



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board Meeting: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 30 June 2021

Time: 10.30am – 3.25pm

Venue: Main Hall, Burgess Hall Events and Conference Centre, One Leisure,
Westwood Road, St Ives PE27 6WU

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council, Councillor W Fitzgerald – Peterborough City Council (to 3.00pm), Councillor R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor L Nethsingha – Cambridgeshire County Council (from 10.25am), Councillor M Smart – Cambridge City Council and Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council (to 2.00pm)

Co-opted Councillor E Murphy – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and D Preston – Police and Crime Commissioner

Apologies: Councillor L Herbert, substituted by Councillor M Smart, and J Thomas, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

Also present: Councillor L Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (via video link)

13. Announcements, apologies, and declarations of interest

Apologies for absence were reported as set out above.

There were no declarations of interest.

Due to the amount of business to be covered the Mayor stated his intention to vary the order of business from the published agenda the agenda to move those items which did not require a decision to the end of the agenda. There was no objection.

14. Minutes of the meeting on 2 June 2021 and Action Log

An action log had been introduced to accompany the minutes to ensure consistency and transparency across all Combined Authority boards and committees.

Councillor Bailey requested two corrections to the draft minutes:

- i. Minute 5: Minutes of the Meeting on 24 March 2021
Paragraph 1: To note that Councillor Herbert was not seeking to amend the minutes of the meeting on 24 March 2021, but wished to have his reservations recorded.
- ii. Minute 10: Appointment of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2021/22
To make clear that the Mayor had agreed with Councillor Boden's expressed view that the chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be a Conservative member.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Bailey, it was resolved unanimously by those present and voting to:

Approve the minutes of the meeting on 2 June 2021 as an accurate record, subject to two changes requested at the meeting.

15. Petitions

No petitions were received.

16. Public questions

No public questions were received.

17. Forward Plan

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to present the Committee's question on this item.

On a point of order, Councillor Boden stated that he did not believe that the Constitution had been followed in relation to the election of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28 June 2021. As the outcome was disputed, he believed it would be more appropriate for officers to present the Committee's question. The Monitoring Officer stated that he had considered this issue and had circulated a legal briefing note to the Board. In his view the election had been lawful and proper, and as such Councillor Dupré was the lawfully elected Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. However, if any Board members or their legal advisers wished to discuss this further he would be happy to do so outside of the meeting. The Mayor thanked the Monitoring Officer for taking a proactive approach to events and declared himself to be reassured on this point.

Councillor Boden commented that this was a judgement for the Mayor, but that he and several members of the Board found this position unacceptable. As such, he served a requisition notice on the Mayor in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Constitution. The

Monitoring Officer stated that the requisition to call an Extraordinary meeting of the Board would be considered, but that he would not make a declaration on it at the time.

On the basis of the Monitoring Officer's advice, the Mayor invited Councillor Dupré to present the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

Councillor Bailey asked for clarification of whether the meeting was a hybrid meeting as the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had presented the Committee's question via video link. The Monitoring Officer stated that it was a requirement that decision-makers should be physically present at the meeting, but that the Chair had broad discretion to allow others to attend as most appropriate. The Mayor stated that in the light of Covid, limiting the number of physical attendees was a priority.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Smith, it was resolved unanimously to:

Approve the Forward Plan.

18. Membership of the Combined Authority Committees

Councillor Edna Murphy left the meeting room for the duration of this item.

The report set out nominations to places on Executive Committees, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Audit and Governance Committee which had been received from constituent councils since the annual meeting on 2 June. An additional recommendation was made by the Monitoring Officer to note that Councillor Edna Murphy, the Chair of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, had been nominated as the Fire Authority's non-voting co-opted member of the Combined Authority Board for 2021/22 and Councillor Mohammed Jamil, Vice Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, had been nominated as her substitute.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Smith, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Appoint the Members and substitute Members nominated by constituent councils to the Executive Committees, Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee for the municipal year 2021/2022 (Appendix 1); and
- b) Note the named representative and substitute representative for each organisation as set out in the report.
- c) Note that Councillor Edna Murphy, Chair of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, has been nominated as the Fire Authority's non-voting co-opted member of the Combined Authority Board for 2021/22 and Councillor Mohammed Jamil, Vice Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority, has been nominated as her substitute.

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Murphy to the Board on her return to the meeting room.

19. Appointment of the Chief Executive

The report contained an appendix which was exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it contained information which was likely to reveal the identity of an individual. The Mayor asked if any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was invited to approve the appointment of the candidate recommended by the Employment Committee as chief executive of the Combined Authority. The name of the proposed appointee was contained within an exempt appendix which had been circulated to the Board. An additional recommendation was proposed to withhold the identity of the preferred candidate until 14 July 2021 in order for the appointment to be reviewed by the senior civil servants appointment panel, but the Monitoring Officer advised that there was no reason for the Board to delay making the appointment.

Councillor Boden asked whether the expectation that the preferred candidate would take up post in the autumn remained the same. The Monitoring Officer stated that the expectation was that they would join in the first part of October 2021.

Councillor Bailey commented that she has sat on the Employment Committee and that the field of candidates had been excellent. However, the report before the Board did not in her opinion reflect the full recruitment process which had also included the candidates being interviewed by a panel of constituent council chief executives. She further judged that some of the information contained at paragraph 2.5 of the report should have remained confidential and commented that it was a matter of regret that this had been made public.

Councillor Smart commented that he understood that there was no requirement on the Combined Authority to withhold the name of the preferred candidate at this time and asked whether legal advice had been sought on this point. The Monitoring Officer stated that there was no direction upon the Combined Authority, but that it was felt to be in the public interest to support the process whereby the appointment would be reviewed in accordance with the usual practice for senior civil servants. He would be happy to share the documentation around the decision to keep the name of the preferred candidate exempt at this time this with the Board.

The Mayor stated that the preferred candidate was keen to join as soon as practicable and that the Combined Authority was being respectful of central government processes.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that the Combined Authority was doing the right thing. Nobody would be advantaged or disadvantaged and it protected the integrity of all involved.

Mr Adams commented that he was supportive of the approach which seemed a sensible, but that he understood that the process could direct constraints upon the individual concerned. The Monitoring Officer stated that detailed conversations had taken place around this and that he was confident that the appointment could proceed.

