



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

JAMES PALMER
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 25th November 2020 (meeting adjourned at 2.04pm).
Meeting reconvened Friday 27 November 2020 8.01am – 8.35am.

Present: Mayor J Palmer

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council (until 1.55pm), Councillor S Count – Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, Councillor J Holdich – Peterborough City Council (Wednesday 25 November only) and Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council (Wednesday 25 November only)

Co-opted Members: Councillor R Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and Councillor D Over, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority (Wednesday 25 November only)

Apologies: Wednesday 25 November 2020
Councillor R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council and J Bawden - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

Friday 27 November 2020
Councillor R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council, and J Bawden - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group and Councillor D Over, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority.

Also present: Councillor L Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

597. Announcements, apologies and declarations of interest

The Mayor welcomed the success of AstraZeneca's work to produce a viable and economic vaccine against Covid 19. AstraZeneca was a major Cambridgeshire employer and this represented great news for the health, wellbeing and economy of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and beyond.

Apologies for absence were noted as recorded above. In addition, Councillor Over sent his apologies that he would be joining the Wednesday meeting late.

Kim Sawyer, Chief Executive, declared an interest in Item 4.1: CAM Special Purpose Vehicle Budget Update and Award of the CAM Conceptual Design Contract as an

Interim Director of the Board of the CAM Special Purpose Vehicle. As Ms Sawyer had been appointed to this position by the Combined Authority Board there was no conflict of interest (minute 608 below refers).

598. Minutes of the meeting on 30th September 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 30th September were approved as an accurate record. A copy will be signed by the Mayor when it is practical to do so.

599. Petitions

No petitions were received.

600. Public questions

No public questions were received. A number of questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and these were heard under the relevant agenda items. A copy of the questions and responses is attached at Appendix 1.

601. Forward Plan

Councillor Herbert asked for more information about the extraordinary meeting of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee which was proposed for December. The Mayor advised that he wanted to discuss again the CAM Programme Update report which had been on the agenda for the committee meeting on 4 November 2020 but not voted on due to technical issues ahead of the Greater Cambridge Partnership meeting on 10 December 2020 to gain a steer from the Committee.

The Board was advised that Councillor Count had resigned from his role as Lead Member for Investment and Finance. The next iteration of the Forward Plan would reflect this change. The Mayor asked that his thanks to Councillor Count be recorded.

With the consent of the meeting, the Forward Plan dated 13th November 2020 was approved.

602. Combined Authority Board and Committee Appointments: November 2020

The Board was advised that Cambridge City Council had made changes to its substitute member of the Combined Authority Board and membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. These changes had been accepted by the Monitoring Officer under his delegated authority to accept membership changes notified by Board members during the municipal year to ensure a full complement of members and substitute members at public meetings. The Board was also invited to appoint members to the Employment Committee to reflect the revised committee membership agreed at the meeting on 30 September 2020. Board members' nominations had been published that morning on the Combined Authority website and circulated to all Board members.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised of a correction to the voting arrangements for recommendation (d), to nominate and appoint members and substitute members of the Employment Committee. This required a simple majority rather than the two thirds majority stated in the report.

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

- a) Note the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Martin Smart as its substitute member on the Combined Authority Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.
- b) Note the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Mike Davey as one of its members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.
- c) Note the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Mike Sargeant as one of its substitute members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2020/2021.
- d) Nominate and appoint members and substitute members to the Employment Committee.

603. Appointment of Chief Executive Officer (ONE CAM LTD)

The report was withdrawn due to the preferred candidate having accepted a counteroffer from another major transport infrastructure scheme.

The Mayor exercised his discretion as chair to invite Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's question on this item. A copy of the question and response is attached at Appendix 1.

604. Budget Monitor Report: November 2020

The Board received a report containing an update of the 2020/21 budget position and capital programme as at 30 September 2020. This contained a forecast outturn revenue variance of an underspend of around £2.9M for the year. This was due in the main to a reduction in spend on the Health and Care Sector Work Academy of £2.2m against budget. This underspend would be ring-fenced and carried forward. There had also been underspends on travel costs due to Covid-19. There was an overspend on the corporate budget due to a decrease in interest received on capital balances. The capital budget forecast a favourable variance of £13.2M for the year. This related mainly to the withdrawal of one recipient of local growth funding and this funding would be re-purposed.

Councillor Herbert asked for more information about the proposed loan of up to £10M that was due to be considered by the Board in January 2021 and whether this related to

East Cambridgeshire Trading Company or Laragh Homes. He noted that all large loans to date had been made to these two companies and expressed the hope that the proposed £10M loan was genuinely open to all. He further asked about the current position on the £100M Affordable Housing Programme in relation to the dialogue with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). The Mayor stated that he had a positive meeting the previous week with Luke Hall MP, Minister of State for Regional Growth and Local Government and was awaiting final sign-off by MHCLG in the next few days. He further commented that many proposed loans were discussed by the Housing and Communities Committee and all required the approval of the Combined Authority Board, so the process was fully transparent. In relation to the proposed loan, the Chief Finance Officer stated that this would be subject to the treasury management strategies which protected the Combined Authority in relation to any loan it made and that the usual due diligence would apply. The Director of Housing and Development stated that officers were in talks with several interested parties with a view to adding additional affordable housing projects to the existing portfolio. This included the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company and Laragh Homes. The report to the Board might be put back to March 2021 pending the outcome of the decision by MHCLG.

Councillor Bailey commented that the loan scheme was available to all developers and trading companies and that it was to the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company's (ECTC) credit that it had made multiple applications. The projects being brought forward by ECTC were focused on quality developments and infrastructure and any loans received were paid back with interest and so were of benefit to all. The Mayor commented that Laragh Homes was delivering affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire as well as East Cambridgeshire, including £100k Homes.

Councillor Herbert asked about the proposal to add two additional accountants to the Combined Authority finance team. The Chief Finance Officer stated that this additional resource was required due to the increase in the volume and complexity of the business being handled by the Combined Authority during the past year. The finance team was currently supporting a number of subsidiary companies established by the Board and the cost of the additional staff would be covered through re-charging for services.

