



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES**

**Date:** Wednesday 29 January 2020

**Time:** 10.30am – 2.30pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE.

**Present:** J Palmer (Mayor)

Councillors A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, C Boden – Fenland District Council, L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, R Hickford - Cambridgeshire County Council, J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, J Neish – Huntingdonshire District Council and B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

A Adams – Chair of the Business Board

**Co-opted Members:** J Bawden (Clinical Commissioning Group) and Councillor D Over (Vice Chairman, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority)

**462. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Count (substituted by R Hickford) and R Fuller (substituted by J Neish)

The following declarations of interest were made:

**Item 3.1.1: £100m Affordable Housing Programme (Non-Grant) Proposed Acquisition – Hunts**

Mayor James Palmer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. The Mayor did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote. Minute 477 below refers.

**Item 3.1.2: £100m Affordable Housing Programme (Non-Grant) Proposed Acquisition – Fenland**

Mayor James Palmer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. The Mayor did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote. Minute 478 below refers.

**Item 5.1: University of Peterborough Outline Business Case Phase 1**

Councillor John Holdich declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as the Leader of Peterborough City Council. Following advice from the Monitoring Officer Councillor Holdich did speak and vote on the item. Minute 482 below refers.

Item 6.1: For approval as Accountable Body: Local Growth Fund Project Proposals  
January 2020

Austen Adams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the managing director of Stainless Metalcraft (Chatteris) Ltd. Mr Adams did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote. Minute 483 below refers.

**463. MINUTES – 27 NOVEMBER 2019**

The minutes of the meeting on 27 November 2019 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask a question on behalf of the Committee. Councillor Dupré asked, further to Minute 455: Climate Change, what progress had been made with the appointment of a Chair of the Independent Commission on Climate Change and what impact the delay in recruiting a Chair would have on the proposed timescales for production of its report. The Mayor stated that he was not sure there had been a delay in recruiting the Chair. Discussions with potential Chair candidates and potential commission members were on-going and an announcement, including information on future timescales, would be made soon.

**464. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

**465. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Nine public questions were received relating to the Local Transport Plan and transport projects around Cambridgeshire. These were taken before discussion of the Local Transport Plan. Minute 467 below refers. Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were taken when the relevant report was presented.

**466. CHANGE TO THE PUBLISHED ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Due to the high level of public interest in the Local Transport Plan the Mayor exercised his discretion as Chair to vary the order of business from the published agenda to take this report as the next item of business. This would be followed by a report on Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure which had been added to the agenda under special urgency arrangements.

**467. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN**

The Local Transport Plan (LTP) would set out the Combined Authority's vision and goals for delivering transport in Cambridgeshire to meet local need and statutory requirements. Officers had worked with key stakeholders both within the county and beyond its borders to produce the Plan, including Cambridgeshire County Council, Peterborough City Council and the Greater Cambridge Partnership. Community Impact Assessments and Environmental Impact Assessments had also been carried out and a public consultation had run for 15 weeks rather than the 12 weeks required by statute in recognition that part of that time fell within the summer holiday period. The LTP would provide a baseline and it would be for the Board to decide when it should be refreshed. The report and recommendations had been considered in detail by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 January 2020 and had been unanimously endorsed.

Nine public questions were received regarding the Local Transport Plan and transport projects around Cambridgeshire. A summary of the questions and responses is published at the following link - [Combined Authority: Public Questions](#).

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask a question on behalf of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Dupré asked how consultation responses from members of the public about climate change had resulted in changes to the approach or contents of the Local Transport Plan. The Mayor stated that climate change had been afforded a high priority within the LTP. A key objective was to reduce emissions to 'net zero' by 2050 to minimise the impact of transport and travel on climate change. The Authority understood that climate change, a global issue, required interventions at a local level. By committing to a target of net zero carbon by 2050 it would ensure that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough were at the forefront of driving reductions in emissions from transport. In order to meet this overarching objective, the Authority would look to:

- Utilise new technologies as they became available to minimise the environmental impacts of transport;
- Manage and reduce transport emissions; and
- Encourage and enable sustainable alternatives to the private car, including reducing the need to travel.

In addition, the Authority would look to incorporate climate resilience into the new transport network, designing infrastructure that was resilient but also easily repairable. By ensuring that the transport network was protected against human and environmental disruptions, journey time reliability would be improved.

Councillor Smith commented that it was helpful to the Board to hear from so many members of the public and that this highlighted the importance of the LTP to local residents. Much was happening at present which would influence the LTP, including the emerging Joint Local Plan for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City which was currently out for public consultation. This required a dynamic and flexible LTP which would be able to respond to the evolving position.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the LTP as a necessary plan for now but asked when it would be refreshed to reflect the evolving position within the county, such as the creation of larger density sites which would benefit from public transport links to take cars off of the road. He recalled the Combined Authority's previously stated aim of enabling most residents to be able to travel from home to work in 30 minutes. Officers stated that they were working closely with the Bus Reform Taskforce to ensure that public transport options were fully reflected. The LTP would be refreshed as and when the Board saw fit in light of the emerging position of Government and the evolving situation locally.

Councillor Boden commented that the Combined Authority had been tasked with doubling gross value added (GVA) and reducing inequality across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It was important that a balance was maintained between these two aims within the LTP. The Mayor endorsed the need for the LTP to improve equality of opportunity for parts of the county which experienced higher levels of deprivation.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the LTP. East Cambridgeshire was experiencing a period a rapid growth and welcomed the improvements to transport infrastructure which had already taken place and those which were planned. She acknowledged the environmental concerns which existed, but noted that the proposals included significant investment in rail, off-road cycle routes and bus provision. The LTP set out a commitment to a better deal for rural areas and this was to be welcomed.

