



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Agenda Item No: 1.2

CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 29 May 2019

Time: 10.30am – 1.25pm

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

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

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

A Khalid – Chair of the Business Board

Co-opted Members: J Ablewhite (Police and Crime Commissioner) (to 12.50pm)

340. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor was pleased to announce that he had appointed Councillor John Holdich as Statutory Deputy Mayor. He had also appointed Charles Roberts to the role of Strategic Adviser. This appointment was made under his executive powers as Mayor to a post which was identified within the recent revised structure of the Combined Authority. The Mayor also welcomed Councillors Bailey and Boden to the meeting and expressed his warm thanks to Councillor Chris Seaton, the former Leader at Fenland District Council, for his wise counsel during his time as a member of the Board.

Apologies were received from Councillor S Count, substituted by Councillor R Hickford, J Bawden (Clinical Commissioning Group) and Councillor D Over (Fire Authority).

Declarations of non-pecuniary interest were made during the course of the meeting by Councillor J Holdich in relation to Item 4.2: Greater Peterborough Inward Investment Pilot (minute 362 below refers) and Item 5.2: Skills Brokerage Contract and Future of the Careers and Enterprise Company Contract for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (minute 366 below refers) as a member of the Opportunity Peterborough Board. A declaration of non-pecuniary interest was made by Councillor L Herbert in relation to Item 5.3: University of Peterborough – Outcome of Review and Reflect Leading to the Progression of an Outline Business Case (minute 367 below refers) as he was until recently an employee of Anglia Ruskin University.

341. MINUTES – 27 MARCH 2019

The minutes of the meeting on 27th March 2019 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor.

342. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

343. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

344. FORWARD PLAN

Councillor Herbert commented that he would like to have sight of the Forward Plan further ahead of meetings. The Mayor noted his request that changes since the last published Plan should be included in future.

It was resolved to note the Forward Plan

345. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

Most constituent council nominations for Board members and substitutes were shown in Appendix 1 to the report which had been tabled as part of a supplementary document pack. The exception was East Cambridgeshire District Council as the date of its annual meeting had been postponed due to a clash with the European elections. To address this it was recommended that late notifications of appointments to the Monitoring Officer should take immediate effect. The inclusion of an Independent member on the Audit and Governance and Overview and Scrutiny Committees would on this occasion tip the political balance against the majority Conservative membership of the Board, so it was proposed instead that both Committees should be delegated the authority to consider whether to appoint a single co-opted Independent member (and substitute) to each Committee to represent the independent members elected across Constituent Councils. It was recommended that the Business Board and Co-opted Member representatives to the Combined Authority Board should remain unchanged.

Councillor Boden asked that it should be noted that the substitute member for Fenland District Council would be Councillor Jan French, and not 'Jane' as stated in the report.

Councillor Smith asked for clarification of the comment that there was a need to avoid tipping the political balance of the Committees in an 'inappropriate way'. The Interim Monitoring Officer clarified that as the Conservative Party had polled a majority in the election and were therefore the majority political party, political balance rules meant that they have the equivalent majority of 52% of the seats on each Committee. Including an Independent member on Committees in place of a Conservative seat would place Conservative members in the minority.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the Members and substitute Members appointed by Constituent Councils to the Combined Authority for the municipal 2019/2020 (tabled)

- b) Appoint the Business Boards' nominations as Member and substitute Member to represent them on the Combined Authority for the municipal year 2019/20
- c) Confirm that the following bodies be given co-opted member status for the municipal year 2019/20:
 - 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 the late notifications of appointments to the Monitoring Officer shall take immediate effect
- f) Delegate authority to both the Audit and Governance Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee the power to appoint a single co-opted member (and substitute) to each Committee to represent the number of independent members elected across Constituent Councils.

346. APPOINTMENTS TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

The Mayor stated that Appendix 1 to the report setting out his nominations had been tabled as part of the supplementary document pack.

Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, stated that she had been notified that some members did not recognise the nominations to the Committee membership shown in the report. A report setting out the confirmed nominations from Constituent Councils would be brought to the June meeting for approval.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note and agree the Mayor's nominations to Portfolio Holder responsibilities and the membership of the committees including the Chairs of committees for 2019/20 or until such time as the revised governance arrangements are approved, as set out in Appendix 1 (tabled)

347. APPOINTMENT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Mayor stated that unfortunately an error had been made in the calculation of the number of seats for Labour and Liberal Democrat representatives on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee but this had been corrected before the Board were due to make a decision on the membership. An Addendum Report had been tabled as part of the supplementary document pack which set out the correct allocation to ensure political proportionality following the recent elections in some parts of the county.

Councillor Herbert sought clarification of which constituent council would nominate the third Labour councillor. The Interim Monitoring Officer apologised again for the error in the original calculations which had wrongly resulted in five seats being allocated to Liberal Democrat councillors and two to Labour councillors. The corrected allocation was four seats for Liberal Democrat councillors and three seats for Labour Councillors. To achieve the correct allocation officers had looked at which authority had the largest number of Labour councillors without representation on the Overview and Scrutiny

Committee. This was Cambridgeshire County Council, so Cambridgeshire County Council had been invited to nominate a Labour councillor rather than a Liberal Democrat.

It was resolved by a majority 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 2019/2020;
- b) Approve the amended political party representation on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- c) Confirm the appointment of the Member and substitute Member nominated by Constituent Councils to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the municipal year 2019/2020 as set out in Appendix 2 of the Addendum report (tabled);
- d) To agree that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the co-option of an independent member from a Constituent Council.