Councillor Herbert expressed his thanks to Councillor Count for his contribution during his tenure as Lead Member for Investment and Finance and for the high quality insights that he had provided. The Mayor stated that the burden of the Lead Member for Investment and Finance role had grown significantly since Councillor Count had first taken it on. He would take over responsibility for this area until May 2021 and after that date it would be his intention to set up a Finance Committee to manage this portfolio.

Councillor Smith asked about what appeared to be a substantial over-commitment in relation to housing and business and skills contained in Appendix 3. The Chief Finance Officer stated that Appendix 3 set out the capital programme in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The left hand column showed approved budgets whilst the right hand column showed budgets which were subject to approval. This demonstrated potential total funding and not actual expenditure against budget. All projects within the MTFP remained completely affordable.

It was resolved to note the updated financial position of the Combined Authority for the year.

605. 2021/22 draft budget and medium-term financial plan 2021 to 2025

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1.

The report 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. It also set out the proposed timetable for the consultation and approval of the draft budget and MTFP and the suggested consultees. The draft budget built on the budget and MTFP refresh approved by the Board in June 2020 and provided a clear presentation of the budget lines which had been approved by the Board and those which remained subject to approval. All the projects contained within the budget proposals were affordable and would deliver a balanced budget. There was no intention to precept the constituent authorities.

Councillor Bailey asked that the reference to East Cambridge in the Local Growth Fund (LGF) Project Table be corrected to East Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Smith raised a number of detailed questions on the Harston Capacity Study, A10 dualling and junctions and the nature of the £530k costs relating to the Local Growth Fund (LGF). The Chief Finance Officer undertook to liaise with colleagues on these points and provide a response outside of the meeting. Councillor Smith further asked about the reference to garden villages within the report. She did not recall this having been discussed during her tenure as a Board member and she was concerned that this could conflict with current or emerging local plans. The Mayor stated that the CAM represented a significant part of the Combined Authority's ambition and that in addition to providing a world class clean and green transport solution it would create a platform for housing and business growth. There were no confirmed sites for garden villages at this time, but it was appropriate that it should be included in the budget to recognise the potential.

Councillor Smith further sought clarification in relation to LGF funding in relation to the on-going costs associated with the training and skills hubs. She noted that £5M was shown as having been spent on the Business Growth Service and further funds on training centres. Her understanding was that LGF funding was solely capital funding, but this appeared to be revenue expenditure and she wanted to confirm that was appropriate. Councillor Smith concluded by asking about expenditure on the 2021 Mayoral election. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the LGF was solely capital expenditure and that every call on this funding would be rigorously tested to ensure that it was purely capital. He further stated that provision of around £260k per year had been set aside each year to build a reserve to pay for the 2021 Mayoral election. Mr Hill, Chief Executive, stated his intention to bring a report on Mayoral election costs in 2021 to the next meeting.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Mr Adams, it was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Approve the Draft Budget for 2021/22 and the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2024/25 for consultation.
- b) Approve the timetable for consultation and those to be consulted.

606. Allocation of Additional Funds to Highways Agencies

The Board was advised that additional funds had been allocated from the Department of Transport (DfT) and the Department for Education (DfE) in respect of 'Additional Pothole and Challenge Grant Funds' and 'Additional Home to School and College Transport Funds' for the 2020/21 financial year. The Mayor was required to consult the Combined Authority Board before deciding the allocation of these grants.

Having consulted the Board, the Mayor resolved to allocate the grants as set out below:

Additional Pothole and Challenge Funds

CCC - £10,201,000

PCC - £2,353,000

Total - £12,554,000

Additional Home to School and College Transport Funds

CCC - £876,164

PCC - £179,328

Total - £1,055,492

607. Allocation of the Getting Building Fund

The Board was advised that the Mayor made Key Decision 2020/081: Allocation of the Getting Building Fund on the 5 November 2020 using his general power of competence and under the General Exception arrangements set out in the Constitution. The decision to progress this via a Mayoral decision notice was based on the time constraints on available funding and the urgency of the decision. The Mayoral decision was taken based on the advice of the Business Board following an Extraordinary meeting on 19 October 2020 and after consulting members of the Combined Authority Board at the Leaders' Strategy Meeting on 28th October 2020. Mr Adams reiterated the long and detailed discussion at the Business Board's Extraordinary meeting on 19 October and its unanimous support of the proposal to endorse the University of Peterborough Phase 2 project. In his view, this would come to be seen as an exemplar of this type of project.

It was resolved to:

Note Key Decision 2020/081: Allocation of the Getting Building Fund made by Mayor James Palmer on 5 November 2020 under General Exception arrangements.

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

608. CAM Special Purpose Vehicle – Budget Update and Award of the CAM Conceptual Design Contract

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1.

Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, declared an interest in this item at the start of the meeting as an Interim Director of the Board of the CAM Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). As she had been appointed to this position by the Combined Authority Board there was no conflict of interest (minute 597 above refers).

The Board was invited to agree the appointment of five of the six proposed non-executive directors of One CAM Ltd. Their appointment had been supported unanimously by the One CAM Board at its inaugural meeting on 12 November 2020 and it was hard to do justice to the calibre of the individuals involved. Following discussions with Lord Mair, Chair of One CAM Ltd, and informal discussions with the candidates it was proposed to offer remuneration of £40k per annum. This was consistent with the remuneration levels shown in the 2020 Non-Executive Director's survey by the Quoted Companies Alliance and was considered to be an appropriate sum. The Board was also being invited to appoint Jon Alsop, the Combined Authority's Chief Finance Officer, as interim Chief Finance Officer for One Cam Ltd. An amendment to the heads of terms of the shareholder agreement was proposed so that the appointment of the Chief Executive and Directors of One CAM Ltd would be reserved to the Combined Authority Board. They in turn would be responsible for the appointment of the remaining staff.

