



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

Date: 27th November 2017

Time: 10am

Location: South Cambs District Council

Present:

Cllr Peter Bucknell
Cllr Terry Hayward (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Mike Bradley
Cllr Alan Sharp
Cllr Alex Riley
Cllr John Batchelor (Chair)
Cllr Fred Yeulett
Cllr David Mason
Cllr Dave Baigent
Cllr Rod Cantrill
Cllr Lucy Nethsingha
Cllr Janet French
Cllr David Over
Cllr Ed Murphy

Huntingdonshire District Council
Huntingdonshire District Council
East Cambs District Council
East Cambs District Council
South Cambs District Council
South Cambs District Council
Fenland District Council
Fenland District Council
Cambridge City Council
Cambridge City Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Peterborough City Council
Peterborough City Council

Officers:

Kim Sawyer
Martin Whiteley
Debbie Forde
Anne Gardiner

Interim Legal Counsel & Monitoring Officer
Chief Executive Officer
Governance Advisor
Scrutiny Officer

Others in attendance:

Cllr Steve Count
Cllr John Holdich

Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning
Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Tourism

1. Apologies

- 1.1 Apologies received from Cllr Carter, substituted by Cllr Bucknell.

2. Declaration of Interests

- 2.1 No declarations of interests were made.

3. Minutes

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 23rd October were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:-

- (a) That the names of the Portfolio Holders should be included in the minutes.
- (b) At point 4.2 a more precise description on what imbalance meant should be included as follows.

The committee wished it to be recorded that their interpretation of the word "imbalance" used by the Portfolio Holder meant "That within the combined authority area there was a financial imbalance between different parts of the combined authority area and some areas were more disadvantaged than others .

- (c) Under item 5 the committee asked for it to be recorded that the Portfolio Holder for Skills had advised that there would be no 'mickey mouse' degrees available at Peterborough University.
- (d) At point 6.2 Cllr Hayward asked for it to be recorded that he did not say that level crossings were on the A1 and that he had requested that his point should be raised at the October Board meeting.
- (e) The Committee requested that when presentation slides were sent out to members that they be presented one slide per page.

In relation to matters arising, Cllr Murphy advised that at the last meeting that the S151 officer had agreed to provide information on the £3.8m available for transport in relation to the Rhubarb Bridge crossing. Cllr Murphy was still awaiting this information.

4. Interview – Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning (Cllr Steve Count)

- 4.1 The Committee received a presentation from the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning. (Appendix A).

The Portfolio Holder had provided responses to questions submitted by the Committee prior to the meeting. (Appendix C)

- 4.2 The following points were made during the discussion:-

- The £600m would not deliver all the schemes within the Combined Authority's remit but the funding could be used to unlock further funding streams.
- The LEP and Combined Authority are separate legal entities so there was no financial impact on the combined authority unless it chose to. The Combined Authority had chosen to fund some LEP schemes previously under the LEP's portfolio under approval of the CEO and later ratified by the Board. There were no plans for the Combined Authority to bail out any other organisations