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

- a) Note the Public Consultation Report and Final Local Transport Plan;
- b) Approve the Local Transport Plan.

#### **468. KINGS DYKE LEVEL CROSSING CLOSURE**

The Mayor stated that a key decision on Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure was being taken under the special urgency arrangements set out in the Constitution. It had been included with the agreement of Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and by the Mayor as the Chair of the Board, as required by Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

The project had previously been considered by the Board on 31 October 2018 with a predicted completion date of late 2020. Cambridgeshire County Council had subsequently been advised of significantly increased project costs by the contractor and had chosen to end that contract and conduct a re-procurement exercise. The revised timeframe had an expected completion date of late 2022. Given this change to the proposal and the need to give confidence to County Council and prospective contractors the Board's agreement was sought to the proposed timeframe.

Councillor Hickford thanked the Mayor and Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for agreeing to add this urgent item to the meeting agenda.

Councillor Boden expressed his thanks to Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority for working together to progress the Kings Dyke project as quickly as possible. The project had a benefit cost ratio of almost 8 in normal conditions which rose to an exceptional 270 during times of flood, underlining its vital importance.

Councillor Holdich commented that there had never been any doubt that the project would progress, given its importance to the economies of both Fenland and Peterborough.

Councillor Herbert commented that he remained committed to the project as part of the work to address wider transport issues around the county, but sought more information around the timing of final decisions. Officers stated that the outcome of the current re-procurement exercise would give a new project cost estimate. If this had increased beyond the Combined Authority's existing provision of £30m it would be brought back to the Board for decision.

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

Agree Cambridgeshire County Council's revised timeline for completion of the King's Dyke Level Crossing Closure scheme of late 2022.

#### **469. FORWARD PLAN – JANUARY 2020**

The Forward Plan was published on the Combined Authority website and updated regularly. There were no requests to reserve any committee reports to the Board for decision.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Forward Plan published on 17 January 2020 and the addition to the Forward Plan of KD2020/023: A605 Kings Dyke Level Crossing Closure published on 27 January 2020 under special urgency arrangements

#### **470. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD AND APPOINTMENT OF THE LEAD MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND CHAIR OF THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE**

The Mayor offered his congratulations to Councillor Ryan Fuller on his appointment as Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor Ray Bisby on his appointment as Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and Austen Adams on his appointment as Chair of the Business Board.

The resignation of Councillor Bull as Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council in December 2019 had necessitated a number of changes to Board and Executive Committee membership and Lead Member roles. The changes were shown on the appendix to the report. The Board was asked to note the appointment of Councillor Ray Bisby as Acting Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

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

- a) Note and agree the nominations for membership of the Executive Committees, Chairs and Lead Members for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 1.
- b) Note that Councillor Ray Bisby has been appointed as the acting Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and is now a co-opted member of the Combined Authority Board.

#### **471. REVIEW OF THE CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The existing Corporate Risk Management Strategy adopted by the Combined Authority in February 2018 had been reviewed to ensure that it reflected current best practice. A revised Strategy had been considered by the Audit and Governance Committee on 16 December 2019 and had been recommended to the Board for adoption.

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

Adopt the proposed revised Risk Management Strategy [Appendix 2];

#### **472. REVIEW OF THE DATA PROTECTION POLICY**

The existing data protection policy had been adopted by the Combined Authority in January 2018. Following review, a revised policy had been produced which drew on the data protection policy adopted by the West Midlands Combined Authority. It continued to reflect European Union regulations as these currently remained in force. The policy would be revised as necessary as data protection requirements evolved.

Councillor Boden asked whether any reports had been made to the Information Commissioner's Office. The Interim Monitoring Officer stated that no reports had been made to the ICO's office during his term of office.

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

Adopt the revised Data Protection Policy [Appendix 2]

#### **473. PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

The Performance Report provided an overview of delivery against key metrics. There had been a net increase of three projects rated green across the portfolio.

Councillor Smith welcomed the concise nature of the report and the single page appendix, but asked officers to look again at the presentation of the data relating to gross value added to make it more clear whether delivery was on target. The inclusion of some narrative on amber and red rated projects would also be helpful.

Councillor Boden commented that it would be helpful to have a shorter timeframe in relation to housing projects.

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

Note the January Delivery Dashboard

#### **474. MAYOR'S BUDGET 2020-21**

The costs of the mayoral functions for 2020/21 would be funded from Revenue Gainshare. There would be no precepts issued by the Authority to fund the costs of mayoral functions for 2020/21.

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

Approve the Mayor's draft budget for 2020/21.

In accordance with the Constitution this was a recorded vote:

	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Anna Bailey	X		
Councillor Chris Boden	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert			X
Councillor Roger Hickford	X		
Councillor John Holdich	X		
Councillor John Neish	X		
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		
Mayor James Palmer	X		

#### **475. COMBINED AUTHORITY BUSINESS PLAN 2020-21**

The Board was invited to review and comment on the Combined Authority Business Plan 2020/21. Details of the Authority's budgets would be appended to the final version of the report once approved and it was hoped that the final version would be ready for publication in February 2020. A six month review report would be brought to the Board in September 2020.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask a question on behalf of the Committee. Councillor Dupré noted that page 130 of the report set out progress on key projects. She asked when funding decisions were expected to be made where there was reference to applications for government funding and whether that information could be included in future reports. The Mayor stated that it was understood that the Chancellor intended to hold a Budget in March 2020 and a Spending Review later in the year. It was expected that decisions about central government funding would be linked to those fiscal events. The Mayor would continue to lobby Government where appropriate.