One being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the progress made regarding the appointment to the position of the Combined Authority Chief Executive; and
- b) To receive and agree the recommendation made by the Members of the Employment Committee at the meeting on 16 June 2021 that the preferred candidate be appointed to the position of Chief Executive/Head of Paid Service for the Combined Authority with effect from a start date to be agreed by the preferred candidate and the Human Resources Manager.
- c) To note that the preferred candidate is subject to the Government's business appointment rules, and to therefore withhold their identity from publication until 14 July 2021 or such earlier time as the preferred candidate confirms that it may be made public.

20. Outturn Budget Monitoring Report 2020-21

The Board received an update on the provisional outturn which had been reported in March 2021. The Chief Finance Officer advised that the year-end close down was now substantially completed and published. The draft statement of accounts had been reviewed by the Audit and Governance (A&G) Committee the previous week and was now with Ernst and Young and due to return to A&G in July 2021 for sign-off. Paragraph 2.1 contained a summary of the revenue outturn position which showed a positive variance of around £8.4m. The variances were set out in detail in the appendices to the report and there was a request to carry forward around £6.4m of this to the current financial year. The capital position was set out in paragraph 3.1 and reported expenditure of £152m against a budget of £208m. There was a request for slippage carry-forward of £32m and subject to approval expenditure of £12m. A 30% carry forward on a capital programme was not considered unusual. The largest difference to the figures reported to the Board in March 2021 related to capital housing programmes. The affordable housing programme was currently under reviewed and would be considered separately later in the meeting (minute 29 below refers).

Councillor Smart commented that there appeared to be a big variance in relation to capital expenditure and that he would be keen to see budgets running on time and on budget year on year. The Chief Finance Officer stated that there were a number of projects which would run across multiple years. There was a need to get Board approval at the outset so that the projects could progress, but expenditure might be incurred across a number of years.

Councillor Boden commented that the market towns programme expenditure on Chatteris and Wisbech had been approved previously by the Board, but that no written assurance had been received that these projects could progress despite his repeated requests. He sought an assurance that all approved market towns programme projects could proceed and that the Combined Authority would underwrite that expenditure. The Mayor stated his belief that an email had been sent to Board members earlier in the week confirming this position and asked officers that this should be re-sent. He further asked officers to check that the correct email addresses were being used to contact Board members. Going forward, he would want all members to have Combined

Authority email addresses, but he was content for this email to be re-sent to members' current email addresses. Councillor Fitzgerald commented that Leaders already had multiple email addresses and that from a practical point of view the best one to use was their constituent council email as that was who they were representing, unless there was a Constitutional issue.

Mr Adams sought clarification of the basis on which market towns programme expenditure which had previously been approved by the Board had been paused. The Mayor stated that officers were mindful of the change of direction at the Combined Authority following his election. Councillor Fuller commented that he understood that officers were looking again at business following the change of Mayor, but that the Constitution was clear that the Mayor could not unilaterally halt Board decisions and that he felt the delay was regrettable.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she thought it reasonable that there should be a short pause for the Mayor to review previous decisions, but that she was glad that that the market towns programme was going ahead.

The Monitoring Officer stated that the Mayor was responsible for setting the budget and for consulting on it. Had any changes been proposed to previous decisions these would have been brought before the Board.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Smart, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the outturn position of the 2020-21 financial year;
- b) Approve the carry forward of unspent revenue budgets as set out in paragraph 2.1;
- c) Approve the slippage in the capital programme as set out in paragraph 3.1;
- d) Note the revised 2021-22 budget and capital programme; and
- e) Note the 2021-22 budget amendments set out in paragraph 4.3.

21. Local Highways Maintenance Capital Grant Allocation 2021-22 (Mayoral Decision)

The Board was consulted on the proposal to split the local highways maintenance capital grant allocation for 2021-22 between Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as the two local highways agencies as set out in the report. If agreed, the funds would be passported to these councils. The split was based on previous years' allocations and was based on a Government formula.

Having consulted the Board, the Mayor allocated grants totalling £27,695,000 to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City Council (PCC) in line with the Department for Transport formula for determining each council's share as set out below:

Cambridgeshire County Council £21,955,000

Peterborough City Council	£5,740,000
Total	£27,695,000

22. East West Rail Consultation

The Board was invited to shape the response to the East West Rail consultation. The scheme would be delivered in stages with the aim of having trains running the full length of the line by the end of the decade. The Combined Authority was supportive of the East West Rail scheme, subject to a number of key principles which were set out in the report.

Councillor Smith commented that, as the prospective Lead Member for the Environment for the Combined Authority, she agreed that the line should be electrified from the outset. She also welcomed the aim to minimise the impact on health, although she thought the reference to this should be strengthened and that impacts on wellbeing should also be taken into account. Whatever route East West Rail took it would have significant visual, acoustic and environmental impacts on some communities and action was needed to minimise or mitigate these impacts. While recognising the benefits which the new rail line could bring the Combined Authority must also be a strong voice for the communities which could be adversely affected. In Councillor Smith's judgement, there were some issues missing from the draft response. These included high calibre cycleways and digital infrastructure which could be implemented alongside the rail infrastructure works. She suggested that the Combined Authority might refer to the OxCam Arc principles of a minimum 20% biodiversity net gain as it was imperative to do everything possible to ensure these benefits were delivered in addition to the rail line. There was also a need to be mindful of examples of new routes severing existing active transport links and rights of way and this should be taken into consideration. It would also be good to keep the option of the northern route on the table as the Board wanted to achieve the best route for all, not just the route which could be delivered at least cost.

Mr Adams asked why these points had not been included in the recommendations before the Board when Councillor Smith indicated that they had been included in the consultation response from South Cambridgeshire District Council. Councillor Nethsingha commented that she would like to see some of the wording in the consultation responses submitted by constituent councils reflected in the Combined Authority's response to emphasise to Government that they were speaking with one voice. She further commented that she would like to have seen the actual draft consultation response brought before the Board, rather than the principles on which it would be based. Councillor Fuller concurred, describing the proposed response as lightweight. Huntingdonshire District Council had also submitted a strong response to the consultation and he would like to have seen this better reflected in the proposals before the Board. Councillor Boden judged that it was correct to set out key overarching principles. However, these principles had not been overlaid on the proposed alignments. It was also important for the Combined Authority to take account of constituent councils' responses. The Mayor agreed, stating that he would like a more robust reflection of the Board's comments in the consultation response submitted by the Combined Authority.

The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that officers had received a clear steer from the Board and these comments would be taken into account in formulating a

stronger response to the consultation. This would focus on where there was consensus of opinion amongst the constituent councils. The consultation response was due to be submitted that day, but it was quite usual to ask for a small extension to the deadline and this would be done to allow the changes requested by the Board to be made. The revised draft would be circulated to Board members before it was submitted.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Boden, it was resolved unanimously to:

Agree a Combined Authority response to the East West Rail consultation, subject to the modifications and amendments requested by the Board, and to seek a short extension to the consultation deadline to allow time for those changes to be made.

