



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

JAMES PALMER
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR

Date: Wednesday 29 April 2020

Time: 10.30am – 1.15pm

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

Present: J Palmer (Mayor)

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 L Dupré, Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee

512. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor welcomed the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government's recognition of the role of Mayoral Combined Authorities in working with partners to lead the country's recovery out of the economic impacts of Covid-19. The Mayor also placed on record his pleasure at the Prime Minister's recovery from Covid-19, his return to work and the announcement of the safe arrival of his baby son. The Prime Minister had requested a call with Mayors at the end of the week and Mayoral Combined Authorities were at the heart of the Government's plans for economic recovery.

Apologies for absence were received from Jessica Bawden, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group and Councillor Ray Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The Mayor declared an interest in Item 6.1: £100m Affordable Housing Programme - Approval of Revised Business Plan for Angle Developments (East) Ltd. The Mayor left the meeting for the duration of the item and the vote.

513. MINUTES OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING ON 29 JANUARY 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 29 January 2020 were confirmed as an accurate record. A copy would be signed by the Mayor when practicable.

514. MINUTES OF THE MAYORAL DECISION-MAKING MEETING ON 25 MARCH 2020

The minutes of the Mayoral decision-making meeting on 25 March 2020 were confirmed as a correct record. A copy would be signed by the Mayor when practicable.

515. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no petitions or public questions, but a number of questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Those relating to items on the agenda would be heard under the relevant item. Those not relating to items on the agenda would receive a written response.

516. FORWARD PLAN – 21 APRIL 2020

The Board reviewed the Forward Plan published with the meeting agenda on 21 April 2020. There were no requests to reserve any committee reports to the Board for decision

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

Approve the Forward Plan

517. BUDGET MONITOR UPDATE – APRIL 2020

A favourable variance of forecast revenue expenditure against budget of £5.5m was reported (£30.8m against a budget of £36.3m). The forecast underspend on the capital budget had increased by £12.7m since the report to the Board in November 2019 and full details of material variances, including mitigations and responses, were set out at Appendix 3 to the report. Preparations for the year end closedown were in hand and a report would be brought in June setting out which underspends were due to project slippage and which might be re-profiled or re-allocated. Priorities were being reviewed in the light of Covid-19 priorities in order to identify those most focused on economic recovery, but all proposals would continue to maintain a balanced and affordable budget.

Councillor Herbert asked for more information about underspends relating to the Bus Review Implementation, the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro Outline Business Case (CAM OBC) and the King's Dyke Level Crossing Scheme. The Chief Finance Officer stated that a full review of the Bus Review Implementation had been conducted following the appointment of a permanent project manager and this had resulted in the re-phasing of project expenditure. The project was still expected to be delivered within the budget and timescale proposed. Authority would be sought from the Board in June 2020 to carry forward the underspend on the CAM OBC. Councillor Herbert asked whether the CAM OBC report would be presented to the Board in July 2020. The Mayor confirmed that this was the current expectation and offered a written reply.

It was resolved to:

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

518. UPDATE ON THE COMBINED AUTHORITY'S RESPONSE TO COVID-19 AND FUNDING DECISIONS

This report was added to the Forward Plan as a Key Decision on 21 April 2020 under the General Exception arrangements set out in the Constitution.

The Combined Authority aimed to support Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's economic recovery through an immediate, short term and medium term response. This would involve a wide range of measures including repayment holidays for those in receipt of Business Board loans and the Covid-19 Capital Grant Scheme. The Capital Grant Scheme would be available to small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) for sums of £2k-50k at up to 80% intervention rate and £50k-100k at 100% intervention rate. Whilst these must demonstrate that they would support the creation of new jobs there would also be a focus on preserving existing jobs. 155 applications had been received to date with seven granted so far. The applications in the pipeline would, if approved, already exceed the £2.4m currently available so the Board's agreement was sought to allocate an additional £3m of Local Growth Fund (LGF) monies to this scheme. The report also sought the Board's agreement to the creation of a £500k capital grant scheme aimed at supporting the smallest businesses in the Combined Authority area including sole traders. This scheme would offer grants of between £2k-5k at an intervention rate of 80% and was designed to be quick and simple both to apply for and to administer. The Growth Hub had also been re-oriented to advise companies on the grants and loans available to them. Governance would be managed through the Economic Recovery Sub-Group and the Mayor was convening weekly forums with key stakeholders and partners. Business bulletins were being issued weekly and had reached over 40,000 businesses across the region. The Housing and Development Team was considering whether any measures were required in relation to the £40m revolving loan fund and would submit proposals to the Board if appropriate. Local bus service providers reported a 90% drop in ridership. Following discussions between the Mayor, his fellow Combined Authority Mayors and Ministers the Government had announced a £167m national bus subsidy scheme which would benefit local operators by around £5m. An anomaly had been identified whereby some bus contracts saw Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council taking the revenue risk for fares. The Mayor had written to Ministers about this and the Government had adjusted the scheme. The Mayor was also in conversation with Ministers around transport projects and how these might be progressed in accordance with social distancing requirements. Going forward, consideration would also be needed on the impact on travel patterns and behaviours beyond the immediate situation.

