



Agenda Item 1.2

Date: Wednesday 3 June 2020

Time: 10.30am – 1.45pm

Venue: Meeting held remotely in accordance with The Local Authorities (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Meetings) (England) Regulations 2020

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

A Adams – Chair of the Business Board

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

Co-opted Members: Councillor D Over (Vice Chair, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority)

Also in attendance: Councillor K Price, Vice Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee

526. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Jessica Bawden, representing the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.

There were no declarations of interest.

527. MINUTES OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING 29 APRIL 2020

The Mayor invited Councillor Price, Vice 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.

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

Approve the minutes of the meeting on 29 April 2020 as an accurate record.

528. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

529. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions, but a number of questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which would be taken under the relevant agenda item. A copy of the written responses to questions is attached at Appendix 1.

530. FORWARD PLAN – 22 MAY 2020

The Board reviewed the Forward Plan published with the meeting agenda on 22 May 2020. There were no requests to reserve any committee reports to the Board for decision.

Councillor Herbert asked for clarification of whether the CAM Metro Outline Business Case and outcome of the public consultation which ended on 3 April 2020 would still be brought to the Board in July 2020 or if this would be later in the summer or autumn. The Mayor stated that there was a need to consider the impact of Covid-19 on transport planning and to reflect during the next few weeks on whether the report should come in July 2020 or later in the year.

Councillor Herbert commented that the Forward Plan only covered the period to 24 June 2020 which he judged lacked transparency. The Monitoring Officer stated that the Forward Plan met the obligation to cover business planned during the following 28 days. It would usually cover a longer period, but the calendar of meetings for 2020/21 had not yet been approved and so these dates had not been included. The next iteration would be more comprehensive.

Councillor Smith commented that the possibility of a Board meeting being held on 24 June 2020 had been discussed informally, but she was unclear why this had been included on the published Forward Plan when it had not been agreed. The Monitoring Officer stated that this date remained provisional, but that it had been included in the published papers as a place holder to promote transparency. The alternative was to call an extraordinary meeting at much shorter if it was subsequently decided that the meeting should go ahead. The Mayor stated that it would be for the Board to decide whether a meeting should take place on 24 June 2020.

It was resolved to:

Approve the Forward Plan.

531. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

The Board was invited to note the members and substitute members appointed by constituent councils to the Combined Authority Board for 2020/21, to appoint the Business Board's nominations as its representative and substitute for 2020/21 and to confirm co-opted member status as non-voting members of the Board for the Police and Crime Commissioner and representatives of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group. The Board was further invited to agree that any late notifications of appointments to the Monitoring Officer should take immediate effect.

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

- a) Note the Members and substitute Members appointed by constituent councils to the Combined Authority for the municipal year 2020/2021 (Appendix 1);
- b) Appoint the Business Board's nominations as Member and substitute Member to represent them on the Combined Authority for the municipal year 2020/21 (Appendix 1).
- c) Confirm that the following bodies be given co-opted member status for the municipal year 2020/21:
 - (i) The Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire;
 - (ii) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority;
 - (iii) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.
- d) Note the named representative and substitute representative for each organisation as set out in the report.
- e) Agree that any late notifications of appointments to the Monitoring Officer shall take immediate effect.

532. APPOINTMENTS TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRS AND LEAD MEMBERS

The Board was invited to note and agree the Mayor's nominations to Lead Member responsibilities and the membership of committees including the chairs of committees for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 1.

Councillor Boden commented that Fenland District Council's annual meeting would take place on 17 June 2020 so the Council's committee nominations remained provisional at this stage.

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

Note and agree the Mayor's nominations to Lead Member responsibilities and the membership of the committees including the Chairs of committees for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 1.

533. APPOINTMENT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Board was invited to confirm the size and political balance of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2020/21 as set out in the report, confirm the appointment of constituent councils' nominees and consider requesting that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the co-option of an independent member from a constituent council.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the number of councillors contributing to the work of the Combined Authority's various committees. However, he noted that some councillors were appointed both to Executive Committees and to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. His understanding was that this should not be the case and he sought clarification on this point. The Monitoring Officer stated that the Local Government Act 2000 did not apply to the Combined Authority in the same way as it did to local authorities. However, his advice would be that any Member involved in a decision taken by an Executive Committee should not be involved in the scrutiny of that decision. The Monitoring Officer undertook to raise this question with the Centre for Public Scrutiny and consider whether there was a need to discuss this further with constituent councils and review the Constitution. The Mayor stated that the Board would be updated on the outcome of this work.

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

- a) Confirm that the size of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be 14 members; two members from each constituent council and two substitute members for the municipal year 2020/2021;
- b) Agree the political balance on the committee as set out in Appendix 1;
- c) Confirm the appointment of the Member and substitute Member nominated by constituent councils to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the municipal year 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 2.
- d) Request that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the co-option of an independent member from a Constituent Council.