348. APPOINTMENT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Appendix 2 to the report setting out the nominations received from Constituent Councils was tabled as part of the supplementary document pack.

Councillor Herbert asked for clarification of the political balance figures shown at Appendix 3 of the original report and why these showed an additional place for a Conservative councillor. The Interim Monitoring Officer stated that Appendix 3 was an illustrative document. If the Independent councillors had political party status they would have been entitled to a seat on the Committee. The appendix was included in support of the recommendation to delegate authority to the committee to offer a seat to a co-opted member to enable Independent councillors' voice to be heard in Committee discussions, although they would not be eligible to vote. Councillor Herbert commented that he encouraged Independent councillors to consider forming a political party.

The Mayor stated that if Independent councillors chose to form a political party the allocation of seats would be reviewed to ensure political proportionality was maintained.

It was resolved 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 one independent person for the municipal year 2019/2020
- b) To 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 2019/2020 as set out in Appendix 2 (tabled)
- d) Appoint a Chair and Vice Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee for the municipal year 2018/2019.
- e) To agree that the Audit and Governance Committee consider the co-option of an independent member from a Constituent Council.

349. MANAGEMENT OF THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY

The Mayor asked John Hill, Kim Sawyer, Jon Alsop and Dermot Pearson to leave the meeting room for the duration of the item.

The Mayor stated that he had received notice that Councillor Herbert wished to propose an amendment to the recommendations contained in the report.

Councillor Herbert, seconded by Councillor Smith, proposed that:

The Combined Authority Board be requested to:

~~(i) approve the appointment of John Hill and Kim Sawyer as Joint Chief Executives of the CPCA with immediate effect.~~

~~(ii) review these arrangements by 31 May 2021~~

i) *That in the absence of*

- *any proper appointment process or interview*
- *any detail in the report on the roles or secondment arrangements or salary review*

the proposal be referred to the Employment Committee to make decisions after interviews and to sort out details of roles, reporting and salaries, and the interim appointments extend for two months

ii) appoint Jon Alsop as the Section 73 Chief Finance Officer to the CPCA.

The Mayor accepted Councillor Herbert's request that the report be introduced before he spoke to his amendment.

The Interim Monitoring Officer stated that the report discharged an undertaking given to the Board at the meeting on 27 March 2019 to provide recommendations on arrangements for the role of Chief Executive for the Board to consider at its annual meeting.

Councillor Herbert commented that this explanation was thin and incomplete, and that in his view the same criticisms could be levelled at the report. An appointment process for the role of Chief Executive had been carried out via the Employment Committee in March 2019, but no appointment made. Several members had been unhappy about this and reservations had been expressed about the absence of a member of Combined Authority staff on the day to ensure due process was followed. In Councillor Herbert's view the Mayor was effectively hiring and firing staff and by-passing the Employment Committee. He judged that appointing the two Interim Joint Chief Executives whilst a permanent post holder was recruited was a defensible position. However, he judged that the only proper way to appoint a Chief Executive was through an interview process. The report before the Board contained no clear explanation of how responsibilities would be divided between the two Interim appointees and nothing about Mr Hill's role and responsibilities. Councillor Herbert did not think it appropriate for a public body to proceed in this way. Officers at such a senior level should be appointed by a due process which could be defended. The Employment Committee had been permitted to

make big decisions about the future structure of the organisation so he did not understand why it was not playing a role this time. Councillor Herbert commented that he did not believe that any of the Constituent Councils would appoint a Chief Executive in this way and that there was a perception that East Cambridgeshire was taking control of the Combined Authority.

Councillor Smith commented that she had sat on the Employment Committee in March 2019 which had considered the applicants for the Chief Executive role. There was one outstanding candidate amongst the field whom all of the Committee members had scored the highest. At that point the Mayor had exercised a veto on the appointment. In her judgement this veto system disenfranchised other Board members and was deeply disappointing. However, on that occasion the proper process had been followed and she did not understand why the same thing had not been done this time.

Councillor Bailey commented that she understood that there had been significant differences of opinion within the Employment Committee about the candidates seen in March 2019. The proposal before the Board was for two fixed term contracts with a review date and an end date. It was likely to take a permanent appointee between three and six months to leave their current job in addition to the time needed for the selection process which was a substantial amount of time given that there was less than two years left of the current Mayoral term of office. She understood that there had been no complaints about the performance of the Interim Joint Chief Executives to date and felt it was good practice and mutually beneficial to share staff across the Constituent Councils. In her view the focus now should be getting on with delivery.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

The Board turned to consideration of the substantive recommendations. The Interim Monitoring Officer stated that the way forward was entirely a matter for the Board. In such matters the Board had primacy over all of its Committees and on that basis he judged that it was an appropriate report. The addendum report tabled as part of the supplementary document pack addressed the need to appoint a new Interim Monitoring Officer when his own appointment expired at the end of May 2019.

Councillor Smith commented that she had numerous complaints about the report. She called on other members of the Board to voice publicly the reservations which they had expressed in private regarding the competency of the individuals involved. The only benefit to the arrangement which she could see from the proposed extension of the appointments of the two Interim Joint Chief Executives was a financial benefit to East Cambridgeshire District Council.

Councillor Smith requested a recorded vote. The Mayor stated that he was under no obligation to accept such a request and on this occasion he would not do so. Any Board member was though free to request that their own vote should be recorded. The Interim Monitoring Officer confirmed that this was correct.