Councillor Smith commended the clear and concise format of the report and the use of plain English.

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

- a) Review the draft 2020-21 Combined Authority Business Plan attached at Appendix 1 and consider any appropriate amendments.
- b) Delegate to the Chief Executive the authority to finalise the Business Plan for publication in the light of the view of the Combined Authority Board.

#### **476. BUDGET MONITOR UPDATE**

The Board received an update on the financial position to the end of November 2019. Details of forecast variances between the predicted revenue outturn and the annual budget for the main budget headings were set out at paragraph 2.7. These included a favourable variance of £141.3k on external support services due to lower than expected costs to date relating to external legal and professional fees. A favourable variance of £120k also existed in relation to investment revenue from Combined Authority balances. Actual expenditure to date on transport and infrastructure projects reflected the expected cost profile, with increased costs expected in the latter stages of the financial year. A report would be brought in March 2020 which would

invite the Board to review all underspends and to decide which represented true savings and which should be carried forward to the 2020/21 financial year. Some capital projects had been re-profiled and some items had not yet been billed. Updated information would be reported in March.

Councillor Boden commented that the Combined Authority was still quite a new body. As such, a forecast outturn variance of around 6% was to be commended, but he asked what would be considered an appropriate maximum variance as the organisation matured. The Chief Finance Officer stated that no absolute figure was set, but the budget was kept under constant review and the Board would be updated of any variances against forecast outturn.

Councillor Smith commended the clarity of the report. She sought clarification of the reference to the Community Land Trust and £100k homes budget. The Chief Finance Officer stated that this should read, 'The Community Land Trust and £100k homes budgets were established via the MTFP refresh in September and has not incurred limited expenditure to date.'

The Mayor commented that in-year savings on the Mayor's budget were expected due mainly to the departure of his chief of staff, Tom Hunt, following his election as the Member of Parliament for Ipswich. Mr Hunt had made a significant contribution to the Combined Authority's work during his tenure and he wished to place on record his thanks.

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

Note the updated financial position of the Combined Authority for the year.

#### **477. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME (NON-GRANT) PROPOSED ACQUISITION – HUNTINGDONSHIRE**

Mayor Palmer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. The Mayor did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote. The Interim Monitoring Officer left the meeting room for the duration of the item. Legal counsel was provided by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Councillor Holdich stated that he had resigned from his appointment as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. As such, he had no interest to declare and would chair the item in his capacity as Deputy Mayor.

The Deputy Mayor reminded the Board that the report contained a number of exempt appendices. Should any members wish to discuss these it would be necessary to consider whether to exclude the public and press from that part of the debate. No member expressed the wish to discuss the exempt appendices.

The Board's approval was sought for the grant of a loan of £1.4m to Angle Developments (East) Ltd to enable the acquisition of a freehold residential development site in Huntingdonshire. The loan funding would be taken from the £40m revolving fund within the £100m Affordable Housing Programme. The site currently had planning permission for 11 executive homes with no affordable housing units. If approved, a further planning consent would be sought for up to 24 units, to include affordable housing units. The Combined Authority would take first legal charge over the property until the loan was repaid.

Councillor Boden welcomed the proposal, commenting that this was an entirely appropriate use of the revolving fund. However, he noted that it was difficult to measure the benefit of the proposal using traditional measures as these usually looked to cost, and in these cases there was no cost as the loan would be repaid.

Councillor Herbert commented that he had no objection to the proposed scheme, but that he calculated the Board had already committed in excess of the £40m in the revolving fund. The Chief Finance Officer stated that a close analysis had been undertaken of the cash-flow within the £40m revolving fund. More than £40m had been committed in total, but on current projections the £40m total would not be exceeded at any one time. A further cushion would be provided by the repayment of some previous loans. Councillor Boden suggested this innovative approach might be put forward for an award.

Councillor Smith asked who was responsible for underwriting the project in the case of any overspend. Officers stated that there was an element of risk in any development project. In this case the risk would sit with Angle Developments (East) Ltd, which was wholly owned by the Combined Authority, and would be mitigated by the first legal charge over the land. The value of the land would increase as it was developed and no parent company guarantee was implied.

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

- a) Approve the lending of a sum of £1,400,000 from the Combined Authority to Angle Developments (East) Ltd to enable the acquisition and progression of a revised planning application on a site in Huntingdonshire (comprising £900,000 to acquire the site and £500,000 in costs). Heads of terms for the acquisition are detailed in the Business Case at Exempt Appendix 1. The purchase will be Conditional on satisfactory investigation and pricing of land contamination being within the £300,000 allowance provided for in the business case.
- b) Grant delegated authority to the Housing and Development Manager, in consultation with the Deputy Monitoring Officer and the Lead Member for Investment and Finance, to conclude any necessary documentation to complete the loan with Angle Developments (East) Ltd.

#### **478. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME – NON-GRANT – FENLAND**

Mayor Palmer declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. The Mayor did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote. The Interim Monitoring Officer remained absent from the meeting room for the duration of the item. Legal counsel was provided by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Councillor Holdich stated that he had resigned his appointment as a director of Angle Developments (East) Ltd. As such, he had no interest to declare and would remain in the chair for this item in his capacity as Deputy Mayor.

The Deputy Mayor reminded the Board that the report contained a number of exempt appendices. Should any members wish to discuss these it would be necessary to

consider whether to exclude the public and press from that part of the debate. No member expressed the wish to discuss the exempt appendices.

The Board's approval was sought for a loan of £1.29m to Angle Developments (East) Ltd to enable the acquisition and progression of a revised planning application on a site in Fenland. The site had been given outline planning consent for 29 homes with no affordable units, but this had now lapsed. Purchase would be conditional on a new planning application being approved by Fenland District Council whereby the majority of units would be affordable homes. The Combined Authority would take first legal charge over the property until the loan was repaid.