534. APPOINTMENT OF AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE 2020-21

The Board was invited to confirm the size, composition and political balance of the Audit and Governance Committee for 2020/21, confirm the appointment of the Members and substitute Members nominated by Constituent Councils and re-appoint the existing independent person, Mr John Pye, to the Committee for 2020/21.

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

- a) Confirm that the size of the Audit and Governance Committee should be eight members; one member and one substitute from each Constituent Council and confirm the reappointment of the existing independent person for the municipal year 2020/2021;
- b) Agree the political balance on the committee as set out in Appendix 1;
- c) Confirm the appointment of the Member and substitute Member nominated by Constituent Councils to the Committee for the municipal year 2020/2021 as set out in Appendix 2

- d) Appoint a Chair and Vice Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee for the municipal year 2020/2021.

535. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2020-21

The Board was invited to approve the draft calendar of meetings for 2020/21, subject to noting that the Board meeting scheduled for 24 June 2020 remained provisional and that the August Board meeting date had now been confirmed as Wednesday 5 August 2020. Once approved, the calendar of meetings would be shared with constituent councils' Democratic Services teams.

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

Approve the Calendar of Meetings for 2020/2021 (Appendix 1).

536. COMPLAINTS POLICY

The proposed revisions to the Complaints Policy had been reviewed by the Audit and Governance Committee on 26 May 2020 and referred to the Board for approval, subject to a number of small changes. If approved, the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman would be informed. The Board was reminded that the Monitoring Officer had delegated authority to make any changes recommended by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsmen or resulting from the Audit and Governance Committee's function to monitor the complaints procedures.

Councillor Smith requested a change to paragraph 5 to revise or remove the statement, '*However, complainants who go public in the media may forfeit their right to anonymity and their right to confidentiality.*' She judged this to be threatening in tone and questioned whether it was consistent with the Combined Authority's policy on whistleblowing. The Monitoring Officer suggested that the Board's approval of the complaints policy be made subject to him refining this paragraph in consultation with the Mayor to take account of the public interest test. Councillor Smith expressed the hope that the proposed wording would be shared informally with the Board and Councillor Count asked that the final version be brought to the next Board meeting so that Members could see the final version.

Councillor Boden commented that he would welcome the introduction of a public interest test element, commenting that there could be occurrences of this being used for political purposes.

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

- a) Approve and adopt the complaints procedures subject, to any amendments made by the Audit and Governance Committee and to the Monitoring Officer refining the first paragraph of Section 5 regarding complainants' right to anonymity in consultation with the Mayor.
- b) Notify the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman of its decision to approve and adopt the revised complaints procedures.

- c) Note that the Monitoring Officer has delegated authority to make any changes recommended by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsmen or resulting from the Audit and Governance Committee's function to monitor the complaints procedures.

537. PERFORMANCE REPORT JUNE 2020

The Board received a report providing an overview on delivery as of the end of April 2020. This included delivery against key metrics and the RAG status of the Combined Authority's key projects. Across the entire portfolio there was a net downward movement of two projects. The contract on the King's Dyke project had now been signed and the project was rated as green.

Councillor Herbert commented that the RAG ratings were useful, but that he would welcome a bit more information about the projects rated as amber. Officers undertook to provide this outside of the meeting. He further suggested that future reports might usefully include a couple of sentences about each project rated amber or red. Councillor Herbert also asked that an overarching update report on transport projects should be brought to a future Board meeting to allow Members to see how they all linked up and were progressing. The Mayor stated that this point would be noted and confirmed that Members would be updated in due course on the status of those projects rated amber and red.

The June Delivery Dashboard was noted.

538. BUDGET MONITOR REPORT – JUNE 2020

The Chief Finance Officer stated that a commitment was given at the Board meeting on 25 March 2020 to look at the impact of Covid-19 as part of the review of the medium term financial plan (MTFP). This report discharged that commitment. There would be some adjustments in the move towards closedown and during the audit and the Board would be updated on these in the next budget monitor report. Carry forwards, due for example to project slippage, would also be subject to end of year adjustments.

Revenue Budget

The provisional revenue outturn position showed a favourable variance against the approved budget for the year of £6.7m. The majority of work streams showed some element of carry-forward due to having ring-fenced budgets or requiring additional work. Where this was not the case the practice was for underspends to be offered up so that they could be re-prioritised to meet need across the wider organisation. If all of the proposed project carry forwards were approved this would amount to £5.1m, leaving a net underspend of £1.6m against the approved budget and resulting in an increase in reserves going forward.

Capital Budget

The provisional capital outturn position showed a favourable variance of around £32m against the approved budget for the year. Most of this funding was ring-fenced or needed to be carried forward rather than representing an actual underspend.