On being put to the vote it was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Approve the appointment of John Hill and Kim Sawyer as Joint Chief Executive of the CPCA with immediate effect;
- b) Review these arrangements by 31 May 2021;
- c) Appoint Jon Alsop as the Section 73 Chief Finance Officer to the CPCA;

Councillors Herbert and Smith requested that it should be recorded that they had voted against the recommendations.

The Mayor stated that he had not commented in advance of the vote as he had not wished to potentially prejudice its outcome. However, now that the Board had made its decision he wished to place on record that he had listened with both sadness and incredulity to some of the views expressed. He did not share Councillor Smith's recollection of events at the Employment Committee meeting in March 2019. Rather, he recalled that none of the candidates considered by the Committee for the role of Chief Executive had scored highly and that whilst one had been placed slightly ahead there had been no confidence that they were the right fit for the organisation. He judged the allegations made regarding the competency of the two Interim Joint Chief Executives to be shameful. The organisation had been left in a difficult position when the previous Chief Executive had resigned and Ms Sawyer and Mr Hill had stepped in and turned the organisation around, making it the most efficient Combined Authority with the smallest staffing complement in England. Following the Board's decision he was confident that both Ms Sawyer and Mr Hill would continue the exceptional work which they had started. This would see the focus of the Combined Authority move on from governance to delivery. Government's confidence in the organisation was demonstrated by the freeing up of Business Board funding to bring forward business growth and the £227m funding for the Cambridge North Fringe. The Mayor stated that the suggestion of East Cambridgeshire influence over the Combined Authority was a myth based on politics rather than facts. Every part of the county was benefitting from the additional funding and investment which the Combined Authority was able to attract. To suggest a bias towards East Cambridgeshire was entirely without foundation.

The Interim Monitoring Officer drew the Board's attention to the additional recommendation to appoint Dermot Pearson as the new Interim Monitoring Officer when his own appointment ended on 31 May 2019. This was set out in a tabled addendum report contained in the supplementary document pack. Mr Pearson had considerable experience as a Monitoring Officer and had worked in this capacity in a number of high profile organisations.

Councillor Herbert commented that he appreciated that it was difficult to share many details of Mr Pearson's experience in a public forum, but some additional information on his background and experience would have been welcome. He would also like to know whether it would be a full-time appointment and the pay-scale to which he had been appointed. The Interim Monitoring Officer stated that Mr Pearson would be appointed on a full time basis until around the end of August 2019. This should allow sufficient time for the recruitment of a permanent appointee to take place. A copy of Mr Pearson's CV was circulated to Board members for their information.

On being put to the vote it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the appointment of Dermot Pearson as the Interim Monitoring Officer.

John Hill, Kim Sawyer, Jon Alsop and Dermot Pearson returned to the meeting room.

350. CALENDAR OF MEETING 2019/20

It was resolved to:

- a) Approve the Calendar of Meetings for 2019/2020 subject to the outcome of the review of the Constitution to be reported in June 2019 (Appendix 1)

351. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME

The Board considered the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in relation to the Members' Allowances Scheme. The Interim Monitoring Officer emphasised that the recommendations had been made by an independent body and not by officers.

Councillor Smith asked whether recommendation d(i), that the Combined Authority make representations to Central Government for the role of Mayor to be regarded as fixed-term contract employment that was pensionable, was to align Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with the usual practice of other Combined Authorities. Ms Sawyer, Interim Joint Chief Executive, stated that that this was not usual practice and that if the Board chose to accept this recommendation from the IRP it would be unusual and exceptional. In the interests of transparency the IRP's full set of recommendations had been brought to the Board and it was for Board members to decide which it wished to accept. Councillor Smith proposed that recommendation d(i) be deleted from the recommendations. The Mayor stated that he would be comfortable with this change.

Councillor Boden commented that whilst the Mayor was comfortable with this proposal, he was not. The purpose of having an IRP was to obtain objective and considered recommendations. Should the current Mayor choose not to accept the proposed increase in allowance that was entirely a matter for him. However, by rejecting this recommendation the position of future Mayors would also be affected. Councillor Bailey commented that the IRP's recommendations represented a considered response which spoke to a whole piece of work. Her preference would be to accept the recommendations in full to establish an agreed position going forward. Councillor Smith commented that these were good points and that, on balance, she was content that recommendation d(i) should be retained.

The Mayor stated that if the Board chose to accept the recommendations relating to the Mayoral allowance he would not take the proposed £5,000 increase in allowance during his current term of office.

Councillor Herbert asked for clarification of the position in relation to allowances for the Chair and members of the Business Board. The Mayor stated that a report on Business Board allowances was due to be brought before the Board in July 2019.

The Chair of the Business Board commented that the private sector view was that the level of allowances proposed were around half to a third of the salary which would be expected in the private sector for a comparable role.

Councillor Herbert proposed that recommendations b) to agree the scheme for the Mayoral allowance as set out in Appendix 1 and summarised in para 2.6 (a) to (c) below and d (i) that the Combined Authority make representations to Central Government for the role of Mayor to be regarded as fixed-term contract employment that was pensionable be deferred until 2021. The amendment was not seconded.