Councillor Herbert asked how the complexity of the process and governance would fit with the delivery of the CAM project. He noted that there was no reference to the CAM outline business case (OBC) in the report before the Board and asked when this would be finalised. He asked whether there was anything in writing from the Department for Transport (DfT) confirming its support for the approach being taken in relation to the CAM project and reiterated his belief that a response from the DfT or letter of comfort should be sought given the level of expenditure involved in developing the project. Councillor Herbert further expressed the view that the Combined Authority needed to be an intelligent client, suggesting a senior in-house transport director was needed. Ms Sawyer acknowledged the size and complexity of the project. Discussions were taking place with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) about the business case and she would be meeting the chief executive of the CGP the following week to discuss the programme timetable. Discussions were also continuing on how to align the work of the Combined Authority and the GCP. Whilst it was not yet possible to give a date for the

OBC to be brought forward she confirmed that work was in hand towards a more definite approach. It was also proposed to enter into a contract with MACE and to instruct Jacobs and for the outcomes of their work to feed into the business case. The Board was also being recommended to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to enter into three contracts to deliver concept designs for the CAM. If approved, each recipient would receive £200k to develop their proposals and these would be brought before the Board in March 2021. Discussions with the DFT had been promising so far, but the Department wanted to see more detail before giving a commitment in writing. The work recommended to the Board would hopefully put the Combined Authority in a position to provide that detail.

Councillor Smith commented that the SPV might well be the right vehicle for a project of this scale and that she was keen that there should be a segregation of the SPV and the Combined Authority. However, she was concerned at the scale of public money which it was proposed to invest in advance of the CAM project having any formal support from Government. She also wished to clarify whether it was intended to appoint a substantive Chief Finance Officer (CFO) to One CAM Ltd and questioned whether the approval of the three concept design contracts and proposed contracts with MACE and Jacobs should not be a matter for the chief executive of One CAM Ltd rather than the Combined Authority Board. Ms Sawyer stated that it was the nature of major infrastructure projects that significant investment was required to produce the standard of business case would command Government support. Officers had taken advice in relation to the conversion of Local Growth Fund funding from capital to revenue and would share this with the Board. She confirmed that it was intended to recruit a substantive CFO to One CAM Ltd and that Combined Authority staff would support the organisation until the post holder was in place.

The Mayor stated that the CAM would support Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for the next 100 years. The CPIER report had clearly identified what was needed to support and enhance the area's economy, but it required long-term thinking to reach the position to attract the funding needed to deliver such an exceptional project.

[The meeting adjourned from 12.04pm to 12.13pm. Councillor Herbert re-joined the meeting at 12.15pm]

Ms Sawyer stated that consideration was given to whether a dedicated officer was required within the Combined Authority in relation to the CAM project and the thinking on this would be shared at a future Leaders' strategy meeting. The MACE and Jacobs contracts would usually be approved by the chief executive of the SPV, but the substantive post-holder had not yet been appointed so a delegation was sought to the Combined Authority Chief Executive in order for this to be progressed.

Mr Adams commented that he supported moving forward on this. A robust business case would be needed to gain support for the CAM project and investment was needed to produce it. Given the potential benefits of the CAM, the investment needed was relatively small. He highlighted the calibre of the individuals who were willing to become involved with the projects as non-executive directors of One CAM Ltd, commenting that the monetary remuneration they would receive was less than the personal capital they were investing in linking their names and reputations to the project.

Councillor Smith sought clarification of how the three concept design contracts and the Jacobs contract related to the GCP's schemes. Ms Sawyer stated that this was part of the timetabling discussions which were taking place with the GCP and details of the programme business case would be taken to a Leaders' strategy meeting after discussions with the GCP.

Cllr Boden described the CAM project as exciting and welcomed the recommendations. He had been pleased by the decision to create an SPV in order to take the project forward effectively. He was also delighted by the calibre of those willing to take on the non-executive director roles, commenting that it gave a great degree of assurance that the project would be guided by individuals with such experience. He endorsed the Board's role as an intelligent client in relation to One CAM Ltd but emphasised the importance of not seeking to micro-manage the project. The Mayor concurred with this comment and welcomed the robust debate which had taken place.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Holdich, it was resolved by a majority to:

- a) approve the recommendations of the One CAM Limited Board to:
 - i. agree the appointment of the non-executive directors
 - ii. agree the remuneration for the non-executive directors in the sum of £40,000 per annum for each director
 - iii. agree the appointment of Jon Alsop as interim Chief Finance Officer for One Cam Ltd
 - iv. agree the amendment to the heads of terms of the shareholder agreement
 - v. ratify the opening of a bank account with Barclays for One Cam Ltd

- b) Delegate authority to the CPCA Chief Executive to enter into contracts following compliant procurement processes on behalf of the Combined Authority and later novate to One Cam Ltd as follows:
 - vi. Three contracts to deliver Concept Designs for the CAM in the sum of £200,000 per contract
 - vii. A contract for legal services based on schedule of rates and within the 2020/21 agreed budget.
 - viii. A contract to MACE based on schedule of rates and within the 2020/21 agreed budget to facilitate the progression of the CAM outline business case
 - ix. A contract to Jacobs to support key elements of the Delivery Strategy capped at £620,000

609. Fenland Stations Regeneration Outline Business Case

Work on the regeneration of stations in Fenland had been started by Fenland District Council (FDC) in April 2012 and in March 2018 it had been added to the Combined Authority business plan as a key project. Work on developing a business case had

been completed and independently reviewed and budget approval was sought to enable construction work to begin on both the March and Manea Station improvements.

Councillor Boden welcomed the recommendations and stated his wish to place on record how helpful FDC had found the Combined Authority's officers to be in taking this forward. In his judgment, he felt it unlikely that the project would have reached fruition without the support of the Mayor and the Combined Authority. FDC had now secured the required land and negotiations with Greater Anglia were close to agreement. Once complete, the improvements would make a significant difference to travel not only to the residents of March and Manea, but also to those living in the surrounding towns and villages.

Councillor Herbert described the project as excellent. The critical nature of this rail route had been under-estimated by Network Rail and he welcomed the role of the District Council and the Mayor in progressing this.

The Mayor described the poor rail service within Cambridgeshire and expressed his frustration that Cross Country Trains' contract had been extended without reference to either himself or to the District Councils. He would continue to engage with all parties to seek improvements to the county's rail service and would be raising both this and the issue of the Ely North junction with Chris Heaton-Harris MP, Minister of State at the DfT, when they next met.