Response to Covid-19

On 25 March 2020 the Board had received an urgent report setting out the Combined Authority's proposed response to Covid-19. This included an undertaking to review all key projects to identify both risks to delivery and those projects most focused on economic recovery. This work had now been completed and the updated funding assumptions in the MTFP would enable the release of some previously allocated funding. The proposed re-modelled MTFP would re-focus funds towards the Covid-19 response and economic recovery whilst ensuring that the revenue and capital budgets would remain balanced and affordable. Should the Board adopt the re-modelled MTFP each proposed project would still remain subject to an outline business case (OBC) being brought before the Board for approval. Any additional savings would go to improving the overall position. The Combined Authority would remain in credit across each year of the MTFP and the budget remained balanced and affordable.

Councillor Herbert commended the clear and detailed reporting. Some significant underspends had been identified and he asked to take a hard look at the budget and opportunities to re-think some projects during informal discussions as the county began to emerge from Covid-19. In relation to the CAM project, he asked when the Board could expect to see fuller reports on all aspects of this very expensive project as Members needed to understand what the next stages would be and how these linked with the funding plan. The Mayor stated that the CAM Partnership Board would be meeting on 9 June 2020 and constituent council leaders would be meeting informally the following day to discuss this in detail. The report before the Board contained a clear and balanced budget. The CAM was an expensive but joined up scheme and it was important to move to the next stage, subject to the Board's approval. Councillor Herbert commented that he fully supported the CAM Partnership Board and wanted to see the CAM project succeed, but the sums involved were currently quite vague.

Councillor Smith commended the intelligible presentation of the budget report. She sought clarification of whether any monies would be returned to the funding body. The Chief Finance Officer stated that this would not impact on any carry-forwards at present. Should this change the Board would be updated. Councillor Smith further questioned the link drawn in the report between the CAM project and Covid-19 recovery given that the CAM would not be delivered for some time and asked what conversations on this had taken place with the OxCam Arc. The Mayor shared the hope that Covid-19 would be consigned to memory by the time the CAM was delivered. However, he judged that there was a need now to support the business community with bold and innovative solutions. The work of the OxCam arc was symbiotic with this.

Councillor Count expressed his disappointment that it had not been made clear to the Board that as the Lead Member for Finance and Investment he had not been involved in all aspects of the production of the report. Whilst it did represent a balanced report there were a number of questions which he had raised which had not been addressed. His main difficulty related to the way monies had been re-allocated at this stage. His expectation would have been that any identified underspends would be taken initially to the relevant Executive Committee to consider whether they represented true underspends and, if so, to make recommendations to the Board on how that money might be spent. Instead, this re-allocation had taken place at Director level without Member involvement, with

much of the identified underspend being directed to the CAM project. The rationale used for this approach was to show that projects were fully affordable, but this had resulted in a lot of budget lines which remained subject to the approval of the Board. Councillor Count expressed concerns about the CAM budget as there was now over £30m shown with reference to a secondary outline business case of which he was unaware and an unquantified reference to some of the money being for a full business case. Councillor Count confirmed that he had no problem with the addition contained in the report or with the report going forward. However, given that as Lead Member for Finance and Investment he had not been involved in drawing the report up and that it had still been issued with his name on it he felt he must abstain from the vote. The Mayor stated that he appreciated Councillor Count's position and offered his apologies that the report had been issued in Councillor Count's name. The Combined Authority Board had asked for solutions to deal with an immediate issue. The proposals before the Board would enable funds to be re-purposed from projects which were currently dormant and invest significant sums of money directly into the economy of Cambridgeshire. The Monitoring Officer stated that the online report had been updated to show the Mayor as Lead Member for this report and offered his apologies that this had not been conveyed to Board members.

Councillor Smith commented that she would be concerned if Executive Committees and Lead Members were not being involved in the process whilst Councillor Herbert commented on the significant contribution made by Councillor Count. The Monitoring Officer stated that Lead Members would be involved in the preparation of reports. The Chief Finance Officer stated that he had spoken to Councillor Count about this. Going forward, officers would make sure that there was sufficient time for him to be consulted on reports before they were published.

Councillor Herbert commented that in looking at the budget items for the CAM he felt that the Board had lost sight of some other priority transport projects. He would like to look at those too. The Mayor stated that all priority transport projects were still going forward. The funds which it was proposed to re-allocate had been drawn from dormant or completed projects.

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

- a) Note the provisional outturn position against budget for the year to 31 March 2020.
- b) Approve the carry forward of budget underspends to increase the 2020/21 budget to deliver the outcomes identified.
- c) Update the 2020/21 budget and Medium Term Financial Plan in accordance with the proposed changes made following the COVID-19 MTFP response review.

539. CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL £70M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME FORECAST 2020-21

The Board's approval was sought for the carry forward of an underspend of £5,266,287 from the approved 2019/20 budget into the new financial year and to

approve a budget of £15,270,231 for 2020/21 for the £70 million Cambridge City programme. This would give a total budget for 2020/21 of £20,536,518, including carry forward.

Councillor Herbert commented that some sites had been subject to lockdown. However, there was an active building programme in place and it was expected to be back on site in the next few weeks.