- The Portfolio Holder was not aware of any conversations between central government and the Combined Authority regarding the future of the LEP.
- The decision for the CEO of the Combined Authority to act as the interim CEO for the LEP had been discussed with the Portfolio Holder for Fiscal Planning. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Mayor had the power to loan staff to other organisations using general power of competence. This decision was properly recorded. A report had been published and would be discussed at the Board meeting on Wednesday 29th November 2017.
- The Combined Authority was reacting to the situation with the LEP and as it was outside of the Combined Authority's remit it was difficult to forward plan. If this was looked at properly then there were possible benefits to both organisation, for example the possibility of streamlining back office functions
- Members raised the point that it would helpful to have an overview of the remits of the LEP and the duplications or overlap with the Combined Authority. The CEO agreed to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in December to provide an update on the LEP and the relationship with the Combined Authority.
- The Portfolio Holder confirmed that Combined Authority is the guarantor for its own lending; not constituent councils and going forward it would be up to the lender to guarantee any loans. This may change in the future.
- The Treasury Management paper will outline any borrowing requirements and if there are any borrowing caps imposed this would be set out in the finance strategy. Project borrowing would most likely be project specific but the Portfolio holder could not rule out other funding streams being used.
- Land Value Capture was being looked into as a funding solution but discussions were ongoing with central government. It was important to get the infrastructure needed to build the communities.
- The lack of VAT registration for the Combined Authority was not an immediate concern as government was aware of the necessity and legislation to implement this was being sped up. All back monies would be recoverable.
- The transport funding that was given to the Combined Authority was handed down to Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council in its entirety but ultimately the Combined Authority was the transport authority for the area so it required the facility to levy in future.
- The £2m funding promised in the budget last week would be paid over two years and would fund the staffing for the Combined Authority.
- There would be no impact on constituent councils for funding and no constituent council had been asked for funding from the Combined Authority at this point.
- The £20m per year for the next 30 years promised by government for the

Combined Authority would be devalued over the years due to rising inflation and this was one of the reasons it was important to be looking at possible borrowing avenues now.

- A further £76 m was provided to Combined Authority in last week's budget and as central government gained further trust in the Combined Authority further funding would be granted.
- Rather than funding agreements being labeled 'Devolution Deals' more money would come from a continuous series of successful bids and grants.
- Options were being developed to allocate the £100m funding for housing development. The options would be based on assessed need using a robust criteria and business case. Consultants would be selected using similar criteria used by the County Council and an assurance framework.
- The assurance framework stated that the £70m for housing development in Cambridge must be spent within the framework and it must be evidenced, however, Cambridge City Council would have direct control over the allocation.
- £100m to deliver affordable housing can be used on viable sites across the combined authority area including stalled sites which could help with the housing shortage. Funding would be subject to viable individual business cases. It is written in to the assurance framework that should the Board feel that there was a need for them to intervene in an individual business case then they could. Procurements rules must be followed.
- Project appraisal would be done using the budget method with each project being evaluated individually by the Combined Authority. The appraisal on priorities for the area covered by the Combined Authority would be done by the Economic Commission that had been set up. Some items would need independent guidance.
- There were two mechanisms by which the Combined Authority could levy money; the first was through the Mayor's precept which could be used solely to fund the Mayor's own office. Secondly the Combined Authority could have a levy on business rates.
- There was no Mayoral precept predicted for the 2018/19 budget.
- To date there had been no extra cost to the tax payer from the Combined Authority.

4.4 The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder for his presentation and answering the Committee's questions.

5. Interview – Portfolio Holder for Tourism & Leisure (Cllr John Holdich)

5.1 The Committee received a presentation from the Portfolio Holder for Tourism & Leisure (Appendix B)

The Portfolio Holder had provided responses to questions submitted by the Committee prior to the meeting. (Appendix C)

5.2 The following points were made during the discussion:-

- Authority to undertake a Bus Review was going to the Board on 29 November. The review would consider areas such as service on demand, transport to smaller towns and isolation in rural areas especially as it could feed into other schemes. With transportation being seen as a solution to isolation.
- The Bus Review would look at areas beyond the borders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- The Combined Authority could encourage better management of the Public Rights of Way and this would be an area for the portfolio to look at.

5.3 The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder for his presentation and answering the Committee's questions.

6. Review of Combined Authority Agenda

6.1 In response to a question about the St Neots item coming to the Board the CEO advised that St Neots was an underperforming area that had great potential and although different in many ways to other market towns in the area there would definitely be some similarities that could be transferred across areas.

6.2 In response to a question about recruitment at the Combined Authority the CEO responded that the Combined Authority would be confirming the appointment of the Legal and Monitoring Officer on 29 November and would be starting recruitment for the Chief Finance Officer. Currently all posts at the Combined Authority were occupied in some capacity. The CEO planned to wait for a resolution with the LEP before making further permanent appointments.

