



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES

Date: Monday, 25 January 2021

Time: 11.00 a.m.

Location: Virtual Meeting via the Zoom Platform

Present:

Cllr P Jordan	Huntingdonshire District Council
Cllr S Corney	Huntingdonshire District Council
Cllr L Dupre (Chair)	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr A Sharp	East Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr M Gehring	Cambridge City Council
Cllr M Davey	Cambridge City Council
Cllr J Scutt	Cambridgeshire County Council
Cllr A Coles	Peterborough City Council
Cllr E Murphy	Peterborough City Council
Cllr A Miscandlon	Fenland District Council
Cllr A Hay	Fenland District Council
Cllr P Fane	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Cllr G Chamberlain	South Cambridgeshire District Council

Officers:

Robert Parkin	Chief Legal and Monitoring Officer, Combined Authority
Jon Alsop	Chief Finance Officer (S73 Officer)
Roger Thompson	Director for Housing
Cllr Chris Boden	Chair of Housing and Communities Committee
Claire Flowers	Head of Housing Development – Cambridge City Council
Anne Gardiner	Scrutiny Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 No apologies were received.
- 1.2 The Scrutiny Officer conducted the roll-call of Committee attendees.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 No declarations of interest were made.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 14th December 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.
- 3.2 The Chair requested an update on the action for the Task and Finish Group Chair to meet with the Chief Finance Officer and was advised that a meeting was scheduled for the 26th January.

4. Public Questions

- 4.1 There were no public questions.

5. CPCA Budget 2021/22 and Medium-Term Financial Plan

- 5.1 The Committee received the report from the Chief Finance Officer which set out the proposed Combined Authority draft Budget for 2021/22 and the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and Capital Programme for the period 2021/22 to 2024/25, as approved by the Board for consultation purposes on 25th November 2020.
- 5.2 The report provided the committee with the responses received on the consultation process following approval from the Combined Authority Board on the 25th November 2020.
- 5.3 In response to questions from members of the committee the following points were raised:-
 - The £45m for the Housing Programme, that was awaiting confirmation from the MHCLG for release had been included within the budget and was based on the assumption that this money was agreed as part of the original Devolution Deal and that it would be received in the next three months.
 - It was confirmed in regard to staffing costs that £2m would be recharged externally and the remaining £3.4m would be funded by revenue gainshare
 - Some Alconbury Weald Enterprise Zone receipts were to be directed to the A14 upgrade commitment with DfT. The Chief Finance Officer agreed to provide a breakdown on what else would be covered along with comments on the outcome if the receipts were less than expected.
- 5.4 The Committee AGREED to note the report.

6. Director for Housing

- 6.1 The Committee welcomed the Director for Housing, Roger Thompson to the meeting.
- 6.2 Committee members had submitted questions prior to the meeting (Appendix 1) with responses provided.
- 6.3 The following points were raised during the follow up discussion:-

In response to a question on whether the delay to the release of the £45m funding was due to Covid pressures or whether the programme was meeting the required delivery milestones required from MHCLG the Director advised that there had been reviews done on the progress of the programme and had achieved the requirements needed but the process was now delayed by the pressures that Whitehall were managing due to the Covid pandemic.

The Director confirmed that if the £45m was not received then the position for the programme after March would be complicated. As more time passed the risk to the programme was increasing and the Director could not be certain that the money would be received.

In response to a further question around the delay in the release of funding the Director clarified that the delay was due to the decision-making process being held up in Whitehall and that there was no serious delay to the work being carried out on sites.

There had been some practical issues that contractors had needed to manage around adapting to social distancing but that the industry had done quite well and had been very resilient in the last 10 months.

If there was a significant Covid outbreak on one of the sites the Combined Authority would be informed.

In response to a question around the programme end date the Director advised that the decision on this was also being delayed by the pressures that Whitehall were managing due to the Covid pandemic.

In response to a question on the 100k homes the Director advised that they hoped to have as many ready as possible but could not provide an exact number as there were too many variables to consider.