Councillor Boden welcomed the statement in the report that there was a low risk of starts being significantly delayed. However, if that should change he would want to see that brought to the attention not just of the Housing and Communities Committee, of which he was the Chair, but also the Board.

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

- a) Note the revised expenditure profile in respect of the £70 million Affordable Housing Programme led by Cambridge City Council, as part of the £170 million Affordable Housing Programme.
- b) Approve a carry forward of £5,266,287 from the approved 2019/20 budget into the 2020/21 financial year.
- c) Approve a budget of £15,270,231 for 2020/21, giving a total budget of £20,536,518 for the year once the carry forward.

540. WISBECH RAIL

The Board was advised that the identified options had been developed and that the recommended option would be for a heavy rail solution comprising of two trains per hour. The full business case was at the final drafting stage and would be published in due course. The table contained in the report would be subject to change as the proposals were finalised. Officers would continue to engage with the Department for Transport around the Ely North junction capacity issue, but capacity for an hourly direct service might already be in place. The project offered a benefit cost ratio (BCR) of between 2 and 2.5 which was deemed high.

Councillor Boden welcomed the proposal which moved the county closer to a restored rail link to Wisbech. He commended the Combined Authority's continued support for this project, noting that Wisbech was one of the largest towns in the country without a rail link. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report had highlighted the importance of addressing inequality within the county. Restoring the rail link would make a significant contribution to this as Wisbech was one of the most deprived towns within the Combined Authority area.

Councillor Count commented that it was great news to see the proposals developed this far and to see the positive BCR. His preference would have been for the final report to have come to the Combined Authority Board for approval rather than to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, but he understood the timing issues which had necessitated this. The biggest blockage to date had been the issues around the Ely North junction and the report clearly indicated that it was

possible to build an interim solution without Ely North which still offered a positive BCR. This meant it was still a good financial prospect to do it now. As well as making sound financial sense it would meet one of the core aims of the CPIER report in addressing multiple areas of deprivation and addressing inequality. Further engagement with Government was proposed following consideration by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, but the report did not state when the Board would next be updated. The Mayor confirmed that he was content for an update report to be brought back to the Board in six months' time, if not before.

The Mayor stated that the Ely North junction was a problem, but that the Combined Authority now had a Grip 3 Business Case with a positive BCR which made a big difference. Subject to the report being approved he would be calling on Government to help progress this.

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

- a) Note the headline conclusions of the draft Full Business Case that restoring a heavy rail link between Wisbech and Cambridge would be practicable and provide value for money;
- b) Delegate authority to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to approve the final version of the Full Business Case; and
- c) Approve continued engagement with the Department for Transport, and other central government departments to explore the future funding of this project through the Restoring Railways Fund.

541. PETERBOROUGH - TRANSPORT SCHEMES, STUDIES AND MONITORING

The Mayor invited Councillor Price, Vice 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 Board considered a request to approve the release of funding for the 2020/21 financial year to enable Peterborough City Council to undertake a further round of initial transport studies and develop a pipeline of future schemes. A full list of the studies which it was proposed to undertake was included in the report.

The Mayor commended Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council's transport teams for their work in support of this project and expressed the hope that it would be possible to draw down more money for Government for active travel.

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

Approve the release of £100,000 from the provisional allocation in the Medium Term Financial Plan.

This included votes in favour of the recommendations by the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

542. MARKET TOWNS PROGRAMME INVESTMENT PROSPECTUS 2020

The Combined Authority was committed to supporting market towns within the county. The Market Towns Programme was approved by the Board in July 2018 and eleven Masterplans had been developed around the county, many of which had already been approved. The report before the Board set out an investment prospectus consisting of £10m capital funding plus £3.1m recycled funds which had been released following the decision not to progress the St Neots Footbridge project. Subject to the Board's approval, the aim was to launch the prospectus in June 2020. Funding applications would then be brought to a future Board meeting for approval.

Councillor Smith commented that Covid-19 had highlighted the value in being able to shop locally and of the county's micro economies. A report by Bill Grimsey exploring new models for town centres would be published later in the month and she expressed the hope that the Combined Authority would be sighted on this.

Councillor Holdich sought clarification of the criteria against which funding applications would be assessed and asked whether District Councils had been consulted. Officers stated that applications would be assessed against specific call specifications and criteria, including match funding and value for money, and set against the delivery and implementation of approved Masterplan priorities, actions and interventions to support Covid-19 economic recovery. District Councils had been consulted and the details would be finalised with partner organisations if the recommendation to grant delegated authority to the Director Business and Skills was approved.