The Mayor stated that he would be abstaining from the vote, but repeated his intention not to accept an increase in allowance during his current term of office should the Board accept the recommendations.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Review the Members' Allowances Scheme (Mayor's and other Allowances)
- b) Agree the scheme for the Mayoral allowance as set out in Appendix 1 and summarised in para 2.6 (a) to (c) below;
- c) Agree the scheme for the allowances/expenses to those appointed to any independent commissions set up by the Combined Authority Commission as set out in Appendix 1 and summarised in para 2.7 (a) to (d) below;
- d) Agree:
 - (i) That the Combined Authority make representations to Central Government for the role of Mayor to be regarded as fixed-term contract employment that is pensionable.
 - (ii) Whilst outside the remit of this Panel, the IRP commented that the Constituent Authorities IRPs be requested to consider the payment of allowances to their Members serving on the Combined Authority, due to the statutory prohibition on the Combined Authority to pay such allowances.
- e) Consider the payment of allowances/expenses to those appointed to any independent commissions

352. QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORTING

The Board reviewed the Quarterly Performance report which contained data to the end of April 2019. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that a recovery plan was in place for each of the projects rated as amber.

Councillor Herbert asked why the Kings Dyke project was rated as amber and the A10 and A47 Dualling projects were rated as green when there was a perception that these projects were not close to being delivered. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that the status of projects was measured against an agreed set of criteria which included being on timetable, on budget and achieving governance milestones. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had provided some helpful input into these criteria. There were some risks around budget and timetable in relation to the Kings Dyke project, but officers were in commercial conversation with partners about these. Once this was settled the outcome would be reported in the appropriate way.

The Mayor questioned the assertion that there was a perception that the A10 and A47 Dualling projects were not on track when their green RAG rating demonstrated that they were meeting all of the assessed criteria.

Councillor Smith commented that she appreciated officers' efforts to simplify the report, but that she now found it less meaningful. She also questioned the use of 2015/16 data in relation to gross value added and the figures relating to the percentage of residents within 30 minutes travel of major employment centres. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that the Board had agreed that the report should be quite high level and track back to the priorities set. Some use was made of national statistical data and this did have a tendency to lag. A six month review process was in place so there might be further refinements to the reporting arrangements. He understood that the figures relating to the percentage of residents within 30 minutes travel of major employment

centres had been sourced from the Greater Cambridge Partnership, but he would clarify this outside of the meeting.

Councillor Boden commented that there had been a robust examination of performance reporting by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which had included a discussion of the level of detail required by different audiences. The report to the Board was designed to give an indication of warning rather than detailed data. More detailed performance reports were submitted to the relevant Committees for review. On this basis he judged that the report was at the right level to provide the necessary assurance.

It was resolved to note the May Delivery Dashboard.

353. BUDGET: PROVISIONAL OUTTURN

In the absence of the Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance the Mayor invited the Interim Chief Finance Officer to introduce the report.

The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that the 2018/19 outturn figures contained in the report remained provisional as they were still subject to external audit. The draft financial statement for 2018/19 would be considered by the Audit and Governance Committee on 31 May 2019 and published in draft that afternoon. An additional column had been added to the 2018/19 revenue table which showed the month 10 position. This reflected the on-going development of the report's content and presentation. Paragraph 2.6 set out the variances between the predicted revenue outturn position and the annual budget across key business areas while Paragraphs 2.8 to 2.16 set out the variances within the capital programme. There was an 8.6% variance on the capital programme which related primarily to the timing of projects and which was being actively managed. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had expressed the wish to spend some time understanding the final outturn position and this was welcomed. The Chief Finance Officer proposed that, with the consent of the meeting, recommendation (b) should be revised to make clear the proposed carry forward for both the revenue and capital budgets. No objections were raised.

Councillor Herbert asked why Appendix 2 (capital programme outturn 2018/19) showed lots of actuals to the end of March 2019 then lots of late spend variance. Officers stated that the second column containing actuals to March 2019 represented the actual spend. The predicted outturn was the figures report to the Board at its previous meeting in March 2019. The actuals column was what would be reported in the accounts.

Councillor Boden commented that he judged that there had been a massive improvement in financial budget management, although there was still room for further improvement. He asked whether the use of cumulative figures might be a better way to present the revenue and capital carry forwards. Councillor Boden further commented that he would also welcome the benefits which could be delivered by the appropriate flexing of budgets, although he would want to ensure that budget reporting continued to show clearly where the budget had come from.

The Interim Chief Finance Officer suggested that the first report should show the approved revenue budget for the year and the carry forward to produce a revised revenue budget. A similar approach could be taken in relation to the capital budget.

Councillor Herbert noted that Noel O'Neill, Interim Chief Finance Officer would be leaving the Combined Authority at the end of May 2019 and asked that a vote of thanks be recorded for his sterling service.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Note the provisional outturn position against budget for the year to 31 March 2019;
- b) i. Approve the carry forward of £616,400 of revenue budget underspends to increase the 2019/20 budget and deliver the outcomes identified;
- ii. Approve the carry forward of capital underspends identified in paragraphs 2.8 to 2.16;
- c) Note progress being made in the preparation and audit of the draft Statement of Accounts for 2018/19.

**354. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME- SCHEME APPROVALS: MAY 2019
- BELLE VUE, STANGROUND, PETERBOROUGH**

The Mayor stated that the report contained an appendix which was exempt from publication under Part 1, Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and asked whether any members of the Board wished to discuss that appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Development Manager (Residential) stated that the affordable housing programme consisted of £70m for the delivery of 500 new homes in the City of Cambridge and £100m to be used across the wider Combined Authority area to deliver an additional 2,000 homes. The programme was on track and detailed quarterly updates were provided to the Housing and Communities Committee. The first phase of construction at Belle Vue, Stanground, Peterborough was already underway and would include nine affordable housing units. If approved, the remaining 21 units would also be delivered as affordable housing units.