6.3 The CEO provided the Committee with a general update on the situation with the LEP, the following points were made:-

- The first priority for the CEO was to gauge the financial position of the LEP; with agreement from the LEP Board there were some actions that could be taken which would help to relieve some of the financial pressures.
- The CEO had commissioned an independent financial review to be done by Grant Thornton and through the Chair of the LEP an independent review of how the LEP Board operates by Pinsent Masons.
- The CEO stated that he felt that although the Combined Authority and the LEP were two separate entities, his role as CEO was one role - to achieve growth in the local economy and he was clear on what he was doing in each role.
- Officer structures within each organisation needed to be joined up.
- There was an opportunity for the LEP to become stronger and take on a more strategic role for the area; currently it was felt that the LEP was isolated, for example there were work projects being done by the LEP on skills that were also being looked at by other organisations. There was an opportunity to remove duplication.

- The geographical areas covered by the LEP and the Combined Authority were different and this was a matter for the Board to consider, options would be brought back to Board.
- The National Audit Office had completed a review into the LEP which would be published soon. This piece of work examined the governance of the LEP and was different to the two pieces of work that had been commissioned to be carried out by Grant Thornton and Pinsent Mason.

7. Combined Authority Forward Plan

- 7.1 The Committee had no comments to make at this time regarding the forward plan of the Combined Authority.

8. Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

- 8.1 The Committee received the work programme and were asked to comment or make any amendments.
- 8.2 No comments were made about the work programme at this time as the work programme was due to be discussed at the training session with the CFPS.

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 The next meeting would be held on the 18th December 2017 at Fenland District Council.

Meeting Closed: 12.15pm.



CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Councillor Steve Count
Fiscal Portfolio Holder

Presentation to Overview and Scrutiny

Monday 27th November 2017



Portfolio - overview

Key areas of responsibility of the portfolio holder for Fiscal Strategy:

- Strategic Fiscal Planning
- Investment Strategy
- Budget Setting and Monitoring



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Context - Devolution Deal 1

- Responsibility for a multi-year, consolidated and devolved transport budget
- Control of £20m a year funding allocation over 30 years, 60% capital and 40% revenue
- Control of a £100m housing and infrastructure fund
- An additional £70m over five years ring fenced for Cambridge to meet housing needs
- Single pot for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough
 - Investment Fund Grant
 - Transport Grant
 - Adult Education Budget (subject to legislation)
- Funds to be subject to 5-yearly gateway assessments

Further investment – “Devolution Deal 2”

- Transport: A new transforming cities fund - £74 million for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
- Government commitment to the corridor between Cambridge and Oxford
 - the Budget sets out an ambitious integrated programme of infrastructure, housing, and business investment
 - £5 million to develop proposals for Cambridge South station
 - a study on the enhancements needed to accommodate future rail growth across Cambridgeshire.
 - construction will begin on key elements of the Expressway between Cambridge and Oxford
- Capacity funding for Mayoral Combined Authorities – £2m for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
- Housing Infrastructure Fund – announcement due in January 2018 on £194m bid for Cambridge North East Fringe



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Investment Strategy

- Secondary legislation is being drafted that will enable the Combined Authority to borrow
- This will provide the CPCA with the ability to borrow against its devolution deal funding streams
- CBRE Capital Advisors have been appointed to advise on the formation of an innovative and ambitious strategy to deploy the available capital in the most commercially efficient manner
- Other forms of public and private capital will be required to bridge the gap between existing resources available and the costs of necessary infrastructure
- Key principles of the Investment Strategy are as follows:
 - Borrowing against Capital
 - Recycling Capital – recovering and reinvesting benefits into other projects
 - Investment by way of debt or equity – funding will draw upon a blend of public and private sources of capital
 - Innovative Delivery models e.g. Joint Venture models, partners and funding solutions
 - One pot principle
 - Maximising Outputs – measurable economic outputs founded on a robust evidence base
- Land Value Capture – an innovative approach to funding infrastructure