Councillor Count commented that it would be important to ensure that the money was spent, noting that smaller projects might be faster to deliver. He suggested that this would also be an area where more money could be spent from the underspends reported in the Budget Monitor report. Significant sums of money could be attracted from Government as it saw the strong plans in place. In some cases this might take the form of match funding, so he asked whether there might be a need for the Combined Authority to re-focus its priorities in order to fund any suitable applications which could not be funded from the proposed £10m provision. He would like to look again at this when all of the applications had been received. Councillor Count further asked that the wording around the £10m being made available across the 10 market towns other than St Neots should be clarified.

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

- a) Agree the below scope of the Investment Prospectus to in delivery of Market Town Masterplans, and delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Skills, to sign-off of the final version;
- b) Note that the Investment Prospectus will be launched to Market Town leads and partners in June 2020;

- c) Note that funding applications will be brought to the Combined Authority Board for approval from July 2020 onwards.

543. COMBINED AUTHORITY RETRAINING SCHEME

Government had invited Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to be a pilot area for a national retraining scheme. The Board's approval was sought to launch the pilot scheme and spend the £80k allocated by Government.

Councillor Holdich commented that this represented an important piece of work to ensure that the county was ready to resume business post Covid-19. The Mayor concurred, stating that some of the Combined Authority's best work related to investing in training. He thanked officers for their work on this.

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

- a) Approve the development and launch of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Retraining Scheme Pilot.
- b) Give approval to spend the allocated budget of £80,100 from the Department for Education.

544. SURRENDER OF LEASE - ALCONBURY

This report was added to the Forward Plan as a Key Decision on 26 May 2020 under the General Exception arrangements set out in the Constitution. The Mayor invited Councillor Price, Vice 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 report set out the first stage of a three stage process. The financial case for the proposed surrender of the lease on the Alconbury site had been set out by the Mayor in his response to the question from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and also in the report. The second stage would be to identify suitable temporary accommodation and it was proposed that this would comprise a series of hubs across the Combined Authority area, preferably in existing local authority locations. Staff preferences would be taken into account during this process through engagement with the staff forum. Stage three would be the identification of permanent accommodation. The senior management team remained open about the location of this permanent accommodation and would want to take time to reflect with staff on what was needed. A shortlist would be drawn up based on accessibility, connectivity and public transport links and the final decision would rest with the Board.

Councillor Boden commented that he quite liked the Alconbury site and looked forward to the County Council moving there. However, the key consideration was that the Combined Authority was constrained on revenue funding so it was appropriate to take action now to ensure that these limited revenue resources were used to best effect. Officers had moved quickly when offered the opportunity to do this and he congratulated them on that. Councillor Boden expressed disappointment that decisions around the Combined Authority's temporary

accommodation would be made outside of the Board and expressed the view that this should be brought to the Board, or shared informally with Leaders.

Councillor Smith welcomed the hub approach proposed as an interim solution and asked whether this model might also be considered as one of the permanent accommodation options if it worked well, costed against the other options identified. The Mayor commented that this would be a sensible approach. Mr Hill, Joint Chief Executive, confirmed that it would be done.

Councillor Herbert commented that he had no difficulty with the recommendations, but that it was usual to decide where to move to before giving up existing accommodation. The Combined Authority would need an accessible base for staff and councillors where people could be brought together when it was safe to do so.

Mr Adams commented that he supported the proposals. The financial position made good sense and there would in any case be changes in working practices post Covid-19. He asked whether the figures included in the report included dilapidation costs. The Monitoring Officer stated his understanding that it was an inclusive figure, but undertook to check and update the Board if that was not the case.

Councillor Count commented that the figures in the report did not include the cost of the new accommodation or the cost of moving so the level of potential savings could perhaps have been toned down. However, he understood informally that the cost of potential sites could be substantially cheaper than the current accommodation so he was content to support the proposals on that basis. In his view, a core piece of work would be around the organisation's requirement for a permanent space for itself in a changed, post-Covid working environment. It was right that staff should be consulted, but the staff complement would change over time so he judged that cost should be the primary consideration.

The Mayor stated that there had been a lot of inaccurate comment around this issue and that comments attributed to him around the Alconbury site were not merited. This was a financial decision which had arisen in response to an opportunity which had presented itself. When the Combined Authority had entered into the lease for the Alconbury building it had a much larger staff, so it was right to revisit the provision required.

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

- a) Agree to the surrender of the Lease of the Alconbury site, and to approve the payment of £151,537.50 in respect of the cost of the surrender.
- b) Note the updates provided in this report relating to the work to engage with staff on approaches to agile working, and to identify possible alternative sites,
- c) Note that a further report will be brought back to the Combined Authority Board proposing a shortlist of locations for a permanent HQ for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

545. LOCAL HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE CAPITAL GRANT ALLOCATION 2020-21

The report set out the capital funding allocations towards local transport for 2020/21 which had been advised by the Department for Transport. The Mayor was required to consult the Board before making a Mayoral decision to allocate this funding to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as the two highways authorities in accordance with the Department for Transport formula. It was a condition of the grant that both of the highways authorities should provide assurances to the Chief Executives and the Chief Auditor to confirm that the conditions of the funding had been complied with.