In response to a question about new affordable homes being built the Director advised that all new affordable homes have additionality applied to them and each scheme would go through the additionality test.

In response to a question on Garden Villages and the involvement of East/West Rail the Director advised that this was on the Authority's radar but the proposals were currently being led by MHCLG but that some joined up work needed to be done around this to link their proposals into the CAM Garden Villages.

6.4 Some questions were asked about specific sites within the £70m Housing Programme for Cambridge City Council and the following updates were provided by the Head of Housing from Cambridge City Council:

- The land transfer for Clark Maxwell Road was still in process of getting the land from the University College.
- The planning application for L2 - Orchard Park had been submitted for planning approval and waiting for committee date most likely in March.
- The Dundee Close Garage Development was related to modular homes and the officer confirmed that residents had moved into these homes before Christmas.

In response to a question around modular homes the head of Housing Development advised that within the Cambridge City Programme there were 16 which were for the homeless and they were trying to encourage the use of more modular homes.

6.5 The Committee thanked the Director for attending the meeting.

7. Chair of Housing and Communities Committee

7.1 The Committee welcomed the Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee for the Combined Authority, Cllr Boden

The below points were raised during the discussion:-

The Chair of the Housing Committee provided some clarity around the delay in the decision-making process at Whitehall regarding the end date of the Housing Programme. Cllr Boden advised that when the Combined Authority was set up in 2017 there were some monies that were transferred from the previous financial year so when MHCLG had reviewed the dates it appeared that the scheme started a year earlier.

Cllr Boden was confident that MHCLG would sort out the confusion around this and that if they wanted the programme to be delivered then the funding would be released.

The money has been allocated it just had not been paid over to the Combined Authority and the delay is due to the increasing pressure from the Covid pandemic. MHCLG is concentrating on Covid related matters so other issues are being put to one side.

Cllr Boden confirmed that there had been communication with MHCLG to prove that the delivery of housing within the programme was meeting the required targets.

In response to a question about additionality Cllr Boden advised that the teams definitions were not as rigorous as they could have been and as result some units that were included are no longer and it was a matter that was part of ongoing negotiations between the CPCA and the MHCLG and a resolution would hopefully be forthcoming soon.

Cllr Boden advised that if the £45m was not released it would be essential to have a plan B and plan C in place to combat this issue and a report would be taken through the Housing and Communities Committee and the Combined Authority Board with some fundamental decisions needing to be made. Cllr Boden would welcome suggestions from the O&S Committee to help rescue any at risk housing schemes.

In response to a question on the risk that Providers' ability to seek funding from other sources – primarily Homes England; the Cllr Boden advised that this had occurred and that the risk was mainly to the funding stream rather than impacting on the homes being built. Cllr Boden did not consider it a major consideration and advised it would not impact the number of units the Combined Authority could deliver, however if the MHCLG did not release the £45m this could create reputational damage where providers would no longer come to the Combined Authority for funding.

Cllr Boden confirmed that if an extra meeting of the Housing and Communities Committee were required then it would be arranged to discuss the £45m funding issue.

7.2 The Chair thanked Cllr Boden for attending to answer the committee's questions.

8. Combined Authority Board Agenda

8.1 The following questions to the CA Board were agreed:

Item 1.6 Change in Membership - Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Could the Board provide some clarity around the decision making structure that will result from the proposals set out to change the remit of Transport and Infrastructure committee?

Item 1.7 – Appointment of Combined Authority Returning Officer

The reports suggests an election in May can be run within the budget envelope already envisioned. With the vast majority of local authorities reporting that they will struggle to run an election this year - is the Combined Authority confident that it can run a fair and free election under Covid restrictions and within the budget envelope suggested?

Item 1.8 – Performance Report

The Combined Authority's flagship £100m Affordable Housing Programme which is now has a residual RAG status of RED. What plans does the Combined Authority have to address this?