The Police and Crime Commissioner asked how the Housing Strategy dealt with provision of affordable housing to vulnerable people and expressed disappointment that some schemes were not yet targeting support to vulnerable individuals and groups. He commented that he was also talking about the provision of supported housing. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that the Combined Authority's target was to provide affordable homes, so there may not be an opportunity to target these at vulnerable groups. The CPVS would however contact the RSL's who were providing affordable housing to ask them what percentage of homes which were going to vulnerable individuals and households and to consider whether the Housing Strategy could offer any further opportunities to address this.

Councillor Holdich welcomed the proposal, commenting that Peterborough City Council had a good record for providing housing for those in greatest need. However, whilst acknowledging the need to provide affordable housing to vulnerable groups and households, he emphasised the importance of creating mixed and sustainable communities.

Councillor Herbert commented that the waiting list for housing at Cambridge City currently stood at around 2,000 households so demand continued to greatly outstrip supply. Allocation was based on need so those with particular vulnerabilities would be placed higher on the waiting list.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Commit grant funding of £735,000 from the £100m Affordable Housing programme to support conversion of 21 new homes from Open Market sale to Affordable Rent at Belle Vue, Stanground, Peterborough.

355. £70M CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME 2019/20 BUDGET

The Board reviewed the recommendation that underspend from the 2018/19 budget should be carried forward to 2019/20 and added to the recommended budget provision for 2019/20. It was noted that performance updates for the programme were reported to the Housing and Communities Committee on a quarterly basis and most recently in April 2019. The Interim Chief Finance Officer brought to the attention of the Board that the recommendation (b) related to revenue carry forward and that the report also identified a similar carry forward of capital which would be identified in the budget for the new financial year

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 £1,505,274 from the approved 2018/19 budget into the 2019/20 financial year
- c) Approve 2019/20 budget provision of £19,102,771, giving a total budget of £20,608,045 once the carry forward from 2019/20 is included to enable the programme to continue.

356. LOCAL HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE CAPITAL GRANT ALLOCATION 2019/20

The Combined Authority Board was consulted regarding the Mayor's intention to allocate grants totaling £23,541,459 to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council in line with the Department for Transport formula as set out in the table below.

The Mayor approved the allocation of grants as set below:

Constituent Council	Allocation /£
Peterborough City Council	4,958,107
Cambridgeshire County Council	18,583,352
Total	£23,541,459

357. DELEGATION OF PASSENGER TRANSPORT POWERS

The Board considered a recommendation to delegate the role of Travel Concessionaire Authority and other powers set out in paragraph 2.7 of the report to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council for 2019/20. This was consistent with previous practice.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree the delegation of transport powers to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council for the 2019/2020 financial year - as set out in paragraph 2.7 (a).

358. PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

The Interim Head of Transport sought the Board's agreement to commence public consultation on the draft Local Transport Plan and to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport Committee, to allocate funding for consultation from the 2019/20 Local Transport Plan Budget allocation and to make any non-material drafting improvements to the draft before publication in line with Board Members' views. Steven Bishop from Steer was also in attendance.

Councillor Boden commented that he would await the outcome of the consultation, but from his own perspective he noted that the project map showed nothing to join up the north and the south of the county. Improved transport links between the north and south were just as important as those between the east and the west and in his view it was essential that this message was conveyed.

Councillor Smith commented that the section relating to South Cambridgeshire described it as a predominantly rural district with no settlement larger than 10,000. This was incorrect as Cambourne had over 12,000 residents. She found the draft consultation to be lightweight and weak and as a result would be abstaining from the vote. In her view it focused primarily on upgrades to the road transport network and did not give sufficient weight to high quality, affordable public transport. She acknowledged that the Plan was for consultation only at this stage, but was disappointed by what she perceived to be the failure to build in sufficient aspiration around public transport.

Councillor Holdich expressed disappointment that the draft Plan did not draw links with the spatial strategy. However, as it was a consultation document he was minded to let it go and see what response was received.

Councillor Hickford commented that he was grateful that the consultation period had been extended to allow Councils to discuss it at their September meetings.

Councillor Herbert commented that his impression was more positive than negative. Given the number of transport schemes which the Combined Authority was supporting there was a need for a strategy to pull them all together. In his view the Authority should at the end of the consultation be in a position to go back to Constituent Councils and the public with recommendations on five to eight key projects to pursue. Inclusive growth must be a part of this. Whilst accepting that the road network was an issue in parts of the county he judged that there was a lack of investment in rail which could, if addressed, be transformative in some areas. In his view the key issues were inclusivity, north/ south transport links and better engagement on public transport.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Note the draft Local Transport Plan for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and approve consultation on the basis of the draft.
- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport Committee, to allocate funding for public consultation from the 2019/20 Local Transport Plan Budget allocation and make non-material drafting improvements in line with Board Members' views to the draft Local Transport Plan before public consultation.

The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority was continually working to improve the rail network in Cambridgeshire, and in particular the link between Peterborough and London via Cambridge. There was an understanding with Network Rail and the Department for Transport that this was the right plan with more trains provided which ran later. Work was already underway through the Bus Review to continue to improve bus services. Reductions in fares for NHS workers had led to increased usage and discussions regarding the frequency of services on the Guided Busway were already taking place. The CAM Metro system would deliver public transport to rural areas on an unprecedented scale. However, there were still parts of the county with such poor road links that improvements to the road network must also form part of the wider strategy.