Having consulted the Combined Authority Board, the Mayor allocated the grants as set below:

CCC - £17,781,000

PCC - £ 4,773,000

Total - £22,554,000

BY RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD

BUSINESS BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

546. LOCAL GROWTH FUND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT JUNE 2020

The report to the Business Board 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 these exempt appendices as it would be necessary to consider whether to go into private session. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The report to the Business Board provided an operational update as of 1 May 2020. The annual grant payment for 2020/21 was split with one third being held back subject to review of those projects likely to be in delivery. £79.56m had been allocated so far and officers were working with the remaining projects to ensure that the final third of funding could be released. There were currently 18 completed projects, 14 live projects and 16 at pre-contract stage. Some delays had occurred arising from Covid-19, but work was now progressing again. There had been unprecedented demand for the Covid-19 Capital Grant Scheme with just under £5.3m awarded to date. That scheme had now closed. It was proposed to reallocate £320k of returned Local Growth Fund (LGF) funding into the new Adult Education Budget Innovation Fund to support the Further Education sector to deliver additional apprenticeships and retraining. If approved, this would mean that no match funding was required for that scheme. Monthly and quarterly monitoring was continuing to take place, but evaluation had been put on hold until now due to the focus on responding to Covid-19.

Mr Adams commended the Business and Skills team, commenting that the Covid Capital Grant Scheme had been hugely successful and had been recognised by

Ministers as an innovative and agile response. The Director of Business and Skills had been asked to produce a paper on this for Government with a view to it being replicated in other areas. The challenge now was to appropriately deploy all of the available LGF funding as Covid-19 had impacted on this. A contingency plan had been developed to backfill from the project pipeline should any current projects fall away to ensure that all funds were deployed.

Councillor Count commended the work which had been done in support of some great projects which would have real impact. He asked whether the monitoring and evaluation work would include looking at whether the money had been spent on what it was expected to be spent on and whether it had delivered the jobs planned. Officers confirmed that this would be the case.

The Mayor offered his personal congratulations and thanks to the Chair of the Business Board and the Business and Skills team for their work, commenting that there were people still in business today thanks to their efforts.

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

approve of an allocation of £320,000 returned Local Growth Funding into the new Adult Education Budget Innovation Fund as capital match to that fund to support the Further Education Sector plus Apprenticeships and Retraining.

547. BUSINESS BOARD CONSTITUTION REVIEW

The Board was invited to approve the amendments to the Business Board Constitution set out as tracked changes at Appendix 1. These changes included the amendments arising from the Business Board governance review which had been reported in March 2020. A further report would be brought forward in due course proposing amendments to the Assurance Framework to ensure that both the Constitution and the Assurance Framework were fully aligned.

Councillor Count commented that the reference at paragraph 13A that women should make up at least a third of the membership of the Business Board by 2020 was inconsistent with paragraph 8 where this reference was removed. If the Board was serious about this he judged a new target was needed. Councillor Count further noted that the delegated authority to the Director of Business and Skills to approve small grants to small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) did not define the sum involved and asked that this should be clarified. The Deputy Monitoring Officer stated that the Business Board had met its intention to increase the diversity of Business Board members which was why the 2020 date had been removed. This apparent contradiction would be addressed and included in the review of the Combined Authority Constitution which would be brought to a future meeting of the Board. The report recommending the delegation to the Director of Business and Skills which was approved by the Board on 27 November 2019 had defined this sum as up to £150k so this sum would be made explicit in the Constitution.

Councillor Smith sought clarification of the proposal to delete the requirement that *'Private Sector members should not have made substantial personal contributions to any recognised political party and must not serve as an officer in any recognised*

political party. The Deputy Monitoring Officer clarified that this requirement had not been removed, but that it had been included in Paragraph 9.3 which set out a number of other restrictions on Private Sector Board members. In relation to the composition of the Business Board, Councillor Smith commented that her understanding was that the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) required a 50/50 gender balance. She further asked about increasing democratic representation on the Business Board in line with neighbouring LEPs which had more elected members, commenting that as most Business Board meetings were held in private she was not even able to attend as an observer. Councillor Smith further commented that the report did not address the issue of co-terminosity. Mr Adams commented that the model which had been adopted in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough consisted of the Combined Authority Board acting as the Accountable Body and providing political involvement at that point. This allowed the Business Board's decisions to be uninfluenced by political considerations which he judged to be a more democratic approach than that taken by some LEPs. The Business Board Constitution was aligned to that objective. Business Board meetings were mainly held in private because of the sensitive nature of the matters discussed. However, there would be a public meeting of the Business Board later in the year and he would welcome Councillor Smith sitting in on any Business Board meetings if she so wished.