Councillor Boden commented that this appeared to be prime opportunity to deliver additional affordable homes in Fenland.

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

- a) Approve the lending of a sum of £1,290,000 from the Combined Authority to Angle Developments (East) Ltd to enable the acquisition and progression of a revised planning application on a site in Fenland (comprising £790,000 to acquire the site and £500,000 in costs). Heads of terms for the acquisition are detailed in the Business Case at exempt Appendix 1.
- b) Grant delegated authority to the Housing Development Manager, in consultation with the Deputy Monitoring Officer and the Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance, to conclude any necessary legal documentation to complete the loan with Angle Developments (East) Ltd.

The mayor resumed the chair for the remainder of the meeting. Legal counsel was provided by the Interim Monitoring Officer.

#### **479. £100K HOMES BUSINESS CASE**

The need to deliver additional affordable housing across the Combined Authority area was set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report and reflected in the Authority's Housing Strategy. £100k Homes was the preferred mechanism for addressing a gap in affordable housing provision for those who did not qualify for traditional affordable housing, but were unable to afford open market prices. Buyers would own 100% of the property freehold, but any future resale price would be bound by covenant to a price relative to the original purchase price. This would ensure that the discounted price would be available to every subsequent purchaser. The covenant would also require that the property was a main residence to prevent them being used as second homes or sub-let. The proposal had been well received by the development industry and invitations were being offered to work alongside prospective developers and communities to identify suitable locations for £100K Homes. The availability of soft loan financing and land value capture were being explored, but the approach taken would be tailored to meet the need of each site. Some constituent councils had received initial briefings on the product and these would continue.

Councillor Smith expressed her thanks to the Chief Executive and officers for the time spent sharing the proposals with South Cambridgeshire District Council. Based on officers' assurance that this product met the national guidelines as an affordable housing product she would be pleased to run a pilot project in South Cambridgeshire.

There was an expectation that £100k Homes would replace some shared ownership properties, but she would be concerned if they replaced rented units. If the proposals could be made to work in South Cambridgeshire where housing costs were particularly high they should work anywhere in the Combined Authority area. Councillor Smith commented that she had frequent meetings with developers and that it would be helpful if officers could provide a one page summary setting out the proposals which could be easily shared.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the opportunity to expand the affordable housing offer, but asked for more information about what was being done to attract potential developers and the role of the Combined Authority in moderating expectation once the scheme became more widely known. Officers stated that it was intended to hold a series of events for developers to explain how the proposal would work in practice. The management of public expectation was recognised as a particular challenge. A website was being designed to allow potential buyers to register their interest in order to gauge the level of demand, but which would make clear that the product was not yet available.

Councillor Bailey commended the £100k Homes as an innovative product which would put people in the position to buy an affordable first home. She expressed the hope that buyers would have the option to make over-payments on their mortgage in order to build equity quickly and enable them to move on to a second home, freeing up the property for another first time buyer.

Councillor Boden expressed strong support for the proposal and suggested that it was another example of an innovative product which could be put forward for an award. It would be important to recognise the different circumstances which existed in the north and south of the county, but he expected to see demand outstrip supply across the whole of the Combined Authority area. He asked whether any measures would be put in place to ensure that homes went to those who would be living and working locally. Officers confirmed that this would be the case.

The Mayor thanked his advisor Charles Roberts and Emma Grima, Director of Corporate and Commercial Services at East Cambridgeshire District Council, for their work in turning his vision for £100k Homes into a deliverable product. He also thanked the Board for their support for the proposal. He remained confident that it was both possible and necessary to deliver £100k Homes in both the north and south of the county. These were not intended to replace rented accommodation, but would create an additional affordable housing option at zero or minimal cost to the taxpayer. The website would be an important tool as it would provide an indication of the level of demand and how this was distributed across the county. The Combined Authority was not a planning authority, so the support of planning authorities of all political persuasions would be needed to deliver these homes to local residents.

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

- a) Approve the Business Case detailed in Appendix 1; and
- b) Authorise the Monitoring Officer to amend the terms of reference of the Housing & Communities Committee to include the responsibility for adopting the £100k Homes Allocations Policy.

#### **480. MARKET TOWNS PROGRAMME – APPROVAL OF MASTERPLANS FOR FENLAND**

The Board was invited to approve the four Growing Fenland market town masterplans for March, Wisbech, Chatteris and Whittlesey and to note the Overarching Growing Fenland Strategic Report for Fenland. Town teams were established in each of the four towns and asked to identify the strengths of their towns and the areas where improvements could be made. This was used to produce an interim report for each town which informed a public consultation exercise, except in Wisbech where a consultation was already taking place as part of the 'I love Wisbech' project. The outcome of these consultations were used to further tailor the masterplans to local need. Funding opportunities would now be sought from the Combined Authority and other sources. Capital programme funding of £5m was available within the medium term financial plan for market towns pump priming, subject to Board approval, to support the implementation of the masterplans across all 10 market towns. Local authority leads would be invited to submit funding applications against the approved masterplans. These would be independently assessed against published criteria and recommendations made to the Combined Authority Board.

Councillor Boden commended the four Fenland masterplans to the Board. There had been significant public involvement in producing the plans and they reflected the different characteristics of each of the towns concerned. The strategic report contained a number of interesting concepts which went beyond the five year period covered by the masterplans. This had not been approved by Fenland District Council, but the district council would look at the proposals. Councillor Boden welcomed the recognition by other Board members that, whilst Fenland did not need their help, it did welcome their support in ensuring that the north of the county would be offered the same opportunities as its neighbours in the south.