359. NON-STATUTORY STRATEGIC SPATIAL FRAMEWORK PHASE 2 – PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Councillor Boden commented that he had only been appointed to the Board by Fenland District Council within the last few days and taken on the role of Portfolio Holder for Spatial Planning. He had already had a good introductory discussion with the Director of Delivery and Strategy and was excited by some elements of the Non-Statutory Strategic Spatial Framework (NSSF). However, he judged that there were some gaps in the Framework as currently drafted and that it did not yet demonstrate the level of challenge, vision and ambition for the future which was needed. The proposed consultation document read as though the proposals were already agreed. In terms of presentation it would be preferable to raise questions first to encourage fresh thought and innovation, followed by suggested options rather than the reverse which currently the case. A good NSSF was not a local plan; rather, it should be a challenging document designed to resolve competing principles and to take account of the significant social and technological changes which could place within the next 30 years. Many companies and organisations within Cambridgeshire were devoting considerable time, expertise and resources to addressing exactly these questions and the Combined Authority needed to listen to what they had to say. Councillor Boden commented that he had planned to suggest amending the proposed consultation document prior to issue, but on reflection he proposed to withdraw the report and bring back a broader and more ambitious version which also better reflected links with key partners such as the police and health service, preferably to the meeting in July 2019.

Councillor Holdich commented that he would support this proposal. The current draft did not in his view provide sufficient focus on infrastructure and he judged that further work would be valuable.

Councillor Smith welcomed Councillor Boden's proposal, commenting that he had voiced the reservations which she also had with the consultation document as drafted. She would be content for the revision to take a little longer if needed in order to allow sufficient time to draw in the necessary expertise. In particular she felt that there was a

need to reach a collective position on housing delivery and the need to spread economic growth across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Councillor Herbert agreed that the NSSF needed to be strategic and forward-thinking. The Combined Authority had not yet resolved how the additional housing which it was committed to delivering related to the 100,000 new homes contained in plans around the county that were not yet being progressed. It would be important to engage Constituent Councils and he would welcome the opportunity to provide input. Councillor Boden commented that he would welcome comments from all members of the Board to inform the revision of the NSSF before it was brought back for decision.

The report was withdrawn.

360. CONNECTING CAMBRIDGESHIRE: DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Board reviewed progress with the Digital Connectivity Programme over the past year and considered proposals for a new stretch target for full fibre coverage and the incorporation of fibre ducting in future transport schemes. It was noted that the programme now included a delivery plan for public access Wi-Fi in market towns by December 2019.

Councillor Bull welcomed the report and commented that he fully supported the enhanced targets. Huntingdonshire District Council would continue to work closely on this with officers from the Combined Authority.

Councillor Boden also welcomed on the report and suggested that in future it would be helpful to include both the current and profiled positions.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the progress of the Digital Connectivity Programme during 2018/19 and outline objectives for 2019/20.
- b) Endorse the proposal to include provision of fibre ducting in all future CPCA area transport schemes as part of the forthcoming Local Transport Plan.
- c) Endorse the proposed increase to the full fibre coverage target to over 30% coverage by 2022 within the existing programme budget.

BY RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD

361. FOR APPROVAL AS ACCOUNTABLE BODY: I. GROWTH DEAL PROJECT PROPOSALS MAY 2019 (KEY DECISION), II. GROWTH PROGRAMME BUDGET MONITOR, III. ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN

The Chair of the Business Board stated that the Business Board had met the previous day and was pleased to recommend two Growth Deal Project Proposals to the Combined Authority Board for approval. The Mayor thanked the Chair and Members of the Business Board for their detailed consideration of all of the proposals which had been submitted to the Combined Authority Board for approval as Accountable Body.

It was resolved by a majority to:

1. GROWTH DEAL PROJECT PROPOSALS MAY 2019 (KD2019/008)

- a) Approve those schemes recommended by the Business Board at its meeting on 28 May 2019.

2. GROWTH PROGRAMME BUDGET MONITOR

- a) Agree the submission of the Growth Deal monitoring report to Government to end Q4 2018/19.
- b) Agree the launch and to note the spec of call for next round of Local Growth Fund (LGF) projects.

3. ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN

- a) Approve the final Annual Delivery Plan for 2019-20 for submission to Government.

362. GREATER PETERBOROUGH INWARD INVESTMENT PILOT

A declaration of non-pecuniary interest in this item was made by Councillor J Holdich as a member of the Opportunity Peterborough Board.

On the recommendation of the Business Board, the Combined Authority Board considered arrangements for a one year contract on inward investment support activity with the objective of creating new jobs and boosting productivity.

Councillor Boden commented that there still appeared to be considerable confusion in the use of the terms 'Peterborough' and 'Greater Peterborough'. Three specific economic units had been identified in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report and it was vital to be clear and consistent in the use of this terminology.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was supportive of the work being done by Opportunity Peterborough. However, under the new staffing structure at the Combined Authority there was no longer a Head of Inward Investment and he was not sure that this and other proposals were being looked at in a joined up way.

Councillor Holdich commented that the proposal related to a pilot project and would be an extension of the work already being done. As such, he commended the proposals to the Board.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Consider the proposal for a pilot one-year inward investment service for Greater Peterborough area; and
- b) Approve the one-year contract funds to Peterborough City.