Item 1.10 – Combined Authority Business Plan and Annual Report 2021-22

The Business Plan 2021/22 states that 'You will see more active travel, more work towards 'doubling nature' and hammering carbon emissions down to zero.' Can you provide further information and in practical terms about what is meant in practical terms by 'hammering carbon emissions down to zero' especially in regard to the authority's construction and transport projects?

Item 2.1 Budget Monitor Update Report January 2021

a)The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section notes the CAM Outline Business Case a budget of £1.425M – could you advise what stage the Outline Business Case is currently at and how much of the current budget has been spent? Could the detail around this be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?

b)The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section notes the One CAM Innovation Company has £6.84m allocated with nearly £4M of that already spent. How will the remaining £3M be spent by the end of March?

Item 2.3 2021-22 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2021-2025

Forecast expenditure on the CAM Outline Business Case £5M for 2021/22, and £6.5M in years 2022/23 and 2023/24. Will the Outline Business Case be concluded by the end of 2024?

Forecast expenditure on the CAM SPV outlined in Appendix 2c is £2M for 2021/22. What is the spend estimate on the SPV beyond 2021/22 and why is this not included in the forecast?

Item 2.4 Transport Levy 2021/22

Does the Transport Levy amount sufficiently reflect the enormity of work that has been done and will continue to be done by the Combined Authority in the future?

Item 3.1 CAM Update

Why has the CAM Update item been withdrawn?

Item 4.3 Greater Cambridge Partnership Consultations - Waterbeach to Cambridge and Eastern Access

What is the Combined Authority's position on an alternative public transport mode for travel between Waterbeach and Cambridge? This has previously formed part of the Authority's proposals for the CAM; is this still the case?

Item 6.2 University of Peterborough Phase 2 - Incorporation of PropCo2

The plans mention car park provision. What weight has been given to the environmental impact of the proposals in terms of land use and carbon emissions?

- 8.2 Responses to the questions asked at the CA Board meeting can be found at Appendix 2.

9. Combined Authority Forward Plan

- 9.1 The Committee received and noted the Combined Authority Forward Plan.

10. Lead Members Report

- 10.1 The Committee received and noted the Lead Members report.

11. Work Programme Report

- 11.1 The Committee received the report which asked the Committee to discuss and agree items that they would like to be added to the work programme for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the 2020/21 municipal year.
- 11.2 The Committee were informed that the Independent Commission on Climate Change item would need to be pushed back to March's meeting as the report would not be published in time for the committee's February meeting.
- 11.3 The Committee discussed the Bus Review Task and Finish Group item due to come to February's meeting and Agreed that the Chair for the Task and Finish Group should liaise with officers to discuss if there was sufficient new information to warrant a report coming to February's meeting.
- 11.4 The Committee were informed that an extra item on the Lead member Role for the Business Board would be brought to the February meeting.
- 11.5 The members requested that the University of Peterborough item come to February's meeting to help balance the heavy agenda in March.
- 11.6 The members discussed whether it was possible to meet in April during the purdah period and the Monitoring Officer advised that the committee could meet but would provide members with a note of advice on what items it would be appropriate to consider.

11.7 The Committee discussed that the CA Board meeting in March had been moved and requested that the March Committee meeting be moved to the 22nd March to allow scrutiny of the CA Board papers.

11.8 The Committee Agreed:

i) That the Independent Commission on Climate Change item be taken at March's meeting

ii) That the Lead member Role for the Business Board item be taken at February's meeting

iii) Requested that the University of Peterborough item be taken at February's meeting

iv) That the March meeting be rescheduled to the 22nd March to align with the CA Board meeting.

v) The Monitoring Officer would provide members with a note of advice on what items it would be appropriate to consider at the April meeting during the purdah period.

12. Date of Next Meeting

12.1 The next meeting will be held on Monday, 22 February 2021 at 11.00 a.m. with a pre-meeting for Members at 10.00 a.m.

The meeting closed at 13:00pm

Appendix 1

Questions from O&S Members to Chair for Housing and Communities – 25th January 2021.