23. Bus Services

The Board received an update on bus market reform and future opportunities to improve bus services across the Greater Cambridgeshire area. In a usual year the Government and Combined Authority would spend around £50m on bus subsidies. However, passenger numbers had dropped significantly during Covid and buses were still operating at around 50% capacity, so much higher subsidies had been required. At present, the Combined Authority had little formal control over the services provided, including routes and time-tabling. Under the decisions taken by the previous Board the Combined Authority was pursuing a statutory franchising process. An evidence base and formal business case would need to be developed before taking this to public consultation. Good partnerships had been built with the local bus industry and thanks were expressed to Professor Ian Leslie for his contribution to this work. Government was requesting a baseline improvement plan by October 2021 and officers sought a mandate from the Board to produce a business case by the autumn.

Councillor Nethsingha welcomed the progress being made. She commented that it had been a matter of some frustration that work on bus services had not been addressed sooner. This would clearly be a complex piece of work and in her judgement it would be important for this to include discussions around fare structuring, including travel costs for families and groups.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the report. She commented that the delivery of better bus services and rural routes was embedded within East Cambridgeshire District Council's corporate plan and a district-wide survey had been carried out which had attracted around 1500 responses. Her biggest frustration was the statutory requirement to spend significant sums on bus passes and she would welcome any representations which could be made on this issue. Councillor Bailey commented that she would like to see a focus on rural areas and described the arrangements around the Ely Zipper bus which was now the lowest subsidised service in Cambridgeshire. She encouraged the Combined Authority to explore options like this. The Mayor welcomed Councillor Bailey's passion for supporting provision to rural communities and the rural economy, stating that this was something which they shared.

Councillor Smith highlighted the inequalities which existed in the current provision of services, giving the example of young people unable to access education, employment or training opportunities due to transport inequality. The environmental implications should also be taken into account. Councillor Smith welcomed the proposal for the

Combined Authority to take greater control in this area and expressed the hope that it would be speaking to all bus operators about this. The Mayor stated that subsidising fares had been part of his pre-election priorities.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that he was a great advocate of community bus services, particularly in rural areas. He felt that there was a lot the Combined Authority could do to encourage these.

Councillor Boden commented that he was a strong supporter of public transport and that he welcomed the report in as far as it went. He judged that there was a need to provide public transport that the public wanted to use at the times they needed it. Demand responsive transport was a good direction of travel, but he expressed concern that some unrealistic expectations were being raised. For example, a 24% mode shift was not achievable without significant additional investment. In his view it sometimes helped to look further ahead, especially in a strategic authority, and he urged the Combined Authority to have a longer perspective into the 2030s and 2040s. The Mayor stated that he was an ambitious Mayor who had identified bus services as a priority area. He hoped that the Board would like what they saw when the future transport strategy was brought before it.

Mr Adams commented that the Board might be pleasantly surprised by the extent to which business would want to be involved with work on this issue and urged the Combined Authority to engage with business on this. Getting employees to the workplace was a real issue for many employers and he cited an example within his own organisation where a key question from prospective apprentices had been how they could get to Chatteris to take up these opportunities.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Smith, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Mandate officers to continue discussions on bus market reform with bus operators and other partners with the aim of progressing a franchising business case and developing a Bus Service Improvement Plan;
- b) Approve an increase of £100,000 in the bus reform budget to reflect the award of capacity funding by the Department for Transport;
- c) Approve the creation of a £189,000 Covid Bus Service Support Grant budget and to authorise further grants received for this purpose to be included in this budget subject to such increases being reported to the Board in their regular budget update report.

The vote in favour included at least two thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils, including the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

The meeting adjourned at 11.45am for five minutes.

24. Climate Change

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to present the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and the draft response is at Appendix 1.

The Board was aware of the statutory commitment by Government to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050 and had adopted a Local Transport Plan (LTP) which reflected that imperative. The Board had considered the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate Change's first report at its meeting on 24 March 2021. The Commission was chaired by Baroness Brown and comprised a strong team of commissioners, many of whom brought local experience to the role. The Commission's initial report focused on transport, buildings, energy and peat. In considering the recommendations officers had undertaken an inclusive consultation process which had included thematic workshops, a chief executive workshop and discussions with political leaders. The officer recommendation was to accept all of the Commission's recommendations and to set up a working group to draw up an action plan. The recommendation had been framed in this way because it seemed difficult to get to a costed action plan without knowing which of the Commission's recommendations the Board was accepting. Where the Commission had made recommendations to the Combined Authority and to constituent councils the report was clear that the Combined Authority was answering only for itself, and not for constituent councils.

Councillor Bailey, seconded by Councillor Boden, proposed the following amendment:

The Combined Authority Board is recommended to:

- a) **Agree to step up its activities to consider, and where appropriate deliver, on the interim recommendations from the Commission on Climate;**
- b) ~~Agree the response to the Independent Commission on Climate initial recommendations as set out in Appendix 1~~ **Amend the wording of 'overarching recommendation 1' of the Commission as shown below, to delete references to 'Climate Cabinet' and replace with 'Climate Working Group';**

Overarching Recommendation 1

The CPCA should create:

- A Climate Cabinet **Working Group** chaired by the Leader of the Combined Authority – including councils and key regional stakeholders
- A funded delivery team in CPCA to coordinate, champion and facilitate action
- A green investment team
- A climate action plan, including a finance plan, with agreed targets for emissions, actions and monitoring
- An independent monitor, maintaining the CPICC as an independent body to monitor and report on progress annually.

ACTION: Accept - Implementation in hand/route to implementation available.

COST: LOW / **EMISSIONS IMPACT:** HIGH

Detailed response:

The Combined Authority Board agreed March 2021 to the formation of a ~~climate cabinet, to be named the~~ Climate Working Group. [CPCA: underway: staff time].

- c) **Agree the ‘overarching recommendation 1’ of the Commission as amended at recommendation b) above, and further agree that the ‘action plan’ forming part of ‘overarching recommendation 1’ be produced within 6 months and presented to the Board for approval, and such an action plan be renewed every 12 months thereafter; and**
- d) Approve £50,000 from the allocated climate change budget for development of the Commission’s final recommendations.