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

- a) Approve the Outline Business Case outcomes
- b) Approve the start of construction for Manea and March Station works
- c) Approve the drawdown of £1.2 million from the budget within the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

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

610. Fengate Phase 1 Strategic Outline Business Case

The Board received a report on the work done by Peterborough City Council in relation to the Fengate Phase 1 strategic outline business case (SOBC). The Fengate access area was an area of significant growth within Peterborough and the proposed work would support this. The project had an independently verified benefit to cost ratio (BCR) of 2.7, which represented high value for money. The first package of measures included junction improvements and roundabouts and clear milestone activity was set out in the report.

Councillor Holdich commented that this was an important project for Peterborough and would help get America Farm off the ground.

Councillor Smith commented that she had no objections to the proposals. However, as the Board was asked to consider more of these smaller projects it would be helpful to see where they sat within the Authority's transport and access and economic growth strategies so that they could be considered in that context.

Councillor Over voiced his support for the proposals. America Farm represented a great opportunity in an area that was ripe for economic development and would help address the lack of high skills opportunities in Peterborough and the surrounding areas.

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

- a) Approve the Strategic Outline Business Case;
- b) Approve the commencement of the Full Business Case and detailed design stage;
- c) Approve the drawdown of £270,000 from the budget within the Medium-Term Financial Plan to develop the Full Business Case and detailed design.

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

611. Oxford to Cambridge Arc

The report provided an update to the Board on developments in the Combined Authority's work with the Oxford to Cambridge Arc and objectives for future engagement. The Board had agreed previously to identify itself as the Growth Board for the area. Previous discussions had focused on the Arc's importance to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, but this time there was a greater focus on the importance of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to the Arc. This included it being home to around 23% of the Arc's population, but responsible for around 43% of the gross value added (GVA). The Combined Authority was contributing to shaping the Arc's agenda, including work on its green agenda which Councillor Smith was leading. It also had a role in relation to the Combined Authority's levelling up agenda across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the spatial planning activity being driven by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

Councillor Boden expressed his regret at being obliged to sound a negative note, but commented that there was a degree of scepticism around this initiative in the north of the county. Fenland had not initially been included in the map of the OxCam Arc area and even now the five priorities identified in the report seemed more focused on Cambridge City and its environs than the rest of the county. Councillor Boden looked to the Mayor and Combined Authority officers to ensure that the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was included in the discussions. The Mayor acknowledged the strength of these points and commented that the CAM hub to the north of Cambourne

reaching into the Fens, potentially via Alconbury, would be key to linking the north of the county to the south and beyond.

Councillor Smith commented that the view of the Arc was generally more positive in Cambridgeshire than in Oxfordshire.

Councillor Herbert commented that he saw the Arc as a significant opportunity for the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and paid tribute to the work being done by Councillor Smith. By making progress on its own non-statutory spatial plan the Combined Authority would be well-placed to inform the work on this being led by MHCLG. There was a need to be good partners in this project with the opportunity to attract Government investment.

It was resolved to:

Note the Oxford to Cambridge Arc report.

612. Market Town Programme Investment Prospectus – Approval of Second Tranche of Recommended Projects

This report was published late to accommodate three additional project proposals for approval. The Market Towns Programme was being focused on Covid-19 recovery and on approving projects that could be implemented for the period between November 2020 and Spring 2021 in order to support town centres to survive and rebound from the Covid-19 shock to business revenues and customer footfall. Officers deemed it important to include these matters for the consideration of the Board, however this had resulted in the report missing the statutory publication deadline.

The report contained eleven 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 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 whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was invited to approve the second tranche of proposals relating to projects in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire. Twelve project proposals had been submitted and following appraisal, ten were being recommended to the Board for approval at this time. The remaining two bids were still under discussion. Three bids from Chatteris, Ely and Soham related specifically to Covid recovery.

Councillor Boden expressed his thanks to the Mayor and officers for the support now being offered to the often-overlooked market towns. The sums involved might be relatively small but would have a disproportionately positive effect. One of the proposals which had not been included for consideration this time related to the Wisbech Water Park. Fenland District Council would be supporting this proposal and it would be re-submitted for consideration under the next tranche of projects.

Councillor Smith stressed the importance of partnership working between the Combined Authority and town and district councils, commenting that anecdotally she heard there were still some issues with this.

Councillor Bailey spoke in support of the positive impact of the proposed projects in East Cambridgeshire and expressed her thanks for this most welcome investment.

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

Approve the second tranche of project proposals received under Market Towns Programme from Fenland and East Cambridgeshire in the sum of £1,426,169 plus an additional £99,900 for the 'unapproved' balance for tranche one.

613. Devolution Deal, Gainshare Gateway Review and Combined Authority Prospectus

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses is attached at Appendix 1.

The Combined Authority was now over three years into its delivery of the Devolution Deal and doubling of gross value added (GVA) remained achievable. In autumn 2018 the Board had prioritised the programme to create a key project list. Board members had now asked to look more broadly across the whole of the Devolution Deal. Some projects were already complete, some had been varied by agreement and some remained to be done. To date, 72% of commitments had been delivered. Those not yet delivered tended to be in the area of public sector reform rather than project delivery. Officers proposed to bring reports back to the Board on a six-monthly basis. Gainshare was spread across a wide range of projects whilst the locality complementary report complemented the Devolution Deal review. The Combined Authority prospectus was aimed at potential investors looking at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the assessment process and the detailed matrix contained in the reports, commenting that this demonstrated a lot of progress and energy. However, he felt that some qualification was required of the statement that 72% of projects had already been delivered. His preference would be to state instead that 72% of projects 'had been delivered or were in delivery', as stated in the report recommendations. For example, this included references to the Land Commission, the Huntingdon Third River Crossing and the Growth Hub. Work on the A47 was also shown as completed and this was not the case. The Mayor disagreed, commenting that the Devolution Deal did not state that the Combined Authority would deliver the A47 project and that it was beyond its remit to do so. With regards to the Third River Crossing, the Combined Authority had been tasked with identifying the best solution and it had done so.