Received from	Question	Response
Cllr Dupre	<p>£45M withheld funding: at the meeting of the Housing & Communities Committee on 11 January, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee asked about the withholding by MHCLG of £45M of the £100M affordable housing fund, and was told that the Combined Authority had still not received a response.</p> <p>a) Has there been any update on this matter?</p> <p>b) What has been the reason for the withholding of this money and the delay in resolving the issue?</p> <p>c) What has been the impact of the uncertainty on delivery?</p> <p>d) What will be the impact on delivery if the £45M is not provided? It has been reported that the Combined Authority ‘still expects all projects for which grant agreements are being held back to go ahead on their original timetables and without delays’—how will it achieve this?</p>	<p>Although we have been chasing for a response from MHCLG as part of their review process, we have still not heard about the answer, so this remains a risk.</p> <p>MHCLG advised that the longer process is due to Covid pressures. We believe that MHCLG wanted to see more progress on the programme delivery before approving the release of further funding.</p> <p>We continue to look at and assess the potential implications depending on how long we have to wait for a decision.</p> <p>Although we are looking for the funding to be released and therefore the full programme will be funded which will enable full delivery, we have been advised by MHCLG that while they are working hard to get a ministerial decision on the next steps for our housing programme they have not been able give us the quick decision and reassurance that we were seeking. They could not advise when the decision will come or what it will be in relation to the outstanding funding.</p> <p>If the £45m is not provided we will only have funding to deliver 55% of the originally intended programme.</p>
	<p>Programme end date: at the meeting of the Housing & Communities Committee on 11 January, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee asked about the uncertainty over the programme end date for the £100M affordable housing fund, and was told that confirmation of whether the end date was</p>	<p>Our opinion is that the closing date is and should be confirmed as 31st March 2022 as the affordable housing programme was always intended to be a 5 yr programme from approval of the business case in March 2017.</p>

	<p>March 2021 or March 2022 'remains a risk'. However, when the Mayor attended the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 14 December, it is minuted that 'in reference to the question on whether clarity had been received for the closing date for the £100M housing programme; the Mayor advised that the closing date was definitely 2022 and there had been an error made by civil servants in London; the issue should be rectified soon'.</p> <p>a) Has there been any update on this matter, a matter of weeks before what could be the end of the programme?</p> <p>b) If not, and if the end date was 'definitely 2022' on 14 December and any suggestion otherwise was 'an error made by civil servants in London', why is it still a risk a month later?</p>	<p>We have made representations to this effect to MHCLG officers this is held up as part of the same decision making process as the release of the outstanding funding.</p>
	<p>£100K homes: how many people are on the waiting list for a £100K home, and how many of them will get a £100K home in the next three years?</p>	<p>Just over 2,500 people have signed up to the £100K Homes register. £100K Homes are being completed in Fordham. 3 other development schemes under construction have some £100k homes secured. Subsequent £100K Home completions are likely to be in the second half of 2021 and more are being negotiated.</p>
	<p>Garden villages: where is the Mayor planning on building garden villages, and what process is he planning on using to do so?</p>	<p>Garden village locations will be dependant upon a variety of factors including the final CAM routes, availability of land and the likely prospect of securing all necessary consents.</p>

Combined Authority Board 27 January 2021: Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Item 1.7 – Appointment of Combined Authority Returning Officer

Q: The reports suggests an election in May can be run within the budget envelope already envisioned. With the vast majority of local authorities reporting that they will struggle to run an election this year - is the Combined Authority confident that it can run a fair and free election under Covid restrictions and within the budget envelope suggested?

A: Estimates of election costs have been received from constituent councils and are being checked by officers. Whilst increased costs are expected due to COVID-19, there are savings to be made from some common costs being shared across a number of other elections taking place at the same time as the Mayoral election. We are currently expecting the overall costs of the mayoral election to be affordable from the election reserve we have built up over the past four years.

Item 1.8 – Performance Report

Q: The Combined Authority's flagship £100m Affordable Housing Programme now has a residual RAG status of RED. What plans does the Combined Authority have to address this?