(Additional text in bold and deletions in strikethrough)

Councillor Bailey commented her amendment was set down with the best of intentions to progress this work collectively. However, the Leaders’ strategy meeting on 9 June 2021 had been the first time the draft response had been shared with all Board members. At her request a further meeting had taken place on 21 June 2021 to discuss the draft response again, but she felt that the discussion which had taken place was not fully reflected in the report before the Board. There had been no engagement from Combined Authority officers with either East Cambridgeshire District Council’s lead member or lead officer for environmental issues and no time for Board members to discuss the recommendations with their own councils. It was important for the Combined Authority to take this work forward collaboratively and in co-operation with its constituent councils. Thirteen of the recommendations sought to bind the Combined Authority and constituent councils. In her judgement some of these recommendations were unrealistic and she deemed it inappropriate to sign up to things that she was not certain could be delivered. Although the recommendations were not binding on constituent councils she was concerned that those areas where there were problems for particular authorities should be looked at. An example of this was peat. Councillor Bailey* found it astonishing that recommendations were being made on this now when so little information was available. The majority of deep peat was not located in Fenland and most of that which was formed part of functional flood plains. She stated that any proposals for re-wetting this would be resisted to the end. The 2030 net zero carbon emission target could not be met, but if her amendment was accepted it would allow a process of negotiation to begin. Should the original report recommendation be approved she felt that some Members’ support would be lost.

Councillor Smith commented that climate change had been known about for fifty years and decades had been wasted through inaction. Just because something was difficult was not a reason not to do it. This did not mean that the same solutions would work for all and there was a need for flexibility. However, in her judgement it was incumbent upon the Mayor and Board to show leadership on this issue. She highlighted the eminence of Baroness Brown and her Board and strongly disputed that there was a lack of evidence in relation to peat. Councillor Smith questioned whether the £50k proposed for the development of the Commission’s final recommendations was enough and felt this sum should be looked at again in the future. She judged that there was an

**Clerk’s note: This comment was incorrectly attributed to Councillor Bailey. It was made by Councillor Boden.*

opportunity for the Combined Authority to be an exemplar on this issue and stated that she would not be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she would not be supporting the amendment and that she was disappointed that it had been moved. She judged that it would have the effect of getting rid of all of the recommendations other than recommendation 1. Contrary to what had been suggested it was recognised explicitly in the recommendations that constituent councils were not being committed to an operational target. The implication that it was suggested that crucial peat flood plains should be re-wetted was not what was said in the recommendations, although there might need to be discussions about that in the future.

Councillor Fuller declared himself to be somewhat in the middle of the views being voiced. He was disappointed by the rhetoric and commented that there was no consensus on the recommendations and that in his view the report and its recommendations did not reflect the concerns expressed during discussions at Leaders' strategy meetings. He was not opposed to acting or to making this issue a top priority, but he was not willing to sign up to what could not be delivered. He noted that the Combined Authority could not compel constituent councils to act, but judged it to be pointless to pass recommendations to which some constituent authorities had said they could not commit. His preference was to deal with this in a consensual way. The process around this was important and in his judgement it had not been inclusive. His chief executive had not seen the information and his portfolio holder for environment and climate change had not been engaged. The constituent councils were already acting on climate change and were committed to making progress, but these were big aspirations and he wanted to be sure that they were deliverable. Each Council faced multiple competing priorities and must strike a balance in addressing these. With a slightly different and more inclusive approach Councillor Fuller judged that consensus could be achieved.

Mr Adams commented that it was incumbent on leaders to set targets and make a plan. However, he was wary of setting targets without knowing how they would be achieved and felt that there was a need to differentiate between aspirational targets and actual commitments. He noted that recommendation 3 was quite nuanced in its 'aim' to achieve the stated goals. He thanked Councillor Bailey for her amendment which he judged to be a commendable attempt to work together to seek a solution. However, on balance, he judged that there was a need to make a start and accept that some targets were aspirational.

Councillor Smart commented that it was a good report and that in his view there was a need to get on with the job and cut carbon emissions. Changes with technology were happening fast and he did not have a problem with encouraging councils to do the right thing. Environmental catastrophes were already occurring around the world.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that he had listened intently to the debate and that he had not heard anyone say they did not want to act, but the Board must get this right and know how its aims would be achieved. The report was a public document and as such the public would expect to see the Board's decisions delivered. However, input from the constituent councils had been marginal before the meeting on 21 June.

Speaking to her amendment ahead of the vote, Councillor Bailey commented that her aim was for the Board to move forward together and that the language of her amendment spoke to moving faster rather than seeking a delay. The clear and robust actions being taken by East Cambridgeshire District Council underlined that commitment.

The Mayor thanked Board members for their considered responses. In some ways he judged that his job had been made easier by the Board's unanimous decision under the previous Mayor to prepare a response to the recommendations. He emphasised that it was not for the Combined Authority to make commitments on behalf of its constituent councils and that he believed that the report was explicit on this point. However, it was also his belief that if a building was burning you had to act, and on this basis he would not be supporting the amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

The Mayor opened the report and original report recommendations to debate.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that this was a complex matter. Peterborough City Council was wholly committed to acting on climate change and he would now support the report recommendations. However, he expressed the hope that the Combined Authority would work much more closely with its constituent councils on how this was taken forward in future. He judged that this should include discussions with lead officers and improved communication to shape the deliverability of the process and should recognise that different councils were in different places on this journey.

Mr Adams noted the lack of consultation which had taken place and asked that the process should be reviewed to ensure that this did not happen again. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, noted the concerns about the timeliness and nature of consultation with constituent councils on some matters and undertook to develop a set of principles on how this should be conducted. This would be brought to a future meeting of the Board for consideration.

Councillor Fuller asked that the recommendations should not be pushed through in this manner. The Board had heard that there had been a lack of consultation and whilst he wanted to support this work he felt forced to abstain because of the way it was being done. He judged that to continue would seriously damage good will and have a lasting impact.

Councillor Boden commented that there had been suggestions that consultation had taken place when it had not and that he judged the lack of co-operation and a consensual approach on this matter deeply regrettable. Councillor Bailey concurred, commenting that forcing this approach on constituent councils was the opposite of co-operation.

The Mayor stated that sometimes in an emergency situation you had to take a leadership decision. He was comfortable taking this decision.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald, it was resolved by a majority of those present and voting:

- a) Agree the response to the Independent Commission on Climate initial recommendations as set out in Appendix 1; and
- b) Approve £50,000 from the allocated climate change budget for development of the Commission's final recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned from 12.58 – 1.22pm.

Councillor Fuller left the meeting at 12.58pm.

25. Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus – Approval of Fifth Tranche of Recommended Projects and Change Request for Huntingdonshire Funding Timeline Extension

The report contained appendices which were exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The Mayor asked if any members of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The report contained details of the fifth tranche of project proposals from Fenland District Council together with a request from Huntingdonshire District Council to extend the funding timeline for the remaining funds allocated previously to Huntingdon and St Ives until March 2023. All project proposals had been independently assessed.

Councillor Boden expressed his unreserved support for the proposals submitted by Fenland District Council.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Boden, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Approve project proposals received under the Market Towns Programme and in response to town centre Covid-19 recovery from Fenland District Council to the sum of £1,071,021; and
- b) Approve the request received from Huntingdonshire District Council to extend the funding timeline to March 2023 for the remaining £802,150 allocated to the towns of Huntingdon and St Ives.

26. Authority to Spend for the Greater South East Energy Hub

The Board was invited to note grant funding from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) of approximately £1.4m from the public sector decarbonisation programme. BEIS had also advised the Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH) and five other national energy hubs about a Sustainable Warmth competition which was being launched and would enable them to bid into a further fund worth £350m, with around £70m of this potentially available to the GSEEH. Bids needed to be submitted by 4 August 2021 and the GSEEH was offering to act as lead authority on behalf of local authorities which did not wish to bid directly.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Mr Adams, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Note the BEIS grant funding of £1,372,289 for public sector decarbonisation programme;
- b) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills in consultation with Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to recruit 6 fixed term contracted employees for the Greater South East Energy Hub (GSEEH);
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to enter into contracts with consultants for the purpose of the Public Sector Decarbonisation Skills Funding and COP26;
- d) Approve an increase in the core Energy Hub budget, CX0072 of £270k; and
- e) Give permission to the Greater South East Energy Hub to bid into the Sustainable Warmth Competition being run by BEIS.

27. Careers Hub

The Board was advised that since publication of the report the grant fund delivery element of the scheme had been received. All schools within the Opportunity Area would be served by the careers hub and it was intended to apply for an additional hub for all remaining schools in 2022/23. The contract was currently being delivered through Gateley Economic Growth Services Ltd and it was proposed to TUPE a member of Combined Authority staff across to ensure seamless provision. The service was designed to support young people to make informed decisions around their career choices.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she was pleased to see the Combined Authority taking this path. This type of careers advice was very much needed and was addressing a gap in provision.

Councillor Smith expressed the hope that the member of staff being TUPE transferred should not lose out on their pension provision or any similar provision due to the transfer.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Approve the acceptance of the section 31 Local Authority Act 1972 Act grant paid by the Careers and Enterprise Company Limited on behalf of the Department for Education to the CPCA. The grant is £172,100 for the academic year of 2021/22;
- b) Delegate to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Deputy Section 73 Officer and the Monitoring Officer, authority to pay the section 31 grant to Growth Co;

- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills to vary the Contract between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company (Growth Co) and Gateley Economic Growth Services Limited (“Gateleys”) to now include the provision by Gateleys of a Careers Hub Service; and
- d) Approve the TUPE transfer of one member of CPCA staff to Gareth Preece Consulting which is a sub-contractor of Gateleys, the consortium lead contracted to deliver Growth Works.

28. European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) Growth Coaching Grants – Partner Agreement

The Board was advised that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) had carried out a programme inspection on 11 March 2021 and that the project structure had been found not to be fully compliant with project rules. Two possible solutions to this had been identified and officers were recommending Option 2, to have a direct Partner Agreement between the Combined Authority and YTKO (consortium member delivering the Growth Work Contract).

Councillor Smith asked for more information about what had been found to be lacking in relation to compliance. She further sought assurances in relation to the proposed Partner Agreement with YTKO. Officers stated that the Combined Authority was the applicant for the original funding and YTKO was not a nominated delivery partner. MHCLG was seeking a simple Partner Agreement between the Combined Authority and YTKO to discharge that responsibility. Officers confirmed that robust arrangements were in place in relation to oversight and control of the proposed Partner Agreement.

Councillor Boden commented that this appeared to be a purely technical contractual amendment and wondered whether a different governance path might be followed in future for decisions of this type.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve option 2 as set out in this report, to have a direct Partner Agreement between the Combined Authority and YTKO (consortium member delivering the Growth Work Contract);
- b) Approve the draft Partner Agreement included as Appendix 1; and
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business & Skills, in conjunction with the Monitoring Officer to make the necessary changes to the existing Growth Works contract between the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company (Growth Co) and Gateley Economic Growth Services (GEG) using a contracted change control process.

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

29. Implementation of the Revised Affordable Housing Programme

The Board was advised that the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) had offered a new programme of support to March 2022, with conditions, which the Combined Authority had accepted. A key condition was that the Combined Authority would re-invest all returning capital into the agreed housing programme. As reported to the Housing and Communities Committee on 21 June 2021, there were currently 1189 units across 18 schemes which were ready to be progressed pending Ministerial approval from MHCLG. The risk to scheme delivery would increase over time so an early response would be welcome. The recommendations were considered by the Housing and Communities Committee on 21 June 2021 where it was agreed unanimously by those present and voting to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Boden thanked the Director of Housing and Development for a clear report. However, he expressed concern that feedback on shaping future housing policy had been sought using a Survey Monkey poll, which he considered to be both unprofessional and to lack the necessary detail. The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority would look at all avenues for seeking information from constituent councils, but that this would be reviewed.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that it was important that Cambridgeshire should get all of the funding it was promised by Government given the urgent need for more affordable housing in the area and that it was disappointing that MHCLG was not recommending some proposals put forward by the Combined Authority for Ministerial approval.

Councillor Smith noted that the Board had previously agreed the extension of the repayment period for some loans and asked when that money would be paid back and what percentage would be repaid within the timeframe set out by MHCLG. She further asked whether the £100K Homes scheme had now ended. South Cambridgeshire District Council had been offered the opportunity to purchase a number of these homes, but she believed that there was a legal hold over them remaining £100K Homes in perpetuity. Councillor Smith expressed the hope that those people on the waiting list for £100K Homes were being kept informed of the position on these. The Director of Housing and Development stated that Appendix 3 to the report set out the projected receipts from loan repayments and confirmed that the expectation remained that all loans would be repaid in full. However, £42.77m was still required from Government to deliver all of the Combined Authority's proposed affordable housing schemes. With regard to the £100k Homes scheme, the agreement had obliged developers to provide affordable housing units. That was the agreement which was relied upon to deliver the £100k Homes, but it was now likely that the form of the affordable housing delivered would be different.