Councillor Herbert complimented the Business Board and the officer team which supported it on its achievements. However, BEIS had a clear expectation that co-terminosity with the Combined Authority's geographical area would be achieved together with equal gender representation. He was concerned that there would be less transparency around how vacancies on the Business Board would be filled and did not feel that this should be done wholly from a reserve list of candidates. The Deputy Monitoring Officer stated that all of those on the reserve list for appointment would have gone through a full and transparent recruitment process. Work was continuing around co-terminosity and the aim was for the Business Board to achieve equal gender representation by 2023. The Mayor commented that the Business Board was already working co-terminous with the Combined Authority area, but that the former LEP had had commitments beyond that geography which were being honoured.

Councillor Herbert further commented that he would also like to see greater representation of SMEs and for the Business Board to extend its network and become more visible. Mr Adams commented that he judged the Business Board had done well to get to 36% of Board members being female in quite a short time and, although there was still more work to do, this figure was better than most LEPs. The Business Board was mindful of sectorial representation amongst its membership and at present there were five members (36%) representing SMEs, including himself as Chair of the Board. Combined Authority Board members were welcome to sit in on a Business Board meeting if they wished. The Business Board would be holding a meeting in public later in the year, but it was not appropriate to share all of the financial information it discussed in the public domain. Mr Adams recognised that the Business Board had not so far communicated all of the good work that was being done. However, there was now a communication plan in place and two new Business Board members had expertise in this field and would be working with the communications team on this.

Councillor Count commented that he supported Mr Adams' comments regarding political involvement in the Business Board. He had been a long-serving member of the LEP which had preceded the Business Board and it had failed as an organisation with a governance deficit. He judged that the arrangements now in place in Cambridgeshire were running far better and he was comfortable with the local government element of the process being delivered through the Accountable Body arrangements. These arrangements and the Assurance Framework had also passed all examination by Government.

Councillor Smith expressed concern that there was a risk that the Combined Authority Board's role in approving Business Board recommendations could become a rubber stamp. The leaders of the constituent councils knew their local economies well and she judged that there was still a discussion to be had about how leaders engaged with the Business Board to the benefit of all.

The Mayor commented that Combined Authority Board members had access to all of the papers relating to Business Board decisions they were being asked to approve and that he agreed with Mr Adams that politics should be kept out of the Business Board.

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

Approve the amendments to the Constitution set out in Appendix 1, subject to specifying that the Director of Business and Skills had delegated authority to approve small grants to small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) of up to £150k.

This included votes in favour of the recommendations by the eight voting members of the Board present when the vote was taken.

548. EMERGENCY ACTIVE TRAVEL: ADVANCE PAYMENTS TO HIGHWAYS AUTHORITIES

This key decision was added to the agenda under the special urgency arrangements set out in the Constitution and with the agreement of Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Mayor as Chair of the Board had also agreed to add this item to the agenda as required by Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

The request to bring this report under special urgency arrangements reflected the fast moving position on this. The Board was invited to review and endorse the programme of work relating to temporary active transport measures, to authorise payments to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as local allocations under the Emergency Active Travel Fund and to agree that payments could be made in advance of the Combined Authority receiving full payment from the Department of Transport. Active travel had always been a priority for the Combined Authority, but the current social distancing requirements were significantly reducing the capacity of public transport which made this even more important. At the Mayor's request the two Highways Authorities had produced detailed lists of projects and they had already put some measures in place ahead of funding being released in order to progress this quickly.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the work which had been done to date in support of this. He judged there was a need to work with each business sector including the retail sector to look at the possibility of slightly different work times and patterns. Working in partnership with local authorities and the Greater Cambridge Partnership would provide the best possible support. The Mayor commented that staggered opening times would be a key factor and that he was pressing for this.

Councillor Bailey commented that East Cambridgeshire District Council had just closed an extensive survey of bus, cycling and walking habits and the results of this would be fed in to the Combined Authority's work. She judged that the current situation offered a real opportunity to look again at active travel. The first tranche of projects focused on Cambridge City and Peterborough and she understood the reasons behind that, but Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire had the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to support this work and had already received significant funds to deliver active travel measures. Other districts had not had the benefit of this so she would want to see fairness in the distribution of this new funding, commenting that it should not be used to fund schemes which could and should be progressed via the GCP. Councillor Bailey asked what the GCP was doing now to further some of the innovative schemes being put forward in relation to Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire from within its own resources to release the new funding available to those parts of the county which had not previously had the benefit of this. She would welcome a formal response from the GCP on this. Councillor Count commented that all parts of the county had been asked to submit proposals and that he would come back with a formal reply to the Board on how the money would be allocated. Councillor Herbert commented that the funding available offered an unprecedented opportunity to trial measures which would not have been considered under other circumstances and it would be great if all parts of the county could benefit from this funding. The GCP had a staffing and resource capacity and could use these to take a burden off of the county council by managing the schemes in the greater Cambridge area. This would free up capacity there to deliver schemes relating to other parts of the county.