Councillor Count commented that he found some of the wording in the report unhelpful. For example, the Wisbech Rail project was marked as complete. He suggested it

would be more helpful to lift the wording about the commitments directly from the Devolution Deal rather than interpreting what they might mean and asked that officers should look into this. In relation to Wisbech Rail, he welcomed the Mayor's confirmation that he was still working to deliver this and would be raising the issue again when he next met the Minister of State for Transport.

Councillor Smith suggested that the Board should either receive a regular update report on activity that sat alongside the Devolution Deal projects, such as the Covid-19 response, or have this information included as an appendix to future updates on Devolution Deal delivery. The Mayor welcomed this suggestion.

Councillor Bailey commented that there were a number of projects where the Combined Authority had completed the work it had set out to do, but that this did not necessarily mean that it could deliver the project itself. She welcomed the prospectus, describing it as an impressive document for such a young organisation. It also demonstrated the innovative approach being taking, especially around housing where the £100k Homes model was being picked up by Government and in relation to the £40M revolving fund and community land trusts. In Councillor Bailey's view, this demonstrated that devolution had been a good decision and one which had attracted money and investment into the area which it would not otherwise have received.

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

- a) Note that 72% of Devolution Deal Commitments have already been delivered or are in delivery, and agree to take six-monthly progress reports on Devolution Deal delivery in future,
- b) Approve the Locality Complementary Report at Appendix 2,
- c) Approve the Prospectus at Appendix 3.

614. Local Transport Plan CAM Sub Strategy

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

The draft Local Transport Plan CAM Sub-Strategy was presented to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee and the Combined Authority Board in May 2020, Subsequently, a consultation took place between May and July 2020. Of the responses received, 67% of respondents agreed with the overall objectives and details of all of the responses were set out in the appendix to the report. In response, the references to active transport has been increased, the map had been amended and some minor amendments had been made to the narrative. The amended Sub-Strategy had been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 4 November 2020 where it was recommended to the Board for approval.

Councillor Smith commented that she had already expressed her reservations at producing a sub-strategy only a month after the Board had approved the Local

Transport Plan (LTP). She welcomed the high level of response to the consultation and asked how many suggested changes had been accommodated within the revised draft. She further commented that she was unclear what changes had been made from the original draft and that she would have liked to see tracked changes to make this clear. Councillor Smith questioned whether there was any point to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee having considered the report first. The Deputy Monitoring Officer stated that the Transport and Infrastructure Committee's role was to oversee development of the LTP, but that as the recommendation related to spend on transport funding it was a matter for the Board. On this basis, Councillor Smith felt that the full committee paper should have been appended to the Board report rather than it having been provided via an electronic link.

Councillor Herbert highlighted partnership, commenting that the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) could build four routes, but that he was yet to see what the Sub-Strategy would add. He continued to believe that the GCP and Combined Authority could achieve remarkable things in relation to transport issues but felt that the Sub-Strategy was a side issue and did not add significantly to that work.

Councillor Bailey commented that the report talked about integration with emerging highways schemes. She felt it also needed to look at future-proofing in relation to the CAM and would like to see that included in the narrative.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Bailey, it was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Note the consultation responses to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM): Local Transport Plan (LTP) sub-strategy;
- b) Agree the amendments made to the CAM: LTP sub-strategy in light of the consultation responses;
- c) Note that the CAM LTP sub-strategy sets out the vision for CAM, against which, schemes contributing to the CAM will be considered; and
- d) Approve the CAM LTP sub-strategy.

The vote included votes in favour by two thirds of the Members appointed by the Constituent Councils, including the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

615. March Area Transport Study

The Board's approval was sought for the drawdown of £900,000 for construction of the remaining March Area Transport Study Quick Win Schemes which formed part of the March Area Transport Strategy (MATS).

Councillor Count endorsed the proposals as important to the town of March and the surrounding areas. There were some small issues still to be ironed out, but these should not prevent the project moving forward. He expressed his thanks to Fenland District Council, the Combined Authority and to Councillor Jan French for working together to bring this to fruition. Councillor Boden concurred, emphasising the constructive working relationship between the Combined Authority and the local district and town councils. There was still more to be done, but the Combined Authority had managed to make progress on with a longstanding issue and this was to be welcomed.

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

Approve the drawdown of £900,000 for construction of the remaining March Area Transport Study Quick Win Schemes.

The vote included votes in favour by two thirds of the Members appointed by the Constituent Councils, including the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

616. A47 Dualling

The Board was advised that the Mayor had initially met with the CEO of Highways England (HE) in July 2018 to discuss the inclusion of the dualling of the A47 in the HE Roads Investment Strategy (RIS 2) for development and design. The Combined Authority, working with HE, developed documentation to enable its inclusion into the RIS 2 programme. However, when HE published the RIS 2 in March 2020 and its Delivery Plan 2020-2025 these did not include the A47. Officers have continued to engage with HE to progress the scheme. As a result, Highways England had agreed to take forward renewed work on the A47 with a view to reconsidering its inclusion in the RIS programme with the Combined Authority as a co-sponsor on the project board. It was understood that reference to a major upgrade to the A47 would be included in the Chancellor's speech on the Comprehensive Spending Review and further details were awaited.

Councillor Count expressed his disappointment at the lack of progress so far in relation to this project. He asked that the Executive Director for Place and Economy for Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council be invited to all future officer meetings with HE so that the two local highways authorities were represented. Councillor Count also offered to join the Mayor at political meetings with HE. The Mayor welcomed these suggestions.

Councillor Boden echoed the disappointment expressed in relation to the lack of progress on the dualling of the A47. Until now, HE had authorised piecemeal work on the A47 without addressing the issue of dualling. In his view, complete dualling of the A47 was required otherwise economic growth in the north of the county would be prevented. The Mayor agreed, commenting that the scheme had been ranked the third most important in the country and that he hoped to see significant progress on this.

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

Note the report and the proposed next steps.

Councillor Boden left the meeting at 1.55pm.

Recommendations from the Business Board

617. Cambridge South East Transport Better Public Transport and Active Travel Consultation

The Board was invited to note the Combined Authority's approach in responding to the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultation and to delegate responsibility to the Director of Delivery and Strategy to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Combined Authority, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport & Infrastructure Committee.