Councillor Bailey commented that in her view the £100K Homes scheme had not ended as the Board had not agreed to this. East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) remained committed to the scheme and she considered it to be a matter of regret that the Board had not had the opportunity to discuss this. She noted that there were a number of affordable ownership opportunities listed on the delivery schedule and asked what was happening to those. Councillor Bailey further stated that she did not want the Combined Authority to contact ECC officers regarding the formulation of policy as this was a matter for elected members. The Director of Housing and Development stated that where there was the time or opportunity to apply those principle in the period to March 2022 then officers would do so, subject to the wishes of the Board. Councillor

Bailey commented that on the basis that the schedule included a range of tenures she was able to support it.

Councillor Smart stated that there was an affordable housing crisis in the region and he expressed the hope that the Board would work together to get back the £45m which had been promised by Government.

The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority was committed to co-operation and it would listen. He acknowledged the work of the Director of Housing and Development and his team, commenting that there were now three impressive and life-changing schemes before the Board. It was essential to win back Government confidence so that the Combined Authority could deliver the affordable housing schemes needed by Cambridgeshire.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

Approve the proposals for the Affordable Housing Programme being discussed with the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

Councillor Smith left the meeting at 2.00pm.

30. Adult Education Budget 2021/22 Funding Allocations and Policy Changes

The Board was invited to approve the funding allocations for the 2021/22 academic year from the devolved Adult Education Budget (AEB) to the providers listed in Table A of the report to the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021 and associated officer delegations. The allocations were designed to provide continued support to local adult education provision which was aligned to the Combined Authority's priorities, including the levelling up agenda, addressing skills gaps and supporting the productivity of business. It was also proposed to continue to fully fund English as an Additional Language (EAL) training, first Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications for all and to remain focused on supporting deprived areas across the region. The recommendations were considered by the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021 where it was agreed unanimously by those present and voting to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

Councillor Boden welcomed the report and this area of Combined Authority spend and expressed regret that more money was not being spent in this area. He expressed concern at the statement in Appendix 2 that a minimum contract value of £100k had been introduced and asked whether many providers would be affected by this and whether any specialist providers would be impacted. Councillor Boden expressed further concern that the proposal would extend the criteria to include lower layer super output areas (LSOAs) in the 40th centile when some LSOAs in Fenland and Peterborough were in the top 10% of LSOAs. He was concerned this showed a failure to distinguish those in greatest need and deprivation. Officers stated that three providers would be affected, none of whom were specialist providers. There would be a transition period of a year and sub-contractors were allowed where required. Officers would circulate details of the three providers with contracts under £100k to the Board outside of the meeting. The Mayor further undertook to reflect with officers on the

request to consider a gradation in the allocation of funding in future to reflect the variation in need.

Mr Adams asked why the contract with Steadfast Training had been identified when other providers had not. He further commented that business was often quite critical that providers were rewarded for the volume of provision rather than its quality and asked how quality assurance and value for money would be ensured. Mr Adams asked for greater visibility of the data and intelligence showing the impact of the Adult Education Budget (AEB) in the region and for data to be shared. Officers stated that Steadfast Training was a contracted service whereas other providers received grant funding. Assurance framework arrangements included the requirement for an independent assessment of provision and all providers were subject to Ofsted inspection.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that officers had done a good job at the Skills Committee meeting in setting out how this work was evolving. The budget had only been devolved for three years and the Combined Authority was now across all of the necessary assurance checks. However, this was part of a process which would continue to be developed over time.

On being proposed by Councillor Nethsingha, seconded by Councillor Smith, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Approve the funding allocations for the 2021/22 academic year, from the devolved Adult Education Budget (AEB) to the providers, set out in Table A of the report to the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021;
- b) Grant authority to enter into contract for services, with Steadfast Training Ltd;
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills in consultation with Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to enter into contract for services, with the providers set out in Table A, on behalf of the Combined Authority;
- d) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to enter into Grant Funding Agreements, with the providers set out in Table A, on behalf of the Combined Authority;
- e) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to procure, award and enter into contract, with recommended new providers, as required within the devolved Adult Education Budget (AEB) Grant for 2021/22, set out in the AEB Commissioning Guiding Principles; and
- f) Approve implementation of the funding policy changes and funding flexibilities for the 2021/22 academic year, as set out in the report to the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021.

32. Employment and Skills Strategy

The Board received a report seeking approval of the proposed approach to the development and refresh of the current Skills Strategy. This included a request to approve expenditure of £25k from Skills Advisory Panel grant funding on the development of the strategy. Constituent council chief executives were already being consulted and the intention was to consult widely both by place and profession and to engage fully with wider stakeholders. The recommendations were considered by the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021 where it was agreed unanimously by those present and voting to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Mr Adams, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

Approve the proposed approach to the development of the Employment and Skills Strategy, including the approval to spend £25,000 from Skills Advisory Panel grant funding on the development of the strategy.

33. Format of Business Board Meetings

The Mayor reminded the Board that when the Combined Authority Board took decisions as the Accountable Body for the Business Board it was committed to acting in line with the assurance framework in the interests of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area as a whole, and to take decisions based on the recommendations of the Business Board.

Mr Adams commented that this was the fourth time the question of holding all business board meetings in public had been raised following a recommendation made by the Audit and Governance Committee at its meeting on 5 March 2021. The issue had been discussed by the Business Board on 19 May 2021 where it had been agreed unanimously by those members present and voting that this recommendation should be rejected and that Business Board meetings should continue to follow the existing format of holding meetings in private with one public meeting each year. The rationale for this recommendation was that most Business Board discussions involved investment proposals which were highly confidential. If that confidentiality could not be assured the Business Board judged that this would impact on the proposals being brought forward for consideration. The Business Board recognised the need to improve transparency, but felt that this should not be at the expense of compromising confidentiality. Several attempts had been made to open discussions up to the public and no-one had attended. Members of the Combined Authority Board had also been invited to attend Business Board meetings to observe its work and no-one had taken these offers up and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had not sent an observer despite one being invited to attend. The Business Board was committed to being as transparent as possible, but not at the cost of its effectiveness. Of the 28 local enterprise partnerships (LEPs) in the UK only a small minority met in public and these tended to have a full-time chair and lots of private meetings in the background where much of their work was done. He did not believe this to be a model which many of the capable and busy business people sitting on the Business Board would wish to adopt.