A: We remain confident that we will receive the finance necessary, but in the meantime we are preparing an action plan in the possible event of an unsatisfactory outcome that will be discussed with Leaders, the Housing and Communities Committee and the Board.

Item 1.10 – Combined Authority Business Plan and Annual Report 2021-22

Q: The Business Plan 2021/22 states that 'You will see more active travel, more work towards 'doubling nature' and hammering carbon emissions down to zero.' Can you provide further information and in practical terms about what is meant in practical terms by 'hammering carbon emissions down to zero' especially in regard to the authority's construction and transport projects?

A: The Combined Authority is committed to the objective of reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2050 and this has been reflected in existing policies such as the Local Transport Plan. The Authority has established the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Climate Change Commission, chaired by Baroness Brown, and the Commission will publish its report soon. The Combined Authority Board will discuss the Commission's recommendations and their implications for the Authority's actions and policies, and will set out its response following publication.

The reason we asked Baroness Brown to lead the Commission in this work was because the Combined Authority does have significant construction and transport projects in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. We have an economy that is demanding housing delivery, demonstrated by the cost of housing, particularly in the south of the county. We have a burgeoning economy in Peterborough which is showing consistent growth and we want to make sure that any policy we put forward for growth is sustainable given the rural nature of our county. Projects such as CAM Metro are entirely designed to bring forward sustainable and ecologically sound growth in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and we are doing everything we can now to make appropriate decisions now to hit those targets.

Item 2.1 Budget Monitor Update Report January 2021

Q: The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section # notes the CAM Outline Business Case budget of £1.425M – could you advise what stage the Outline Business Case is currently at and how much of the current budget has been spent? Could the detail around this be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?

A: This budget line reflects costs associated with the City Tunnel Section of the network. There is no further expenditure expected against this budget line in 2020/21. Over the summer of 2020, during the technical work to support the City Tunnel Section OBC, the segmented approach to delivering the CAM was challenged. Work was initiated to reassess the programme approach. Work is continuing to develop a single programme approach for a single network, referred to as 'One CAM'. Details of the emerging expenditure associated with the new approach was provided to this Board in the CAM update reports in August and September 2020.

Q: The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section # notes the One CAM Innovation Company has £6.84m allocated with nearly £4M of that already spent. How will the remaining £3M be spent by the end of March?

A: The One CAM company has £1.9M allocated against it for this financial year as an equity investment. That is currently funding the recruitment costs and the non-executive director allowances. The remaining funding is held by the CPCA to support a number of workstreams as set out in the CPCA Board decisions of August and September last year. As in previous years, officers will bring a paper at year end providing an analysis of all underspends and (where appropriate) will recommend the Board to approve the carry forward of any unspent balances to fund activities that may extend into the new financial year.

Item 2.3 2021-22 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2021-2025

Q: Forecast expenditure on the CAM Outline Business Case £5M for 2021/22, and £6.5M in years 2022/23 and 2023/24. Will the Outline Business Case be concluded by the end of 2024?

A: The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) provides for funding until 2023/24. Work is ongoing to establish a timetable under the One CAM approach, which will be reported to the Board once it is finalised with the DfT and other Government departments.

Q: Forecast expenditure on the CAM SPV outlined in Appendix 2c is £2M for 2021/22. What is the spend estimate on the SPV beyond 2021/22 and why is this not included in the forecast?

A: Similarly to the previous answer, work will continue over the next year to confirm the expected on-going costs of One CAM and appropriate funding arrangements to support those costs. This will be for agreement between the CPCA Board and One CAM Limited as to who holds responsibility for the budget and future funding of the project.

Item 2.4 Transport Levy 2021/22

Q: Does the Transport Levy amount sufficiently reflect the enormity of work that has been done and will continue to be done by the Combined Authority in the future?

A: The paper before the Board explains in the tables at paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 the cost of the functions that the Levy may by law fund, and the functions the proposed levy will fund. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can analyse those it would be very helpful.

Item 3.1 CAM Update

Q: Why has the CAM Update item been withdrawn?

A: There are no decisions or substantive updates for the Board for this meeting. A full report will be brought to the next meeting of the Combined Authority Board, in March.