Councillor Count welcomed the offer of officer support from the GCP. He commented that much of the previous funding from Government had been made specifically available to urban areas which had limited those areas which were eligible to apply. He was proud of what it had been possible to achieve with this funding in Cambridge City and expressed the hope that it might now be possible to replicate some of this good work in other parts of the county with the funding which had now been received. Looking forward, he anticipated that there would be a permanent change in the behaviours of both individuals and businesses following the experience of Covid-19. He would expect to see a greater emphasis on working from home and greater use of technologies such as e-bikes which would make cycling further distances a practical option for many more people. To this end he suggested that the Combined Authority might want to do some work around the size of future cycle lanes as part of the Local Transport Plan.

The Mayor judged that it would be right for the Combined Authority Board to ask the GCP for its immediate response to the Covid-19 crisis, what investment it was putting into cycle routes in the Cambridge area and whether it would be re-

purposing existing funding. He would be happy to write to the GCP on this basis on behalf of the Board.

Councillor Herbert commented that he would be happy to discuss this issue further with the Mayor, Councillor Bailey and their respective officers. The GCP was committed to working in partnership, but he emphasised that until recently a whole range of the schemes now under consideration could not have been possible. Councillor Herbert further commented that the GCP was not holding £400m in funding as had been suggested, but that it had received a commitment for £200m over the next five years, subject to a further gateway review. Nearly 90% of this funding would be for routes that would enable the CAM Metro and extend out to the surrounding areas.

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

- a) Note and endorse the programme of work under way on temporary active travel measures;
- b) Agree payments of £2,093,346 to Cambridgeshire County Council and £781,654 to Peterborough City Council as local allocations under the Emergency Active Travel Fund;
- c) Agree that the payments can be made in advance of the Combined Authority receiving full payment from the Department for Transport.

This included votes in favour of the recommendations by the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

(Mayor)

Combined Authority Board 3 June 2020: Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1. Agenda item 1.2: Minutes of the Meeting on 29 April 2020

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee received a written response following its question to the meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 29 April stating that 'productive discussions' were ongoing relating to the appointment of a Chair of the proposed Independent Commission on Climate Change. What have these discussions consisted of and have they resulted in the appointment of a Chair of the Independent Commission and other commissioners? What progress on this important piece of work has been made in the last month?

Response:

The Chief Executive, in consultation with the Mayor, has appointed the Right Honourable Baroness Brown of Cambridge to lead the Independent Commission on Climate Change for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Baroness Brown is a Cambridge resident, an engineer with experience of senior leadership roles in industry and academia and a preeminent voice for climate change adaptation and mitigation and the low carbon economy.

Baroness Brown currently serves as Chair of the Carbon Trust; Vice Chair of the Committee on Climate Change and Chair of the Adaptation Sub-Committee; non-executive director of the Offshore Renewable Energy Catapult; and member of the WEF Global Agenda Council on Decarbonising Energy. She was non-executive director of the Green Investment Bank, she led the King Review on decarbonising transport (2008), and she is the UK's Low Carbon Business Ambassador.

Baroness Brown made a statement on her plans for the Commission on 3 June 2020 and there will be further announcements on the Commission's membership and work programme imminently. Baroness Brown is an independent chair with her own remit, but the Mayor has asked her to look specifically at mitigation of the impact of the Combined Authority's growth agenda and water shortages in the south of Cambridgeshire and how these might be addressed using re-directed water from the Fens.

2. Agenda item 3.3: Peterborough – Transport Schemes, Studies and Monitoring

There is an increased emphasis on active transport modes and an increased level of importance attached to cycling, walking and equestrian transport as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. What steps are being taken to prioritise active travel not only in the light of Covid-19 but more generally?

Response:

Active travel is a priority for the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan. The likely effects of Covid-19 on travel choices have also made urgent short term interventions to support active travel necessary. The Mayor asked the Highways authorities to develop a package of such measures at the beginning of May 2020 and the first of those are being implemented now. An urgent report to the Combined Authority Board on 3 June 2020 set out details of how that work is being funded and led.

3. Agenda item 3.6: Surrender of Lease - Alconbury

The paper accompanying this item refers to savings that will be achieved as a result of the surrender of the lease on the Combined Authority headquarters in Alconbury. However, there are no assumptions included in terms of the costs associated with alternative accommodation. Can the Board provide a more accurate savings figure which takes into account such costs? Secondly, why is the Combined Authority paying a whole year's rental costs to terminate the lease at Alconbury?

Response:

The Combined Authority is looking to pay the £151,537.50 settlement figure because it represents a substantial saving over the total accommodation liability that would be incurred during the three year period until the next break option date on the existing lease (July 2023). The settlement figure represents less than six months of the total annual accommodation cost (£307,651).

The current situation is evolving and aside from a temporary space, freehold options will be considered which would accommodate a mix of work practices and locations. These will be consulted with staff and assessment of space requirements and costs will follow as part of any future proposal put to the Board. A more accurate savings figure will be provided to the Board when these options and costs are better known.