Councillor Smith welcomed the development of the proposals at local level. This spoke to one of the strengths of the Combined Authority in looking beyond the boundaries of individual city and district councils to the life experience across Cambridgeshire and working together to address areas of deprivation and exclusion.

Councillor Herbert commented that it was important that this work was led locally. He agreed that the strategic document needed some further work, but it contained some interesting ideas.

Councillor Bailey commented that the presentation of information around bus subsidies in the strategic document was a little curious. Increasing the use of public transport to reduce the need for passenger subsidies should always be the aim. The Mayor commented that the challenge around bus use was being considered via the Bus Reform Taskforce. Large areas of Huntingdonshire, South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire and rural Peterborough all experienced these issues.

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

- a) Approve the four Growing Fenland market town masterplans produced for March, Wisbech, Chatteris and Whittlesey.
- b) Note the Overarching Growing Fenland Strategic Report for the Fenland district (referenced in paragraphs 2.21 – 2.25).

#### **481. CAMBRIDGE AUTONOMOUS METRO CORE OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE – PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The Board's approval was sought to agree that a non-statutory public consultation on the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) should take place in early 2020. The consultation document was being drawn up in consultation with key partners including Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Greater Cambridge Partner. It would focus on needs and benefits and potential route alignments for tunnelled sections and the findings would influence the concept design. The recommendations were considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 January 2020 and endorsed unanimously.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask a question on behalf of the Committee. Councillor Dupré asked why members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's CAM Metro Task and Finish Group were not provided with advance copies of the consultation materials as agreed with officers. The Mayor stated that the draft consultation material was currently being prepared by the Combined Authority's consultancy team in conjunction with the Mayor's office. It was anticipated that the material would be available in early February 2020 and it would be shared with the Task and Finish Group as soon as it was available.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the proposed consultation process and sought more information on the content of the consultation document. Officers stated that it would include indicative locations for portals, stations in Cambridge City and route alignments. A series of renders would illustrate some of the considerations at key city centre locations, paying due regard to the integration of city centre stations with other modes of transport. The aim was for the consultation to run from mid-February to the end of March 2020 to allow its findings to inform work on the outline business case.

Councillor Bailey commented that East Cambridgeshire District Council had asked that the consultation should make clear what aspects were subject to consultation now and what would be the subject of future consultation. This would be important in order to establish reasonable expectations. Officers stated that the consultation would not be re-visiting questions which had already been the subject of previous consultations, but it would include details of envisaged future consultation proposals. There would be a number of further opportunities for public consultation and engagement during the preparation of the outline business case and final business case.

Councillor Boden acknowledged the need for a project on the scale of the CAM to sustain growth in the south of the county and was supportive of that. However, the effect would not be limited to the greater Cambridge area as those beyond could use it to improve their access to greater Cambridge. It would therefore be important to consult across the whole of Cambridgeshire and possibly beyond. At the least he would want to see the integration of the CAM with transport links in the north of the county.

The Mayor stated that if funding for the Alconbury spur could be confirmed in the spring, work could start on that route, opening up the option to link further north. His ambition was for the CAM to extend across Cambridgeshire, and public consultation would be a key part of that process.

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

Agree that a non-statutory public consultation on the CAM should be undertaken in the early part of the New Year.

The meeting was adjourned at 1.05pm for 10 minutes.

**482. CAMBRIDGE AUTONOMOUS METRO PROGRAMME - REGIONAL ARMS STRATEGIC OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE (SOBC) TENDER DOCUMENT.**

The Board was invited to approve the early development of the Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) regional arms strategic outline business case tender documents as part of the wider CAM programme. This would be funded from the uncommitted contingency funds within the 2019/20 CAM outline business case budget. The recommendation had been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 January 2020 and endorsed unanimously.

Work on the CAM project was currently focused on the tunnelled section within Cambridge City. However, the CAM was not just an underground metro system for the City but a public transport enabler for the whole region. The aspiration was to bring forward work on the regional arms sooner than originally planned.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask two questions on behalf of the Committee. Councillor Dupré commented that the Local Transport Plan Consultation referred to the demand for a stop on the CAM network in East Cambridgeshire. She asked how this issue would be developed and where the stop would be located. Officers stated that the requirements for the overall CAM network were subject to the usual demand forecasting and transport analysis as well as consultation with appropriate key stakeholders and local government departments. The Combined Authority was currently unable to answer questions about the specific stops and routes in East Cambridgeshire as options would be developed as part of future work on the business case for the eastern regional route. The Transport and Infrastructure Committee had asked officers to undertake the initial procurement activities to develop the CAM regional routes later in 2020. A specification for the demand modelling for the whole of the CAM network was currently being prepared and would be shared with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, CAM partnership Board and CAM Technology Advisory Committee in due course.

Councillor Dupré further asked what progress the Combined Authority was making towards identifying funding options for the CAM Metro project. Officers stated that the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) reported that the CAM could be paid for through a series of funding mechanisms, which might include local contributions and dedicated revenue streams, in particular land value capture and tax increment financing. The SOBC indicated that a mixture of these would be required to cover the capital expenditure and financing requirements for implementing the CAM, and to ensure public and business confidence in the development of the scheme. As the development of the business case for the scheme progressed further, work would be done to confirm the appropriate funding and financing package to deliver the CAM. This would need support from Government, but would also include money raised through the economy of Cambridgeshire. The conclusions of that work would be reported in the Outline Business Case in summer 2020.

The Mayor stated that the CAM could only work as the sum of its parts. The underground tunnelled section in Cambridge City would replace the need for a ring

road around Cambridge. The Combined Authority's aim was to reduce the number of cars on the road and the CAM would be instrumental in achieving this.

