neil Darwin outlined the project funded by DCMS and managed by Innovate UK which was looking for interest in the R&amp;D aspects of the Internet of Things. He proposed that a combined approach from the two cities in the LEP area would be the best way forward.</p> <p>Notification would be required to DCMS by 30<sup>th</sup> September and Steve Bowyer reported that Opportunity Peterborough was actively involved in projects and workshops associated with the Internet of Things. He agreed to share their findings and experiences with local authorities within the LEP area.</p> <p>It was agreed that a bid would be prepared for the 'Internet of Things Cities demonstrator' for submission to Government.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2015/74	<p><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2015 were approved. Neil Darwin confirmed that Adam Breeze's report on Enterprise Zones would be circulated shortly and discussions on devolution were continuing.</p>	<b>ND</b>

2015/75	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Mr Mark Lloyd</u> It was noted that Mr Lloyd would be leaving Cambridgeshire City Council to join the Local Government Association.</li> <li>2. <u>Alconbury and Molesworth discussions</u> Cllr Ablewhite reported that the MOD was preparing a review of these sites for publication during February 2016. RAF Wyton was expanding considerably in terms of additional personnel and it was unlikely that significant changes would be taking place at Alconbury. Cllr Waters reported that no clear information was indicated from Government in respect of Mildenhall but that significant expansion would be taking place at Lakenheath with consequent effect on planning and infrastructure.</li> <li>3. <u>Housing Issues</u> John Bridge reported that in view of the Government decisions on reduction of housing rents for housing associations this could affect housing stocks and affordable housing. Claire Higgins emphasised the need to respond to this Government initiative and the consequent effect on the Housing Association movement nationally and locally. The approach from the LEP would be formulated after the publication of the Housing Bill in the Autumn.</li> </ol>	ND/CH
2015/76	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The date of the next meeting was fixed for Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> September 2015 at 3pm at a venue to be advised.</p>	