The proposals had been considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 4 November 2020 and had been recommended unanimously to the Board for approval.

Councillor Smith asked that Board members should have sight of the proposed consultation response before it was sent. The Mayor agreed.

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

Delegate responsibility to the Director of Delivery and Strategy to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Combined Authority, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport & Infrastructure Committee.

618. Local Growth Fund Programme Management November 2020

The Board was invited to approve the recommendations on Local Growth Fund (LGF) Programme Management made by the Business Board on 10 November 2020. It was noted that the LGF annual payment had been received from MHCLG on 30 October 2020. Expenditure on the programme totalled £91M to date and there were currently 20 projects in delivery, six at pre-contract stage and 22 completed. Expenditure of £2.2M from the Covid-19 business capital grant had been reported to the Business Board on 10 November 2020 whilst expenditure to date now totalled £3.2M. £2,043,178 of remaining LGF funding had been discussed by the Business Board and it had been unanimously recommended that this should, subject to the Combined Authority Board's agreement, be allocated into the Growth Grants strand of the new business service. The Eastern Agri-tech Growth Initiative continued to make good progress and it was recommended that £100k of current funding should be carried forward to 2021/22 to complete the scheme and carry out a programme evaluation.

Councillor Smith asked for confirmation that transferring LGF monies into the growth grants fund remained a capital grant and asked the size of the growing places loan

fund. She further suggested that it would be helpful to have a map showing the geographic spread of LGF funding. Officers confirmed that the transferred LGF monies would remain capital and that the growing places loan fund was around £10M. Officers undertook to look into producing a map to show the location of LGF projects.

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

- a) Allocate the remaining £2,043,178 Local Growth Fund into the Growth Grants strand of the new Business Growth Service;
- b) Delegate authority to Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, Lead Member for Finance and Investment and Section 73 Officer, to approve launching the grant scheme approved by the Business Board to receive the remaining £2,043,178 Local Growth Fund;
- c) Approve the carry forward of £100,000 of the current funding allocation to the Eastern Agri-tech Growth Initiative scheme to enable the close out of the scheme, handling of final claims, a full programme evaluation and report during 2021-22; and
- d) Note the programme updates outlined in the report to the Business Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 2.04pm and resumed at 8.01am on Friday 27 November 2020.

619. Growth Deal Project Proposals November 2020

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

The report contained two 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 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 whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was reminded that the application for the Cambridge Visitor Welcome project had been declined by the Business Board and Combined Authority Board in September 2020, but that the applicant was invited to re-apply. A revised application had been submitted and was recommended by the Business Board for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the external appraisal report.

Councillor Herbert commented that the visitor economy in Cambridge and throughout Cambridgeshire had been severely damaged by Covid-19. Overseas visitor numbers had dropped to almost nil and UK visitor numbers were also low. Councillor Herbert expressed his thanks to the Mayor for the work he had done in bringing Cambridgeshire and Peterborough together on this and expressed the hope that there would be the opportunity to discuss this issue more fully with the Mayor and leaders of the other constituent councils as the situation evolved.

Mr Adams commented that the revised application had received unanimous and enthusiastic support from the Business Board. The Business Board would welcome further proposals from local authorities or other parties on how to stimulate the visitor and wider economy.

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

Approve funding for the Cambridge Visitor Welcome project based on the project scoring criteria and external evaluator recommendation.

620. Local Economic Recovery Strategy Update

The Board was advised that the Skills Committee voted unanimously on 9 November 2020 to recommend the updated version of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to the Combined Authority Board for approval. That recommendation was subsequently withdrawn by officer decision, approved by the Chair of the Committee, as one of the appendices presented to the Skills Committee was incorrect. The correct appendices were subsequently presented to the Business Board and the recommendation was made to the Combined Authority Board by Business Board.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses is attached at Appendix 1.

The Board was invited to approve the refreshed LERS which had been produced by Metro Dynamics in conjunction with local authorities. The LERS was a live document supported by the Covid-19 dashboard. It had originally been proposed to bring a further refresh to the Board in January 2021, but due to the impact of the second lockdown it was proposed that this should now be deferred to March 2021.

Councillor Herbert commented that there was much in the strategy that was useful and he welcomed looking at the geographical impact in this way. In his view, it also underlined the need to forge strong partnerships in the three key areas identified in the CPIER. Councillor Herbert suggested that it would be useful to look again at the tables from page 370 and the information from page 396 at a future Leaders' Strategy meeting.

On being proposed by Mr Adams, seconded by Councillor Boden, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the updated version of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough.
- b) Note that the next Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Refresh will be brought to the Board in March 2021, rather than January 2021 as previously proposed.

621. Business Board Annual Report 2019/20 and Annual Delivery Plan 2020/21

The Business Board was required to publish an annual report and annual delivery plan each year. Subject to their approval by the Combined Authority Board these would be submitted to the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS).

Mr Adams stated his wish to place on record his thanks to the Director of Business and Skills and his team for their outstanding achievements during the past 12 months, particularly in the light of the significant additional work created around the response to Covid-19. These sentiments were echoed by the Mayor and the Board.

Councillor Boden commented that in his view productivity could not rise without addressing relative deprivation. He questioned how it was intended to measure outcomes and expressed concern that there might be an unreasonable expectation around quick wins. He further asked about when the relative deprivation in education that was experienced in the north of the county might be eliminated. The Director of Business and Skills stated that most of the ambitious goals in the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) were based on the CPIER and were long-term goals. The programmes in place would begin to show initial outputs in the next 12 months, for example more people being engaged in training opportunities. The outcomes would probably be seen in 2021/22, for example as those who had been engaged in training either moved into employment or demonstrated career progression. Adult Education Budget (AEB) programmes had been focused on Fenland and Peterborough to address this differential together with interventions to create higher value jobs. The new University of Peterborough would also contribute to this. It was hoped that the signs of this should be visible in five years with real change being evident in 10 years. Mr Adams commented that this was not a problem with a quick fix and that the Business Board was seeking to tackle it on many fronts. He suggested it would be helpful to overlay a map of where investment was being made on the heat map of deprivation to look at how these compared.