363. GROWTH COMPANY STRATEGIC OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE

The Mayor stated that the report contained an appendix which was exempt from publication under Part 1, Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

1972 and asked whether any members of the Board wished to discuss that appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

On the recommendation of the Business Board, the Combined Authority Board had approved the Local Industrial Strategy on 27 March 2019. This contained the creation of a new Growth Company for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as a major new innovation. Following further work the Business Board now recommended that the Combined Authority Board approve the development of an Outline Business Case for September 2019 and authorise officers to form a Company Limited by Guarantee in June 2019. There was a time-limited opportunity to establish the Growth Company in time for it to make an application for funding. The £2m which it was proposed to invest in the new Growth Company would attract a further £19.6m of funding. A further report would be brought back to the Board in September 2019 which would offer the opportunity to review the position and to stop the project should the Board choose.

Councillor Boden commented that he hoped that the proposals would prove successful, but that the Board must not be afraid to stop the project in September 2019 if it was not proceeding as hoped.

Councillor Herbert commented that there was a lot of informative detail in the exempt appendix to the report, but that he did not wish the meeting to go into closed session to discuss this. He asked whether it would be possible to publish a redacted Strategic Outline Business Case. He asked who would sit on the Board of the Growth Company, how it would be accountable and what influence the Growth Company Board would have over spend. Officers stated that it was proposed in the short term to slot the Growth Company into the Housing Company arrangements. The Housing Company Board would comprise of members of the Combined Authority Board and a report would be brought back to the Board to make these appointments. In the longer term the governance arrangements would form part of the report which would be brought back to the Board in September 2019. Officers would also review the information contained in the exempt appendix and see whether there was more information which could appropriately be included in the public report in September.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Approve the development of an Outline Business Case for September 2019;
- b) Authorise Officers to form a Company Limited by Guarantee in June 2019
- c) Agree the funding strategy for the services and authorise Officers to:
 - i) Submit proposals for external funding to Local Growth Fund, Growing Places Fund, European social Fund and European Regional Development Fund;
 - ii) Submit, through the subsequent Outline Business Case proposals for internal funding from within the already agreed Medium Term Financial Plan of the Business Board and its Enterprise Zone receipts.

The Police and Crime Commissioner left the meeting.

364. ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

The single Assurance Framework was agreed by the Business Board and the Combined Authority Board in March 2019. Final checks had now been undertaken against the Government guidance and reporting requirements and an updated single Assurance Framework produced. For completeness, this revised version was being brought back to both the Business Board and the Combined Authority Board for sign-off. The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) advice was that was that the Assurance Framework was expected to be kept under review so it would be brought back to the Board periodically.

Councillor Smith commented that the amended Assurance Framework had been included in the supplementary document pack tabled at the meeting which did not allow time for Board members to review it properly. Officers stated that they had only just received comments from BEIS so it was a judgement call on whether to bring it as a tabled paper to the Business Board and Combined Authority in May 2019 to provide members with early sight of the revised document or to delay until the following meeting when it could be published a week before the meeting in the usual way.

The Mayor stated that the recommendation to agree the revised single Assurance Framework had come from the Business Board which had detailed oversight of this document. The Combined Authority Board needed to trust the Business Board to discharge this responsibility. The Business Board had considered the Assurance Framework when it had met the previous afternoon so it was not possible for the Combined Authority Board to have sight of its comments before today. Councillor Smith commented that she accepted that this was the role of the Business Board, but that as a point of principle it was bad practice for late papers to be presented at such short notice.

Councillor Herbert commented that it was not clear from the report that the Business Board served a geographical area almost twice the size of the area served by the Combined Authority. He asked how long this would remain the case given that the Local Enterprise Partnership review had recommended that the Business Board's geographical coverage should be co-terminus with that of the Combined Authority. The Mayor stated that the Business Board area would become co-terminus with that of the Combined Authority. In the meantime, the projects that it was supporting in neighbouring counties such as the investment in a Haverhill business park agreed the previous day could also have a positive impact on Cambridgeshire businesses and residents.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Agree the revised single Assurance Framework (tabled), which is in line with the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government's revised National Local Growth Assurance Framework for Mayoral Combined Authorities with a Single Pot and Local Enterprise Partnership.

The Mayor offered his thanks to Aamir Khalid for his work as Chair of the Business Board as he would be stepping down from this role following his appointment as the new CEO of TWI Ltd. Mr Khalid thanked the Mayor and commented that he had seen significant developments in the role of the Business Board during his period as chair. Whilst he was stepping down from this role he would remain on the Business Board and continue to support its work.

365. CREATION OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH EMPLOYMENT & SKILLS BOARD INCORPORATING SKILLS ADVISORY PANEL AND ADULT EDUCATION BUDGET GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

On the recommendation of the Skills Committee, the Combined Authority Board considered a recommendation to approve the creation of a Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Employment & Skills Board, its proposed terms of reference and governance. This had been referenced in the Devolution Deal and would condense the work of three bodies into one.

Councillor Holdich commented that that funding for the Adult Education Budget would be top-sliced to focus on the modern skills that Cambridgeshire required.

Councillor Smith suggested that membership be widened to include the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership. Officers confirmed that a collaborative approach would continue to be taken in relation to both business and public sector partners.

It was resolved by a majority to:

- a) Agree to the creation of a Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Employment & Skills Board
- b) Agree to the proposed Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Employment & Skills Board Terms of Reference
- c) Approve the proposed Terms of Reference and Governance.

366. SKILLS BROKERAGE CONTACT AND FUTURE OF THE CAREERS AND ENTERPRISE COMPANY CONTRACT FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

A declaration of non-pecuniary interest in this item was made by Councillor J Holdich as a member of the Opportunity Peterborough Board.

Councillor Holdich commented that skills brokerage was already taking place across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Opportunity Peterborough was supporting the north of the county whilst Form the Future was supporting the south. The pilot project would run for a year with lessons being learned over that period.