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

Approve early development of the CAM regional arms SOBC tender documents as part of the wider CAM programme and for £100,000 to be utilised from uncommitted contingency within the current 2019/20 CAM OBC budget to fund the early development of these documents.

#### **481. DELEGATION OF PASSENGER TRANSPORT POWERS AND THE TRANSPORT LEVY 2020-21**

The Board considered recommendations relating to the delegation of passenger transport powers and the Transport Levy 2020/21. These recommendations had been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 9 January 2020 and endorsed unanimously.

The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority was the statutory Transport Authority for Cambridgeshire. Initially these powers had been delegated to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, but as the Combined Authority matured as an organisation it would be important to forge an agreement to enable it to take over these services from 2020/21 onward. The Combined Authority would work closely with the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council to ensure a smooth transition.

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

- a) Approve the delegation of the role of Travel Concessionaire Authority and other powers set out in paragraph 2.8 of the appendix, to Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City Council (PCC) for the 2020/21 financial year
- b) Approve the amount and apportionment of the Transport Levy (2020/21 financial year) as set below:

Peterborough City Council: £3,849,906

Cambridgeshire County Council: £8,497,733

#### **482. UNIVERSITY OF PETERBOROUGH OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE – PHASE 1**

Councillor John Holdich declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as the Leader of Peterborough City Council. Following advice from the Monitoring Officer Councillor Holdich did speak and vote on the item.

The University of Peterborough project was proceeding on time and was due to open in September 2022. Talks with providers were on-going and it was proposed that the Combined Authority and Peterborough City Council establish a property company to build the new university campus. Subject to the approval of the outline business case the procurement of the infrastructure would involve selecting a contractor to deliver the physical capital works. The building would then be leased to the Higher Education

(HE) provider. A separate company (UniCo) would be established to include the HE provider, Combined Authority and Peterborough City Council to enable the local government partners to continue to influence the delivery model. The HE provider would need to be eligible for registration with the Office of Students and to have validated degree-awarding powers. The outline business case had been produced externally and independently reviewed.

The Mayor reminded the Board that the report contained a number of exempt appendices. Should any members wish to discuss these it would be necessary to consider whether to exclude the public and press from that part of the debate. No member expressed the wish to discuss the exempt appendices.

Councillor Smith commented that she was impressed by the calibre of the work which had been done, but that she would welcome sight of the risk register. Officers undertook to share this with the Board. Councillor Smith further asked for more information about the £5m described as accommodation costs. Officers clarified that this related to teaching space to accommodate more students rather than living quarters.

The Mayor described the University of Peterborough project as an exceptional story which represented the Combined Authority's vision to create a technical university based on the CPIER report. It would be the first university of its kind and would meet the needs of people in the north of the county and have a significant and positive impact for years to come.

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

- a) Approve the preferred option as part of an Options Appraisal and adopt the Outline Business Case for the new University of Peterborough as a Combined Authority priority and key element of the Local Industrial Strategy and Skills Strategy;
- b) Approve the development of a Subscription Agreement between the Combined Authority and Peterborough City Council for the capital investment into the development of Phase 1 and the land required and delegate to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Skills, the Chief Financial Officer and the Monitoring Officer, authority to negotiate and complete the Subscription Agreement;
- c) Approve the commitment to invest the £12.3M capital budget into the Phase 1 build and draw down the funding to mobilise the activities and milestones identified within the Outline Business Case to achieve the target of opening the University in September 2022 to 2000 students.

#### **483. FOR APPROVAL AS ACCOUNTABLE BODY – LOCAL GROWTH FUND PROJECT PROPOSALS JANUARY 2020**

Austen Adams declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the managing director of Stainless Metalcraft (Chatteris) Ltd. Mr Adams did not take part in discussion of the report and did not vote.

The Mayor reminded the Board that the report contained a number of exempt appendices, including the new one page project summaries discussed at the previous

meeting which had proved very useful. Should any members wish to discuss these it would be necessary to consider whether to exclude the public and press from that part of the debate. No member expressed the wish to discuss the exempt appendices.

At its meeting on 27 January 2020 the Business Board had considered 15 project proposals which had been submitted in response to the invitation issued in July 2019. £38.3m of funding remained to be allocated by the end of March 2021. Following detailed consideration of the project proposals the recommendations had been revised as set below:

- a) Recommended that the Combined Authority Board approve funding for the projects ranked 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, ~~10~~, 12 and 14 in the table at paragraph 2.8 of the report based on achieving highest scoring criteria and external evaluation recommendation.
- b) Recommended that the Combined Authority Board approve a revised grant funding offer for the project ranked 11 in the table at paragraph 2.8 in the report of £2,400,000.
- c) Recommended that the Combined Authority Board approve a revised grant funding offer for the project ranked 13 in the table at paragraph 2.8 in the report of £1,400,000.
- d) Recommended that the Combined Authority ~~defer project ranked 15 in the table at paragraph 2.8 below based on the scoring criteria, until the next round call of Local Growth funding or alternative funding becomes available~~ **reject** project ranked 15 in the table at 2.8 in the report.
- e) Recommended that the Combined Authority decline projects ranked 3 and 16 in the table at paragraph 2.8 in the report based on the scoring criteria for project 16, as this is the lowest scored project, and the external evaluation recommendation on project 3.
- f) **Recommend that the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Investment and Finance, be granted delegation to approve project ranked 10 upon completion of satisfactory renegotiation of the management fee proposed and due diligence.**

Additions shown in **bold type**.

Deleted text shown as ~~struck through~~.