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

Approve the Business Board Annual Report for 2019-20 and Annual Delivery Plan for 2020-21, and for these to be published and formally submitted to the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS).

622. iMET Project Local Growth Fund Recovery

The report contained seven 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 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 whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board's approval was sought of the partial recovery of the Local Growth Fund (LGF) investment into the iMET project which had now closed. Approval was also sought to re-focus use of the equipment for the benefit of current and future learners.

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

- a) Approve pursuing clawback of Local Growth Funding (LGF) in relation to the iMET Programme LGF investment, by selling the iMET building on the open market for a cash receipt back into the recycled Local Growth Funding budget, through agreements with Cambridge Regional College and the Landlord Urban and Civic;
- b) Approve the Combined Authority owning and disposing of the iMET building to effect claw-back, if required. It is not the intention of the transaction as currently envisaged that CPCA would take ownership of the iMET Building. If CPCA do take ownership, it would only be for a short period of time before the iMET is transferred to the end purchaser;
- c) Approve a refocussed Grant Funding Agreement between Cambridge Regional College and the Combined Authority and that final sign-off of that agreement, in relation to the iMET equipment being retained and utilised by Cambridge Regional College to continue delivering learner outputs, is delegated to the Director Business and Skills in consultation with the s73 Officer and the Lead Member for Investment and Finance;
- d) Delegate authority to the Director Business and Skills, in consultation with the Section 73 Officer, the Monitoring Officer and the Lead Member for Investment and Finance, to finalise the form and then sign-off the Surrender or Assignment Option Agreement between Cambridge Regional College and the Combined Authority, once full and final agreement with the landlord has been achieved; and
- e) Delegate authority to the Director Business and Skills in consultation with the Section 73 Officer, Monitoring Officer and the Lead Member for Investment and Finance to finalise Heads of Terms on an agreement with the landlord of the iMET building, which in turn facilitates the final sign-off of the option agreement with Cambridge Regional College.

623. Kickstart Scheme

The Board's approval was sought to the Business Growth Service acting as a gateway organisation to administer the Kickstart Scheme in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and as the primary referral partner for any Kickstart requests via the Combined Authority. The recommendations had been endorsed unanimously by the Skills Committee on 9 November 2020 and by the Business Board on 10 November 2020.

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

- a) Approve the Business Growth Service to act as a Gateway Organisation to administer the Kickstart Scheme for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area; and
- b) Approve the Business Growth Service as the primary referral partner for any Kickstart requests via the CPCA.

624. Keeping Christmas Kind

The Mayor exercised his discretion as chair to accept a request from the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner to advise the Board about a 'Keeping Christmas Kind' toolkit which had been produced in response to the rise in verbal and physical abuse being experienced both locally and at national level by shop workers. Further details were available on the [Police and Crime Commissioner's website](#).

(Mayor James Palmer)

Overview and Scrutiny Committee questions to the Combined Authority Board: 25 November 2020

Item 1.7 Appointment of Chief Executive of ONE CAM Limited

Q: Can the process for the level of remuneration to be received by the Chief Executive of One CAM Limited be evidenced and justified?

A: The remuneration for the post of the Chief Executive Officer of One CAM Limited was established in consultation with the appointed external executive search consultants. They have significant experience in the recruitment of Chief Executive Officers, specifically in relation to major infrastructure projects.

At the final interview stage, of the candidates selected, three of the four candidates had existing or last job salary and bonus packages significantly in excess of the maximum salary offered for this post. So the remuneration being offered is significant, but the reality is that this is a very competitive sector and there are other organisations offering more.

Item 2.2 Draft 2021-22 Budget and MTFP to 2024-25 for Public Consultation

Is there any indication of when we might expect to see the strategy underlying the financial figures extrapolated beyond 2021/22?

A: There is a section devoted to each Directorate in the main body of the draft budget and Medium Term Financial Plan report which outlines the strategic approach to deliver the vision and growth ambition of the Combined Authority through 2021/22 and beyond. These sections also refer to other Combined Authority Strategies such as the Local Transport Plan, the Skills Strategy, the Housing Strategy and the Local Economic Recovery Strategy.

The staffing budget shows a 2% pay award and increments for performance related pay. Given the expected announcement of a public sector pay freeze is the CPCA expecting to proceed with this pay award?

A: In previous years the Combined Authority has followed the pay agreement reached between the National Employers and the NJC Trade Union side on rates of pay. We will monitor any government announcement on a possible public sector pay freeze, but

at this stage it is prudent to make provision for a cost of living pay award in the staffing budget. If an announcement is made for a public sector pay freeze, the same rules will apply to the CPCA as all other public sector bodies.

There are revenue proposals referencing EU funds up to 2023-24. Are these funds received prior to Brexit and will they be received post-Brexit?

A: The EU funding identified relates to three project proposals which have been approved by the relevant EU bodies with funding packages over multiple years as identified in the MTFP. There is no risk that these funds would not be available regardless of whether the UK leaves the current transition period with an EU trade deal or not, as the UK Government has guaranteed to replace the funding should it not be possible to claim it from the EU after the transition period.

Item 4.1 CAM Special Purpose Vehicle

Given the expected announcement of a public sector pay freeze is it appropriate that an annual salary of £40,000 per annum is awarded to non-executive directors? Can the O&S Committee have some background to the process justifying this level of remuneration?

A: The CAM will be vital in supporting our economy and vital to the UK's industrial future. It is a project of national significance.

To build this game-changing public transport, we need the best people. The recommended non-executive directors have a wealth of experience in building major projects, managing big budgets and with a record of exceptional leadership across business and the public sector. Securing funding and financing for the CAM is precisely one of the key areas where they will be able to support in the scheme's delivery.

I'm pleased that this recruitment process has resulted in recommending appointees of this calibre and proves just what a draw the CAM is, and will continue to be, for the kinds of talented people we need to build it.

The remuneration of £40,000 was discussed with the candidates during the recruitment process and is in line with payments to other non-executive directors as shown by the recent 2020 Non-Executive Director's survey by the Quoted Companies Alliance. The benefits that will be realised by CAM will be many times the money invested, and will be felt for generations to come.