Councillor Smith commented that there was always a risk that the value of a pilot project could be undermined if it was underfunded and asked if the proposed level of funding was sufficient. It would be important to invest properly in seeding skills development now to feed future economic development. Officers stated that the figures proposed represented officers' best estimate for the work required based on the current position. The results of the pilot project would be reported to the Board in a year's time, via the Skills Committee.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Agree to the grant of £272,500 for Skills Brokerage to Peterborough City Council as accountable body for Opportunity Peterborough for the delivery of the Skills Contract.

- b) Agree to a revised contract with the Careers and Enterprise Company (CEC) to August 2020 and linking the match funding provided to Peterborough City Council for Opportunity Peterborough.
- c) Agree to the grant of £37,500 to Form the Future, funded via the revised CEC contract, to provide 50% funding for 1.5 Full Time Equivalents for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire skills brokerage delivery.

367. UNIVERSITY OF PETERBOROUGH - OUTCOMES OF REVIEW AND REFLECT LEADING TO THE PROGRESSION OF AN OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE

A declaration of non-pecuniary interest was made by Councillor L Herbert in relation to this item as he was until recently an employee of Anglia Ruskin University.

On the recommendation of the Skills Committee, the Combined Authority Board considered the proposals arising from the review and reflect process. The Interim Chief Finance Officer stated that a detailed report had been submitted to the Skills Committee which identified exactly how the funding would be spent. The proposal was to release £300,000 of allocated capital funds for 2019/20 together with £235,000 revenue funding. No revenue budget had been set for this project, but there was £1m available for feasibility studies within the revenue budget. The Board had asked previously to be consulted when it was proposed to release funds from this budget and its agreement was now being sought.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was fully supportive of the project, but felt there was a need for a more transparent update to the Board on where the project stood, the proposed route to market and the funding position.

Councillor Holdich commented that he would be happy to provide an update report, but that it would be better to do so after the consultants' report had been received and considered. This was likely to be around September 2019. The application for accreditation to the Office of Students had been submitted and, if successful, would be worth around £100m in funding.

Councillor Smith commented that she felt that there had been inadequate research into the nature and level of actual demand and asked what further work was planned. She also asked what the added value of attending the University of Peterborough would be in comparison to other higher education providers. She further commented that she had been greatly impressed by the inspirational leadership evident at the new university at Milton Keynes. Officers stated that they were currently collating responses to a survey of 200 business in and around Peterborough which sought to identify the workforce skills they required. It was acknowledged that the University of Peterborough would need a unique selling point to establish its place amongst providers and by working with the Business Board, local businesses and the Skills Committee it would be possible to identify and address the skills needs of priority sectors. A strong investment strategy would also be needed. Santander PLC was supporting the new university at Milton Keynes and the University of Peterborough would need support of that type. The changes could not all be introduced immediately so a blended approach was required to move towards a course offer which would better meet the skills needs of the local economy and encourage graduates to stay and contribute to the local economy.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the findings of the reviews that recommend the way forward for the University of Peterborough to be developed to meet the outcomes of the

- b) Approve:
- i. Running an academic partner review, comparison and selection process that includes PRC, ARU and others.
 - ii. Release £300,000 of capital funding identified in the 2019/20 Capital Programme to deliver items 3 and 5 of the programme outlined in Table B in the report and power is delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairman of the Skills Committee, to approve/agree Officer Decision Notices to maintain the momentum in project delivery for items 3 of Table B – Timescales for commitment and spend of funding. Progress will be reported back to the Skills Committee in July.
 - iii. Approve the release of £235,000 from the non-transport feasibility funding in the revenue budget for 2019/20 to deliver items 1, 2, 4 and 6 in Table B in the report and power is delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairman of the Skills Committee, to approve/agree Officer Decision Notices to maintain the momentum in project delivery for items 1, 2 and 4 of table B – Timescale for commitment and spend of funding. Progress will be reported back to the Skills Committee in July.
 - iv. The Action plan and Timescales set out, noting they both enable meeting the original objective of 2000 students on the Embankment site by 2022.
 - v. Officers procuring expert consultants to support the execution of that Action plan to these timescales.
 - vi. Agree to a review, through the Outline Business Case Process, of the current assumptions regarding:
 - a. The level of CPCA capital investment in the build; and
 - b. The Governance Process of the University Programme.
- c) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive to enter into the contractual relationships following the procurement of the external consultants required to undertake the activities specified.
- d) The definition of the University as set out in 2.5 of the report.

The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority was committed not just to creating a university at Peterborough, but to creating the best possible university. Discussions were already taking place with potential investors to support this ambition.

368. SKILLS STRATEGY

On the recommendation of the Skills Committee, the Combined Authority Board considered the proposed approval and adoption of the Skills Strategy.

Councillor Holdich commented that the Skills Strategy was a robust and evidence-based document which had been drafted by an expert author group following significant consultation with business, the Adult Education Board and providers.

Councillor Smith described the Skills Strategy as full of aspiration, but quite lightweight in describing in how those aspirations would be turned in to reality. Officers stated that this detail would be contained in the delivery plans. The Adult Education Board delivery plan was already available and the Skills, Talent and Apprenticeship Hub delivery plan was being progressed via the Growth Company.

Councillor Holdich commented that the Skills Committee was working well and welcomed input from members.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve and adopt the Skills Strategy at Appendix A of the Business Board report.

369. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Combined Authority Board would meet next on Wednesday, 26 June 2019 at 10:30am in the Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge CB3 0AP

(Mayor)