Item 4.3 Greater Cambridge Partnership Consultations - Waterbeach to Cambridge and Eastern Access

Q: What is the Combined Authority's position on an alternative public transport mode for travel between Waterbeach and Cambridge? This has previously formed part of the Authority's proposals for the CAM; is this still the case?

A: The proposed Combined Authority position on the issues raised in the GCP's consultation on the Waterbeach to Cambridge scheme is set out in the papers before the Board. That project forms part over the overall CAM Network.

In addition to the development of the CAM scheme, and following the representations made both by the Mayor and by the Combined Authority, Network Rail has completed upgrade works to extend platforms at Waterbeach and Littleport. As a result, the infrastructure between Cambridge and King's Lynn can now support eight-carriage train formations calling at all intermediate stations. This is a significant boost to space and seats on train services. With the introduction of the December timetable, this has meant that following the completion of the work, there are now half-hourly services at Waterbeach and that will be a significant improvement for passengers using the station.

The GCP's current plans, which the Mayor has asked them to look at, are to take a busway from Cambridge North Station – which is just over a mile from Waterbeach - around Waterbeach and into Waterbeach Station. The question is whether that is the best way to spend the money at this moment in time or would the money be better spent on upgrading the railway stations that are there. Also, with consideration of the new town which is being built at Waterbeach Barracks, would the route for the potential CAM Metro, where the busway will eventually become the CAM Metro, be better if it went in a corridor alongside the A10. These are just suggestions for the GCP to consider.

Item 6.2 University of Peterborough Phase 2 - Incorporation of PropCo2

Q: The plans mention car park provision. What weight has been given to the environmental impact of the proposals in terms of land use and carbon emissions?

A: The requirement for a car park was a stipulation made by the planners at Peterborough City Council and includes 178 spaces to accommodate:

- Up to 250 tenants in the new research building*
- The replacement 36 spaces allocated for the teaching building, lost as a result of the research building being placed over the land allocated to them; and*

- *An allowance for additional spaces to allow the currently approved on-street parking for the teaching building, to move into an off street car park.*

Consideration will be given to reducing the number of spaces so as to limit the use of car transport and the feasibility of electric vehicle charging points is being considered.

In regard to the environmental impact on the land in use, we have developed a landscape solution that minimises the take up of the public space and attempts to provide a net increase in green space, in comparison with the current land use.

Report added to the agenda after publication

Terms of Reference – Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Q: Could the Board provide some clarity around the decision making structure that will result from the proposals set out to change the remit of Transport and Infrastructure committee?

A: This question appears to relate to the item “Amendment to Terms of Reference: Transport and Infrastructure Committee” rather than Item 1.6, which is a simple change to the County Council representation on the Transport & Infrastructure Committee.

The effect of the proposed amendment to the terms of reference of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee would be to provide a formal mechanism for the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, on behalf of the CPCA as Local Transport Authority, to support the Mayor in his role as a non-voting member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board. This would in turn contribute to the decision making of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board on matters relating to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro scheme. The mechanism would be for the Committee to provide the Mayor with representations on CAM matters being considered by the GCP. Final decision making on GCP CAM projects would remain with the GCP Executive Board, subject to any public inquiry process necessary to secure the necessary consents for an individual scheme.

The intention is to ensure that the Transport and Infrastructure Committee is fully briefed on pending GCP CAM decision making and can support the Mayor by formulating representations to the GCP, on behalf of the CPCA as Local Transport Authority.

The decision making structure would be:

- *The GCP would publish its agendas for Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings in the normal way.*

- *Any reports relating the CAM scheme would be brought to a meeting of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee. The relevant GCP officers would be invited to present the reports and respond to any queries from the Committee.*
- *The Committee would formulate any representations on those reports and they would be shared with the GCP by the Mayor.*
- *The GCP Executive Board would then have those representations available to it when it made its decisions on CAM matters*

This is all about trying to get a proper process in place around joint working between the Combined Authority and the GCP.