How does the Board justify the level of funding on a project that is currently speculative; and what level of recompense is likely if the project does not happen?

A: The CPIER report evidenced the fast rate of economic and employment growth in our region, and highlighted the importance of planning now to ensure that strong growth will be sustainable beyond 2030. The CAM is the transport network that will deliver that growth. As I have already said the CAM will be vital in supporting our economy and is vital to the UK's industrial future. It is a project of national significance.

The CPCA makes no apology for having an ambitious vision for our area and we are willing to invest in the best people and structures to deliver that. Our transport system will be a smart, zero carbon network, which also opens opportunities for quality housing developments built on green, sustainable principles.

It is perfectly normal for projects at a phase of delivery similar to CAM to not have secured every pound needed for delivery. What the CAM company and the Combined Authority is here to do, is make things happen. We are building the case for investment in schemes which will support people and our economy for decades to come. We are continuing to develop all aspects of the CAM programme, including funding and financing, and working with our new chairman, non-executive directors and our partners, including in Government, to attract the investment we need.

It is a huge challenge to deliver the solutions needed by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and to implement the recommendations of the CPIER report. This is not the way that councillors are used to seeing transport schemes delivered by local government, but this is how it is done nationally and internationally to deliver innovative transport solutions.

Item 4.6 Devolution Deal, Gainshare Gateway Review and Combined Authority Prospectus

(Appendix 1: 1) Are we realistically still considering doubling GVA?

A: We were ahead of the trajectory required to double GVA when the Covid shock took place. There are 22 years of the Devolution Deal to go and every prospect that the economy can recover recent momentum and get back on trajectory over that time. The fundamental competitive advantages that make Cambridgeshire and Peterborough one of the UK's global economic assets remain intact.

(Appendix 1: 4) When will material be placed in the public domain arising from the work of the Public Sector Reform Commission?

A: Discussions are continuing with the Commission to enable findings from its work to be published soon.

(Appendix 1: 6) How does the Board define world-class connectivity and how will we know something is world-class?

A: The Combined Authority's programme of infrastructure improvements such as the CAM is based on new technology and innovative design, including requirements for digital infrastructure and net zero compatibility, and is intended to sustain the international competitiveness of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough economy. The acid test and the benchmark of whether our investments are world class is whether our area continues to attract global investors in the future.

(Appendix 1:18) When will the impasse be resolved in terms of holding back £45m of the £100m housing fund? If this is not resolved how will this affect the delivery of the commitment? When will it be made clear whether March 2021 or March 2022 that is the end date for the £100m scheme?

A: We have received no indication from MHCLG that we will not receive the outstanding £45m of funding for the remainder of our housing programme. Mayor James Palmer met with Luke Hall MP, Minister of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government last week to update him on the Mayoral Combined Authority work to spearhead our innovative and exciting regional housing programme. The Minister was supportive of the Combined Authorities approach and confirmed that decisions from the review with MHCLG were imminent. We are expecting confirmation of the housing programme end date at the same time.

(Appendix 1: 14) When will the Joint Assets Board will be established?

(Appendix 1: 34) This is not, as yet, implemented; can the O&S Committee have an update please?

(Appendix 1: 35) What are the Combined Authority's expectations for a second Devolution Deal?

(Appendix 1: 39) What is happening on the government's proposals on business rate reform and what are the implications for the Combined Authority of not proceeding?

(Appendix 1: 41) What is happening on the devolution of strategic planning powers to the Mayor and what is the likely impact?

(Appendix 1: 43) What is happening on forming an Education Committee with the Regional Schools Commissioner and other key education stakeholders and what is the likely impact?

(Appendix 1: 46) What is happening on the work with government to explore a more integrated pathway of service delivery for the causes of offending behaviour early to reduce the use of courts and prisons and what is the likely impact?

(Appendix 1:53) Could the O&S Committee have an update on the work with local partners to consider how best to establish a sub-national transport body?

(Appendix 1:58) Does this commitment now refer to the Government White Paper on Planning for the Future or something entirely different?

(Appendix 1: 69) The DfE did not include the Combined Authority in Area Reviews, as the process was considerably advanced by the time the Combined Authority was established in March 2017. The last of the Area Reviews were concluded in August 2017, but this commitment is described as 'Not yet implemented by Government'. Could the O&S Committee have an update on what the Combined Authority expects to happen now?

A: Summary updates on these items, where available, are provided in Appendix 1 to the Board paper which the O&S Committee considered earlier this week. The Board is being invited to begin regular progress reporting on the Devolution Deal Commitments which have not yet been implemented. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be involved in that regular update process.

Item 5.1 Local Transport Plan CAM Sub Strategy

What does the Board envisage the role of the Greater Cambridge Partnership to be in this as that body is barely mentioned in the report?

A: The Greater Cambridge Partnership is a partner of the CPCA in the delivery of the CAM. The GCP is a partnership of the three Councils who were successful in securing a City Deal for our area. As such it is a joint committee and delivery team set up by those three Councils to deliver on the commitments they agreed with Government.

The GCP is different from the CPCA, which is a separate public authority with statutory responsibilities, primarily as the Local Transport Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. In that role the CPCA has direct responsibility to deliver the local transport plan.

The CPCA sets the strategic direction for transport schemes within the area. The GCP delivers its schemes in accordance with that statutory plan. As the GCP does not have a strategic transport role, it does not feature within the Local Transport Plan other than by reference to its role as a delivery partner for the CAM.

Items 6.3 Local Economic Recovery Strategy Update

How is the Combined Authority liaising with its constituent authorities and the Greater Cambridge Partnership on Covid recovery?

A: Through the Local Economic Recovery Sub-Group of the COVID 19 Local Recovery Forum, all our Local Authority Partners and the Greater Cambridge Partnership have been integrally involved in the authoring, review and recent update of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy.

Has the impact of Brexit on future investment funding been considered and, if so, how will funds be delivered to help those impacted by Brexit?

A: The impact of Brexit has not been fully analysed within the Local Economic Recovery Strategy as the impact is not yet known. The next update of the LERS will include this analysis, once the specifics of the Trade Deal are known and can be assessed for impact.