Councillor Smith commented that it would be useful to be given some mapping information on the location of the projects. Officers stated that the Business Board had made the same request and had also asked that projects should be grouped thematically in future.

The Mayor thanked the Business Board and the 'Dragons' Den' panellists for their detailed consideration of the projects submitted. He further commended the vision and ambition of the project proposals themselves.

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

- a) Approve funding for the projects ranked 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 14 in the table at paragraph 2.8 below based on achieving highest scoring criteria and external evaluation recommendation.
- b) Approve a revised grant funding offer for the project ranked 11 in the table at paragraph 2.8 below of £2,400,000.
- c) Approve a revised grant funding offer for the project ranked 13 in the table at paragraph 2.8 below of £1,400,000.
- d) Reject project ranked 15 in the table at paragraph 2.8 in the report.
- e) Decline projects ranked 3 and 16 in the table at paragraph 2.8 below based on the scoring criteria for project 16 as this is the lowest scored project and the external evaluation recommendation on project 3.
- f) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Investment and Finance, to approve project ranked 10 upon completion of satisfactory renegotiation of the management fee proposed and due diligence.

#### **484. FOR APPROVAL AS ACCOUNTABLE BODY – LOCAL GROWTH FUND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT JANUARY 2020**

The Board was advised that nine projects were currently in the delivery phase, a further nine were at the pre-contract negotiation stage and a further 12 projects had been approved under the previous item (minute 483 refers). Expenditure to date totalled £77.7k and this would accelerate as more projects entered the delivery phase. The King's Dyke project was currently the only project with a red RAG rating and the reasons behind this had been discussed earlier in the meeting (minute 468 above refers). The Wisbech Access Strategy and Lancaster Way Phase 2 Grant were rated amber. All other projects were rated green.

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

- a) Note the programme updates outlined in this paper to the Combined Authority Board.
- b) Note the submission of the Growth Deal monitoring report to Government to end Q2 2019/20.

#### **485. MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN**

The Board was invited to agree to the incorporation of the draft Local Growth Fund Monitoring and Evaluation Plan into the Combined Authority's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. It was a requirement of central government funding that a specific Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Local Growth Funding was put in place.

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

- a) Approve the incorporation of the proposed Local Growth Fund Monitoring & Evaluation Plan into the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and to grant the Monitoring Officer delegated authority to make any consequential amendments required to the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.
- b) Note the resource implications for effective Monitoring & Evaluation to be delivered.

#### **486. EASTERN AGRI-TECH GROWTH INITIATIVE FUNDING REVIEW**

The proposal to approve a reduction in the Local Growth Fund allocated to the Eastern Agri-Tech Growth Initiative scheme of £3.5m had been endorsed by the Business Board on 25 November 2019. This reflected the recognition that it would be difficult to utilise the full sum allocated by the deadline of March 2021. However, in order to allow this key decision to be included on the Forward Plan for a minimum of 28 clear days the report to the Combined Authority Board was deferred to its January meeting.

Councillor Bailey commented that she had been contacted by a fellow councillor and member of a trade association who was concerned that they could not recall having seen any publicity encouraging applications. Whilst she was content to accept the Business Board recommendation she asked that consideration be given to the promotion of the initiative going forward. Officers stated that both the Skills Committee and Business Board had identified the same issue and that it had been agreed that £120k would be spent on future marketing and promotion. There would still be a total of £12m small business grant funding available to 2023 so the budget could be re-balanced in future years if demand increased.

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

Approve a reduction in the Local Growth Fund allocated to the Eastern Agri-Tech Growth Initiative scheme of £3.5m.

#### **487. SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL GRANT SCHEME FUNDING ALLOCATION**

The proposal to approve the allocation of an additional £9m to the Small Business Capital Growth Grant Programme from Local Growth Fund and recycled Growth Fund to create a total £12m budget for the Small Business Capital Growth Grant programme had been endorsed by the Business Board on 25 November 2019. However, in order to allow this key decision to be included on the Forward Plan for a minimum of 28 clear days the report to the Combined Authority Board was deferred to its January meeting.

The scheme remained at an early stage of development and would be more heavily promoted going forward. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan discussed previously (minute 485 above refers) would be used to identify the best areas for investment. Bench-marking was being carried out with two other Combined Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships and a provider had been contracted to work on the first £3m of funding.

Councillor Smith asked what was being done to support start-ups. Officers stated that start-up businesses would be eligible to apply for funding.

Councillor Neish asked how district councils could help make their local businesses aware of the opportunities available to them. Officers stated that meetings were being arranged with district council officers to discuss this.

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

Approve the allocation of an additional £9m to the Small Business Capital Growth Grant Programme from Local Growth Fund and recycled Growth Fund to create a total £12m budget for the Small Business Capital Growth Grant programme.

#### **488. HIGH GROWTH SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED ENTERPRISERS OBSERVATORY**

The Board considered a recommendation to create an Observatory to help identify high growth small and medium enterprises who would be target clients. Promoting the opportunities available to business was a key part of the work being undertaken, but it was important to attract the right applicants. The Observatory would develop the understanding of potential high growth companies so that these could be identified and proactively targeted.

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

- a) Note and approve the proposals to create the Observatory which will act as a Research, Analytical and Market Intelligence function to identify the Combined Authority's target clients at a total cost of £80,000 subject to the following:
- b) Approve the re-profiling of £80,000 from the 19-20 LEP Capacity Funding budget to cover the costs of the High Growth SME Observatory in 2020/21 and 2021/22.