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Assurance Framework

- Single Investment Fund (SIF) – A Single Pot of funding alongside other local and national funding sources
- All projects funded through the SIF will be subject to a single prioritisation, appraisal and monitoring and evaluation
- Defines how funds are allocated and that there are robust local systems in place to ensure resources are spent with regularity, propriety, and value for money.
- A structured approach to:
 - Develop a portfolio of infrastructure investment proposals
 - Commission and oversee the development of a capital investment strategy
 - Engage with private investors
 - Develop a prioritisation framework
 - Assess the robustness of the outline business cases
 - Present its findings and recommendations to the Combined Authority for decision

Funding Summary as at 25 October 2017



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

| | <u>Outturn</u> <u>2016/17</u> £k | <u>Budget</u> <u>2017/18</u> £k | <u>Budget</u> <u>2018/19</u> £k | <u>Budget</u> <u>2019/20</u> £k | <u>Budget</u> <u>2020/21</u> £k | Total £k |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Funding</u> | | | | | | |
| Gain Share | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 100,000 |
| Housing (General) | 10,000 | 30,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 30,000 | 100,000 |
| Housing (Cambridge) | 10,500 | 10,500 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 15,000 | 70,000 |
| LTP Capital Grant | 0 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 110,616 |
| | 40,500 | 88,154 | 79,654 | 79,654 | 92,654 | 380,616 |
| <u>Budget Allocations</u> | | | | | | |
| Revenue | 416 | 11,444 | 3,532 | 3,782 | 2,482 | 21,655 |
| VAT charge | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| <u>Capital</u> | | | | | | |
| - Gain Share | 0 | 7,708 | 3,708 | 1300 | 0 | 12,716 |
| - Housing (General) | 0 | 2,810 | 2,060 | 410 | 240 | 5,520 |
| - Housing (Cambridge) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Local Transport Plan | 0 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 27,654 | 110,616 |
| | 497 | 49,616 | 36,954 | 33,146 | 30,376 | 150,588 |
| <u>Budget Unallocated</u> | | | | | | |
| Earmarked Reserve | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Gain Share Revenue | 7,057 | -3,444 | 4,468 | 4,218 | 5,518 | 17,818 |
| Gain Share Capital | 12,000 | 4,292 | 8,292 | 10,700 | 12,000 | 47,284 |
| Housing (General) | 10,000 | 27,190 | 12,940 | 14,590 | 29,760 | 94,480 |
| Housing (Cambridge) | 10,500 | 10,500 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 15,000 | 70,000 |
| Revenue Reserve | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |
| | 40,003 | 38,538 | 42,700 | 46,508 | 62,278 | 230,028 |
| <u>Cumulative Balances</u> | | | | | | |
| Earmarked Reserve | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | |
| Gain Share Revenue | 7,057 | 3,613 | 8,081 | 12,299 | 17,818 | |
| Gain Share Capital | 12,000 | 16,292 | 24,584 | 35,284 | 47,284 | |
| Housing (General) | 10,000 | 37,190 | 50,130 | 64,720 | 94,480 | |
| Housing (Cambridge) | 10,500 | 21,000 | 38,000 | 55,000 | 70,000 | |
| Revenue Reserve | 419 | 419 | 419 | 419 | 419 | |
| | 40,003 | 78,541 | 121,241 | 167,749 | 230,028 | |