Councillor Bailey commented that she had attended a Business Board meeting in March as a substitute and had been entirely persuaded by the Business Board's view.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she was uncomfortable at turning down a request from the Audit and Governance Committee that Business Board meetings

should be held in public, noting that it was public money being spent. All local authorities held some meetings or parts of meetings in private session and to her that seemed an appropriate model.

Councillor Smith highlighted the issues of transparency and accountability. She commented that commercially sensitive information could be discussed separately and that she was not convinced by what she had heard that the whole Business Board meeting needed to be held in private. Councillor Smith further suggested that the Business Board needed to be clear about what information at its meetings was subject to Freedom of Information arrangements.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that Business Board meetings could be held in public, but in practice the public meeting would open and then immediately go into private session.

Councillor Boden commented that he believed the Combined Authority to be fortunate in having a Business Board which worked so well. He was clear that in order to consider its business the Business Board needed to have a free-flowing discussion. He noted that the Board's decisions and minutes were published and that it was their discussions which were kept on a confidential basis. Councillor Boden expressed great confidence in the Business Board and its processes.

The Monitoring Officer stated that the Business Board made its decisions in private, but that these were brought to a public meeting of the Combined Authority Board for ratification. The Business Board agenda and minutes were published, but in order to discuss its business it would constantly need to move into private session if its meetings were made public.

The Mayor commented that prior to his election he had said that he thought that the Business Board should meet in public. He now understood the more nuanced position, but in the course of time he would like to see more public sessions.

On being put to the vote the recommendation was lost.

The Monitoring Officer stated that as the Mayor had voted against the recommendation the recommendation was lost. Officers would reflect on the position and a further report would be brought to a future meeting which would explore the full consequences of the proposal. In the meantime, the arrangements for Business Board meetings would remain unchanged.

Councillor Nethsingha expressed the hope that the next report on this issue would have more input from the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Fitzgerald suggested that Mr Adams explain the Business Board's reservations to the Audit and Governance Committee. Mr Adams commented that members of the Audit and Governance Committee had never attended a meeting of the Business Board.

Councillor Boden commented that the Mayor voting against the recommendation did not oblige him to bring forward another report on this issue.

The Mayor stated that before he was elected Mayor he had expressed concerns about the Business Board meeting in private and so he was following through on that. However, he had listened to the discussion and had now attended a meeting of the Business Board . He looked forward to hearing more and getting a better understanding of the issue over time. He would take on board the reservations expressed by the Business Board and by members of the Combined Authority Board.

34. Sector Strategies

The Board was recommended to approve the adoption of the Advanced Materials and Manufacturing Sector Strategy, the Life Sciences Sector Strategy and a one page Digital Strategy update, noting that a full refresh of the Digital Strategy would be brought to the Board at a later date. The Agri-Tech Strategy would also be brought to a future meeting. Work on the strategies had begun the previous year but had been paused due to Covid and Brexit. The strategies had been subject to wide consultation. In adopting the strategies the Business Board and Combined Authority Board would aim to address the actions required, but they were not committed to delivering them. The recommendations were considered by the Business Board on 19 June 2021 where it was agreed unanimously by those present and voting to recommend the proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval.

On being proposed by Mr Adams, seconded by Councillor Bailey, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Approve adoption of the Advanced Materials and Manufacturing Sector Strategy;
- b) Approve adoption of the Life Sciences Sector Strategy; and
- c) Approve the proposed One Page Digital Strategy update, adopt that one-page strategy update as an addendum to the original strategy, and note that the whole Digital Sector Strategy will be refreshed and brought back to the Combined Authority Board.

Councillor Fitzgerald left the meeting at 3.00pm.

35. Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2020/21

The Mayor expressed his wish to place on record his thanks to Mr Pye, the Independent Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, and to members of the committee for their diligence and hard work.

Mr Pye stated that the substance of the Audit and Governance Committee's work was set out on pages 109-110 of the agenda. Within this, he drew the Board's attention to recommendation 4 which related to the format of Business Board meetings and was about the presumption of openness. This recommended, '...that Business Board meetings should be open to the public unless the Chair decided otherwise', rather than the current presumption which was that Business Board meetings should be held in private. The Audit and Governance Committee had expressed no material concerns during the period covered by the 2020/21 annual report and officers had been open and

supportive. During the next year the Committee would look at governance arrangements for the Combined Authority's subsidiary companies.

Councillor Bailey expressed her thanks to Mr Pye and to the Audit and Governance Committee for their report and for the valuable work which the Committee carried out. She noted that both the Audit and Governance Committee and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government had reported no material governance concerns about the Affordable Housing Programme during the period covered by the report.

The Audit and governance Committee Annual Report 2020/21 was noted.

36. Manufacturing and Materials Research and Development Centre Project Change Request and Revised Business Plan

The report contained appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that they contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The Mayor asked if any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was advised of Mayoral Decision Notice 34-2021 made on 28 May 2021 which had approved a project change request for the Manufacturing and Materials Research & Development Centre; approved a revised Business Plan for the Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd; delegated authority to the Director of Business and Skills to finalise and complete the necessary legal documentation for the Peterborough R&D Property Company Limited; and to approve the allocation of the balance of the £13.773m Getting Building Fund monies to Phase 2 of the University of Peterborough project and releases the balance of the funding based on the amendment to the Business Plan. A Mayoral Decision had been requested to avoid a three month delay in progressing the proposals. The recommendations were endorsed by the Business Board on 12 May 2021 and were discussed at a Leaders' Strategy meeting on 19 May 2021.

Mayoral Decision Notice 34-2021, Manufacturing and Materials Research and Development Centre Project Change Request and Revised Business Plan, was noted.

37. Community Renewal Fund and Levelling Up Fund Bid Selection Process

The Board was advised of Mayoral Decision Notice 35-2021 made on 11 June 2021 under general exception arrangements which approved the process that had been used to select the final candidate bids for Community Renewal Funds and the Levelling Up Fund. The bidding processes had needed to be launched at very short notice in order to meet the programme deadline. The proposals had been developed in conjunction with Peterborough City Council and Fenland District Council. The proposals were endorsed by the Business Board on 19 May 2021, were discussed at a Leaders strategy meeting on 9 June 2021 and were reported to the Skills Committee on 14 June 2021.

Mr Adams expressed his thanks to the Senior Responsible Officer for the Local Growth Fund and Market Insight and Evaluation for the significant work required in a short period of time to progress this work.

Mayoral Decision Notice 35-2021, Community Renewal Fund and Levelling- Up Fund Bid Selection process, was noted.