#### **489. BUDGET 2020/21 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2020-2024**

The Board had considered the draft budget for 2020/21 and draft medium term financial plan (MTFP) 2020-24 on 27 November 2019 and had approved them being put out to public consultation from 28 November 2019 to 31 December 2019. A summary of responses was set out at Appendix 4 of the report and changes from the draft considered in November 2019 were summarised at paragraph 3.2. The proposals had been reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 January 2020. The over-arching objective was to set an affordable and balanced budget that supported the delivery of the ambitions and priorities of the Mayor and Combined Authority, taking account of the Authority's reserves and expected annual funding stream for 2021 onward. There was no proposal to precept constituent authorities for the 2020/21 financial year.

Councillor Herbert expressed regret that the budget report had not been placed higher on the agenda rather than at the end of a long and busy meeting. He commented that Appendix 3b contained some large numbers which he did not recall being shared

before and asked where these had come from. The Chief Finance Officer stated that the figures related to capital leverage schemes and reflected discussions with Directors about potential future schemes. They had been reported to the Board previously and were included at this stage for information only, not as part of the MTFP. Business cases would be developed for the projects as part of the usual decision-making process. Councillor Herbert asked to take a report on this at a meeting in the near future to allow the Board the opportunity to contribute and to provide greater transparency.

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

- a) Approve the revenue budget for 2020/21 and the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2020/21 to 2023/24.
- b) Approve the capital programme 2020/21 to 2023/24

In accordance with the Constitution this was a recorded vote:

	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Anna Bailey	X		
Councillor Chris Boden	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert	X		
Councillor Roger Hickford	X		
Councillor John Holdich			Absent
Councillor John Neish	X		
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		
Mayor James Palmer	X		

#### **490. MOTION RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLOR CHRIS BODEN**

The Board considered a Motion submitted under Committee Procedure Rule Section 14 by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Bailey. The Interim Monitoring Officer advised that the Motion was in order as drafted.

Councillor Boden commented that the Combined Authority was the Transport Authority for Cambridgeshire. As such, it was quite hypocritical not to act to address the recognised traffic difficulties in Cambridge City. The Combined Authority comprised six local authority areas, excluding the county council, but around half of meetings were held in Cambridge.

An amendment to the Motion was proposed by Councillor Hickford, seconded by Councillor Bailey, that:

The Combined Authority Board therefore resolves to:

~~No longer use any premises within the City of Cambridge, including Shire Hall and the Guildhall, as the venue for any formal or informal meetings of the Combined Authority, including:~~

- ~~i. Formal meetings of the Combined Authority Board, its Executive Committees, Employment Committee, Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee;~~

- ii. ~~Informal meetings where attendance is limited to the Mayor, and / or Members of the Combined Authority and / or officers of the Combined Authority.~~

**Remove Shire Hall, Cambridge from the premises used by the Combined Authority Board, its Executive Committees, Employment Committee, Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee; and not use Shire Hall for informal meetings where attendance is limited to the Mayor, and / or Members of the Combined Authority and / or officers of the Combined Authority.**

Additions shown in **bold type**.

Deleted text shown as ~~struck through~~.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to ask a question on behalf of the Committee. Councillor Dupré noted that the Committee's comments related to Councillor Boden's Motion as originally drafted and did not take account of the amendment proposed at the meeting by Councillor Hickford. If passed, the original Motion would prevent the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or its working groups meeting in Cambridge. The unanimous view of the Committee was that it was deeply disappointing that the Motion did not mention public transport, that it denied the opportunity to hold meetings in the location with the best public transport links for the maximum number of local people including interested members of the public, and did so without evidence of the impact of Combined Authority meetings on air quality and congestion in Cambridge, or the effect on car mileage or carbon emissions which would be caused by holding meetings in places with poorer public transport connections. The Committee was also concerned about the democratic deficit in not holding meetings at the offices of two of its constituent councils and that the proposal was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. In these circumstances, the Committee asked how the proposal could be justified.

Councillor Boden commented that he had confirmed with the Interim Monitoring Officer that the Motion was not contrary to the Constitution. Councillor Hickford's amendment would address the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's concern about no meetings being held in Cambridge. In his judgement, Peterborough rather than Cambridge City had the best public transport links in the county. Councillor Boden was content to accept the amendment proposed by Councillor Hickford.

Councillor Smith commented that for Combined Authority meetings held outside of Cambridge she needed to drive for at least an hour as no practical public transport alternative currently existed. Meetings in Cambridge offered the option of leaving cars at a park and ride site and walking or cycling into the city from there. The meetings held at Shire Hall were generally those that were most well attended by members of the public. On that basis her preference was to leave the current arrangements unchanged.

Councillor Herbert commented that the location of meetings had been discussed by Leaders in the early days of the Combined Authority and it had been agreed to rotate meetings between constituent councils so that they were held throughout Cambridgeshire. By his recollection the only meetings where some Board members had been late arriving due to traffic problems had been those held in Peterborough,

March and Ely. Councillor Hickford commented that there were many occasions where people arrived late to meetings at Shire Hall due to problems with traffic.

Councillor Over commented that his journey from home to Cambridge took between two and a half and three hours compared to the 30 minutes it had taken him to get to Ely.

Councillor Bailey commented that the Motion also related to meetings of Executive Committees and officer meetings. She took on board the point about the democratic deficit which would arise if no meetings were held in Cambridge and, on that basis, was content to support the amendment proposed by Councillor Hickford.

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

Remove Shire Hall, Cambridge from the premises used by the Combined Authority Board, its Executive Committees, Employment Committee, Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee; and not use Shire Hall for informal meetings where attendance is limited to the Mayor, and / or Members of the Combined Authority and / or officers of the Combined Authority.

#### **491. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The reserve meeting date on 26 February 2020 was not required. The Board would meet next on Wednesday 25 March

(Mayor)