Programme Approvals as at 25 Oct 2017



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

| | <u>Updated Budget 2017/18 (£k)</u> | <u>Updated Budget 2018/19 (£k)</u> | <u>Forecast 2019/20 Budget (£k)</u> | <u>Forecast 2020/21 Budget (£k)</u> |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <u>Fiscal</u> | | | | |
| Development of an Investment Fund Strategy | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Development of a Market Towns Strategy | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Contribution to Local Growth Initiatives National Evaluation | 30.6 | 0.0 | | |
| Total Fiscal | 155.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <u>Economic Strategy</u> | | | | |
| Independent Economic Commission: Developing Economic Strategy | 145.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Economic Strategy | 145.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <u>Transport and Infrastructure</u> | | | | |
| Transport & Infrastructure Schemes | 4,200.0 | 3250.0 | 1,300.0 | 0.0 |
| a) Dualling of A47 and Upgrading of A10 | | | | |
| b) Extension to A47 | | | | |
| c) Cambridge Transport Study | | | | |
| d) Wisbech Garden Town Study | | | | |
| National Productivity Investment Fund | 3,290.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local Transport Plan | 200.0 | 300.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Rapid, Mass Transport Strategic Options Appraisal | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Priority Transport Schemes | 3,530.0 | 1000.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Transport and Infrastructure | 11,320.0 | 4,550.0 | 1,300.0 | 0.0 |
| <u>New Homes & Communities</u> | | | | |
| To provide a programme delivery support to manage the £170m Housing Programme. | 240.0 | 240.0 | 240.0 | 240.0 |
| Development of housing strategy and assurance frameworks; plus housing delivery management. | 150.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Housing consultancy to support plans for Housing Programme | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Modular Housing | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Housing Investment Fund Programme - Quick Wins | 2,570.0 | 1820.0 | 170.0 | 0.0 |
| Total New Homes & Communities | 2,995.0 | 2,060.0 | 410.0 | 240.0 |
| <u>Employment & Skills</u> | | | | |
| University of Peterborough - Business Case | 3,840.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Skills Hub | 461.0 | 231.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Employment & Skills | 4,301.0 | 231.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <u>Strategic Planning</u> | | | | |
| Non Statutory Spacial Plan | 150.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Strategic Planning | 150.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <u>Income</u> | | | | |
| Recharge to Housing Capital Grant | -240.0 | -240.0 | -240.0 | -240.0 |
| Total Income | -240.0 | -240.0 | -240.0 | -240.0 |
| Net Workstream Budget | 18,826.6 | 6,601.0 | 1,470.0 | 0.0 |



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Audit and Governance

Internal Audit will be undertaking a review of the Combined Authority's Corporate Governance on behalf of the Audit and Governance Committee. The audit will evaluate and test controls on:

- **Financial Governance:** To confirm that the Authority's financial procedures and regulations are accurate, up to date and support the Constitution and aims and priorities.
- **Organisational Structure / Roles and Responsibilities:** To confirm that the Authority has an open and transparent organisational structure and that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and communicated across the organisation.
- **Decision Making:** To confirm that there is a clear and transparent decision making process within the Authority and decisions taken adhere to these processes as set out in the assurance framework.
- **Strategy and Planning:** To confirm that the Authority's strategies are up to date and communicated across the organisation. To confirm that strategies complement and support each other and are linked to key aims and priorities.
- **Risk Management and Project Management:** To confirm that the Authority has in place an agreed strategy and clearly defined processes for the strategic review of its corporate risks. To confirm that these processes are adopted and consistently applied across all constituent Councils leading on each project.



CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Cllr John Holdich
Deputy Mayor

Presentation to Overview and Scrutiny
Monday 27th November 2017



Portfolio - overview

The Combined Authority has chosen to designate a second Deputy Mayor under its constitutional powers. The role of the Deputy Mayor (Constitutional) is to develop policies that support sustainable rural areas, and to promote the culture, tourism, parks and open spaces of the Combined Authority area.

The portfolio holder for Rural Areas, Culture, Parks and Open Spaces is responsible for:

- Rural ambassador and rural affairs
- Tourism
- Culture
- Parks and Open spaces
- Social action and the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector
- Well-being and Public Health

Rural Communities – the context



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

There are a number of significant challenges facing rural places – as highlighted in latest research published this month.