38. Community Renewal Fund Final Submission Approval

The Board was advised of Mayoral Decision Notice 37-2021 made on 15 June 2021 to approve the final list of applications to the Community Renewal Fund as the Lead Authority in Combined Authority area and to approve the submission of the final list to Government by 18 June 2021. Seven applications had met the required criteria worth a total of £6.3m. Peterborough and Fenland had been named by Government as priority areas which was reflected in the submission. The success of any or all of the applications would lead to a grant award from Government to the Combined Authority. The proposals were circulated to the Business Board on 8 June 2021 for the Business Board to note the final shortlist being proposed for submission and were discussed at a Leaders' strategy meeting on 9 June 2021.

Mayoral Decision Notice 037-2021, Community Renewal Fund Final Submission Approval, was noted.

39. Approval of Allocation of Recycled Growth Funding

The report contained an appendix which was exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The Mayor asked if any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was advised of Mayoral Decision Notice 036-2021 made on 18 June 2021 under general exception arrangements which approved a variation of Local Growth Fund (LGF) decision making processes set out in the Local Assurance Framework, to enable approval of the proposed project; approved the next £2m of unallocated recycled local growth funds to the University of Peterborough Phase 3 project, subject to that project securing full funding from partners Peterborough City Council via a successful Levelling Up Bid and investment from Anglia Ruskin University and subject to the conditional requirements identified in the external appraiser's report being discharged; and approved the allocation of £2m of Combined Authority single pot capital funds as the recycled LGF funding was not immediately available. The £2m of unallocated recycled local growth funds would then be used to repay the single pot capital funds when received. The project would enable the University of Peterborough to grow from 3000 students to 5000 STEM subject students by 2029/30. The proposals were considered at an extraordinary meeting of the Business Board on 9 June 2021 and at a Leaders' strategy meeting also on 9 June 2021. The award was conditional on Peterborough City Council securing £20m for the project.

Councillor Bailey expressed her thanks to the Business Board for its nimble response which had enabled the bid to go forward. The Mayor endorsed this comment.

Note Mayoral Decision Notice 036-2021 Approval of Allocation of £2 million Recycled Growth Funding, was noted.

40. Growth Works Management Review May 2021

The Board was advised that this was the first of the two reports on Growth Works which the Board would receive each year. The Mayor had launched the service on 27 May 2021 and capital grants of £2m had already been allocated. A robust and rigorous allocation process had been put in place which included monthly meetings with delivery partners and community board meetings supported by the Combined Authority governance team. Web-based performance reporting would be available by the autumn. Nigel Parkinson, Independent Chair of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Co, stated that work was just entering the mobilisation stage and that he looked forward to attending future Board meetings to report on its progress. He stated that he had taken on board Members' comments earlier in the meeting about the importance of collaboration and communication with constituent councils.

Councillor Bailey noted the appointment of Councillor Lis Every as a member of the Programme Management Committee, commenting that Councillor Every had a huge knowledge of and commitment to the skills agenda.

Mr Adams noted that Mr Parkinson had previously held a senior position at Caterpillar Global and welcomed the appointment of such an accomplished and experienced individual to the Growth Co. The Mayor endorsed this comment.

The Combined Authority Board:

- a) Noted the appointment of Nitin Patel of the Business Board as a voting member of the Growth Works Investment Evaluation Panel;
- b) Noted the appointment of Mike Herd of the Business Board and Councillor Lis Every of the Skills Committee to be members of the Programme Management Committee;
- c) Noted the financial and non-financial performance of Growth Works and request any required changes to reporting going forward; and
- d) Noted the appointment of Nigel Parkinson Non-Executive Director and Independent Chairperson of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company Limited (Growth Co) as a voting member of the Growth Works Investment Evaluation Panel.

Mayor Dr Nik Johnson
27 July 2021

Combined Authority Board 30 June 2021: Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Item 1.5: Forward Plan

Q: We note item 29 on the Combined Authority's Forward Plan – a decision on CAM - scheduled for the 14th July meeting of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee. What is the Combined Authority's envisaged programme of work on CAM or its replacement and what future interactions with and involvement of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee do you foresee within this programme?

A: As the transport strategy is a Board reserved matter, the forthcoming paper on future transport strategy will be taken directly by the Board on 28 July 2021.

Alongside the general power of Overview and Scrutiny to call-in decisions for scrutiny review, it is open to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to conduct scrutiny activity in relation to areas of the CPCA's work, including the Local Transport Plan.

Item 4.1: East West Rail Consultation

Q: The Committee notes the consultation response from East West Rail and asks whether the Combined Authority will consider co-ordinating its consultation responses on such schemes with its constituent Councils in future?

A: During the development of the Combined Authority's response in relation to East-West Rail, officers engaged with partners and Member Councils from across the region to ensure a level of consistency between submissions. This engagement included meetings with the Executive Director, Place and Economy and the Group Manager: Transport Strategy and Funding from the County Council, the Assistant Director, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth at the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the Transport Advisor at the University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Health Partners, Cambridge Ahead, and Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Transport Sub-Group.

It is of course important that Combined Authority continues to endeavour to reflect the views of the constituent Councils and recognise areas of difference. Over the last two years, the Combined Authority has managed to achieve a number of coherent and

agreed responses to a range of transport consultations, including London Luton Airport's Arrivals consultation, England's Economic Heartland's Transport Strategy and a number of Greater Cambridge Partnership scheme consultations. The Combined Authority will continue to liaise and co-operate with Member Councils to ensure that responses truly reflect the needs of the community.

Item 4.3: Climate change

Q: In light of the findings in the first interim report of the Combined Authority's Commission on Climate Change, will the Mayor be declaring a climate emergency?

A: The Independent Commission have set out the evidence on how a changing climate is affecting Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and given the Combined Authority a clear set of recommendations to respond to. That is the focus of debate for today.

As a society we face significant challenges such as climate change, access to good quality affordable housing, tackling fuel poverty and deprivation, funding of public health and social care, loss of biodiversity and more, all whilst coping with a global pandemic. Making a declaration on just one of these issues, however fundamental, is not the right approach for the Combined Authority. I want to see compassionate improvements to everyone's quality of life, that deliver across all these issues.

What I do believe the right approach for the Combined Authority to set a clear target for reducing emissions and get on with delivering that in a fair and compassionate way. Equally, we must all be prepared for the impacts of a changing climate that are already with us, such as more risk of flooding. This is why we need to act on the Commission's recommendations now and agree the actions that the Combined Authority will take.

We acknowledge that some constituent councils have already declared a climate emergency and respect that decision. The Combined Authority must also now take up the role of tackling climate change and providing leadership on this issue.