

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE AND GREATER PETERBOROUGH
ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP LTD HELD AT ALCONBURY WEALD ON TUESDAY 26TH APRIL
2016**

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

In attendance: Neil Darwin – Chief Executive
Pete Northover – BIS observer
Adrian Cannard – Director of Strategy
Steve Bowyer – Board Advisor
Laura Welham-Halstead – Head of Communications and Connectivity
Lewis Herbert – Cambridge City Council

MINUTE NO.		ACTION
2016/13	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Jason Ablewhite, Prof Nigel Slater and Graham Hughes.</p>	
2016/14	<p>BOARD APPOINTMENTS AND RESIGNATIONS The appointments of Professor Iain Martin of Anglia Ruskin University, Professor Nigel Slater of Cambridge University and Terry Elphick, Managing Director of Skanska, were agreed by the Board for an initial three year period.</p> <p>The resignations of Professor Michael Thorne and Professor Ian White were noted.</p>	
2016/15	<p>EAST ANGLIA DEVOLUTION WORK Mark Reeve introduced the discussion on the East Anglia Devolution Deal and stated that implementation of the agreement to the deal was subject to the completion of the statutory processes and approval of all local authorities which were party to the deal.</p> <p>1. <u>Local Authority Views</u> Cllr Steve Count stated that Cambridgeshire County Council had reviewed the proposition and had indicated certain reservations which had been notified to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Cllr John Holdich stated that Peterborough City Council had also reviewed the proposition and had considered that their preferred option was for a combined Peterborough and Cambridge proposition.</p>	

Cllr Lewis Herbert reported that Cambridge City Council had considered the proposition and had considered that the preferred deal was for a combined Cambridge, Huntingdonshire and Peterborough proposition. He added that the Government proposition was not based on clear evidence based information and he stressed the importance of the economic geography based of Cambridgeshire.

Cllr James Waters reported that Norfolk and Suffolk Council Leaders were meeting on 27th April to review the deal proposed by the Government. He added that the devolution deal as proposed would provide new money and opportunities and the potential for further deals in the future. He considered that there would be benefits available to local authorities from both the Government deal and the proposed tri-county Cambridgeshire/Peterborough deal. He added that the tri-county deal would be of sufficient benefit to local authorities in Suffolk. Mark Reeve added that he would be attending the Norfolk/Suffolk meeting on 27th April as an observer.

Cllr Terry King stated that Rutland stood outside the tri-county deal and also outside the Midland Engine deal and other county based deals. He added that Government appeared to be offering different devolution deals across the Country.

2. Business Views

Mark Read stated that the tri-county deal could impact adversely on Cambridge and Peterborough by reducing the funding available for significant infrastructure and transport issues.

David Gill stated that the proposed deal did not clarify whether the Mayoral role was in addition to existing local authority leaders and what the future of both LEPs was likely to be.

Mark Reeve indicated that there would be 23 individual local authorities, a single Mayor of the combined authorities and two LEPs. The Mayor would have limited powers but a 75% veto by local authorities over expenditure would exist to control Mayoral powers.

Cllr Steve Count indicated that the powers of the Mayor of a tri-county arrangement would have significant powers nationally and more than the Mayor of a smaller proposition.

Pete Northover stated that the BIS stance that there was a single tri-county proposition only from Government at present without any alternative proposition.

John Bridge stated that the view of local businesses was in favour of devolution but any deal should reflect the key economic drivers of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the functional economic geography. He considered that an elected Mayor across the tri-county area would impose an additional level of unnecessary bureaucracy and the decision-making would be removed from local levels. The business view was that the Government proposition was driven by political expediency.

Mark Reeve stated that the overall concept of the devolution deal was not in dispute. However, the LEP's concern was with the detail and in particular the tri-county basis

	<p>of the Government proposition. It was also stated that a wider Strategic Transport Board should be wider than the proposed Tri County deal. With consideration needed to Essex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire.</p> <p>The LEP proposition was to address the option of separate Mayoral arrangements covering Norfolk/Suffolk and Greater Cambridgeshire and had obtained the support of local business and national organisations such as IoD.</p> <p>3. <u>Board views overall</u></p> <p>Mark Reeve expressed concern that the LEP as a private sector led organisation would continue to have influence on the devolution deal. He agreed to circulate a Cambridgeshire/Peterborough devolution deal proposition, which had only recently been produced, to Board members. He proposed that subject to further information being sent to Board members, the LEP would work towards taking a final decision on the tri-county proposition at its June 7th Board Meeting. Any final decision which was not in favour of the Government deal could potentially impact on the future role of the LEP.</p> <p>Mark Reeve added that the key issue was the governance and structure of any new deal while accepting the overall principle of devolution. The June Board meeting would be an opportunity to review the Cambridgeshire/Peterborough proposition and this would be circulated in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>A provisional meeting would be scheduled towards the end of June for the LEP to confirm its final position prior to the final submissions to Government which were required by July 4th.</p> <p>The LEP would continue to participate in the discussion and negotiations for the tri-county deal.</p>	<p>MR</p> <p>ND</p>
2016/16	<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 26th January 2016 were approved.</p>	
2016/12	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>The date of the next meeting was fixed for Wednesday 4th May 2016 at 3pm at Alconbury Weald.</p>	