Rural communities are facing:

- Lack of affordable housing
- Loss of community assets
- Reduced access to services

Rural life is 'disappearing fast' warns new research

Rural schools, pubs and post offices are being forced to close down due to ageing and dwindling populations, a new report has warned.

The research by the National Housing Federation found that 52 rural schools have closed in the past five years, 81 post offices have been shut down since 2011 and 1,365 rural pubs have called time since March 2013.

The *Rural Life Monitor* found a lack of new affordable housing is driving young families and working-age people out of rural areas. It predicts that by 2039, almost half of households in the countryside will be aged 65 or over.



Connected Rural Communities

Connectivity has been a predominant issue for generations of rural communities – the lack of good transport, and more recently digital connectivity, becoming a major factor in economic and social isolation

The Combined Authority aims to bring about a better connected set of rural communities in area through:

- **Investment in better transport infrastructure** – ensuring that the investment in our county's roads and rail is balanced and that rural communities remain connected to nearby towns and cities
- **Better buses and public transport** – the Combined Authority will commission a strategic bus review
- **Digital connectivity** – working with Connecting Cambridgeshire to deliver 99% Superfast Broadband coverage across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough by 2020



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Tourism, Parks and Open Spaces

Following a number of discussions with representative groups including Natural Cambridgeshire, the Tourist Board, and Nene Park Trust four major initiatives are being considered:

- Formalising the status of our natural area, including the Fens
- The potential for a Trust to manage aspects of parks and open spaces across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
- A Quality Charter for Growth
- A Tourism strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Next Steps

- A Rural Housing Conference – Spring 2018
- Development of a Rural Strategy – June 2018
- Substantive proposals for Parks and Open Spaces, and the natural area – March 2018
- Connected Cambridgeshire – Bid for a rural business connectivity fund
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Tourism Strategy – April 2018

Questions Received for Cllr Count

| Question Received From | Question | Response |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Cllr Fred Yeulett | Is the CA's financial position and capability in any way whatsoever compromised by the LEP's current situation? | The LEP and the Combined Authority are separate legal entities and therefore the CA's financial position is not compromised. |
| Cllr Lucy Nethsingha | Please could Cllr Count explain how the situation with the LEP has reached the current state? | CA O & S is designed to either overview forthcoming policies and decisions of the CA or ones already in place. It is not to question members about the actions of the composite authorities or other questions outside of that specific CA remit. |
| | Does Cllr Count feel that the LEP has been treated fairly by central government? | See above |
| | Does Cllr Count feel that the process which has led the government to withhold money which was promised to the LEP was open and transparent? | See above |
| | Has Cllr Count been in contact with the areas which are currently covered by the GCGP LEP, but which are not part of the Combined Authority? What provisions are being made to ensure that areas such as Rutland and Royston continue to get the input and funding they were expecting as parts of the economic area of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough? | See above |
| | Given the way the government has treated the LEP, what does Cllr Count feel is the likely future for the GCP? | See above |

Questions Received for Cllr Holdich

| Question Received From | Question | Response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Cllr Lucy Nethsingha | Is Cllr Holdich aware that Cambridgeshire County Council have effectively turned down a grant from the Arts Council for £1 million which was available for a project improving Arts Education in Cambridgeshire, and particularly directed at increasing the opportunities available for children outside Cambridge? Given his responsibilities for encouraging the creative industries in the area, does he feel this is a wise decision? | No, I was not aware but I have and continue to be in conversation with the Arts Council who I understand are coming to talk to the Combined Authority in the near future. |
| | Does Cllr Holdich feel that the current system of local government in Cambridgeshire, where most areas are covered by 4 different layers of local government, is fit for purpose? What is he doing to address the potential for conflict and confusion where so many different bodies are responsible for decision making in the same area? | If Local Government is to survive then it cannot carry on the same way and one of the Combined Authority's objectives is to look at public sector reform. |