Councillor Smith offered her congratulations to the Director of Business and Skills and his team on their work in support of business which she described as impressive. She welcomed confirmation that the support being offered would seek to safeguard existing jobs as well as creating new ones and asked that Board members should receive copies of the Business Bulletin being sent to local businesses. She further welcomed the proposed £500k capital grant scheme designed to support sole traders and the smallest businesses as she considered these to be vital to the supply chain and those currently most at risk. However, she asked whether this sum should not be higher and whether the support could be used to pay off loans on capital assets. Officers stated that the £500k proposed for

the new capital grant scheme would be used to test the market and gauge the level of demand. The Board would be provided with feedback on uptake and whether additional funding should be considered. It would be difficult under the existing LGF regulations to give loans to small companies where there would be only a small impact on jobs, but officers were discussing this with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). The interpretation of the additionality test had also been raised with BEIS and officers were hopeful of a positive response.

Mr Adams commended the Director of Business and Skills and his team on their exceptional work and the speed and creativity of the offer to business. Members of the Business Board had been briefed by email on the proposal to allocate £3m LGF funding to the Covid-19 Capital Grant Scheme from unallocated LGF funds and had supported this unanimously. He further supported the proposed creation of the £500k capital grant scheme to support the smallest businesses in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Whilst this funding might not prove sufficient he judged it was important to get things moving. In relation to those with loans for capital equipment, Mr Adams suggested they advise their lender if they were experiencing any difficulties with repayments and discuss the possibility of repayment holidays.

Councillor Count welcomed the report which he described as excellent. He sought more information about the governance controls which would be in place around the allocation of the proposed £500k capital grant scheme and who would be approving the expenditure. The Director of Business and Skill stated that officers would be making allocation decisions against the qualification criteria. This would include checks around proof of purchase, company accounts, creditors and county court judgements. Five officers were currently carrying out evaluations of applications which would rise to eight. Their recommendations were submitted to the Team Leader COVID-19 Capital Grant Scheme for checking and approval and a random sample were quality tested by the Deputy Chief Officer for Business and Skills. Councillor Count confirmed that he has satisfied with this process.

The Mayor commended the exceptional work being done by the Business Board and the Combined Authority's Business and Skills team. Their dynamic action was to be applauded and he had discussed this with Ministers who had been similarly impressed.

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

- a) Approve the Combined Authority responses to COVID-19, as described in this report
- b) Approve the Recover Orient Adapt and Regrowth (ROAR) approach, set out in Appendix A
- c) Approve the offer of interest-accruing repayment holidays to companies in receipt of a Local Growth Fund loans, covering repayments due between 24th March 2020 and 31st August 2020
- d) Approve the adjustment of the current Small Capital Grant Scheme eligibility criteria on Intervention rates, Jobs output-value ratio to grant-value,

including safeguarded jobs in output measures for grants, subject to consultation with BEIS where appropriate

- e) Approve the allocation of £3million Local Growth Funding to the COVID-19 Capital Grant Scheme, from returned unallocated Local Growth Funding.
- f) Approve the creation of a £500,000 capital grant scheme aimed at supporting the smallest businesses in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority area and delegate to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Mayor, the Section 73 and the Monitoring Officer, the setting of detailed parameters and criteria for the scheme.

519. SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL

The Board's approval was sought to release £150k from the provisional allocation in the Medium-Term Financial Plan to continue with the sustainable travel project in Peterborough. A range of interventions had been delivered during the 2019/20 financial year to influence sustainable travel behaviours including bespoke travel plans for businesses, the Peterborough "Bike It!" project and a number of public events and had been well-received.

Councillor Holdich stated that the project was working and that Peterborough City Council endorsed the proposal that additional funds should be released to enable it to continue.

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

Approve the release of £150,000 from the provisional allocation in the Medium-Term Financial Plan to continue with the sustainable travel project within Peterborough.

520. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN SUB-STRATEGY – CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTONOMOUS METRO

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

The Transport and Infrastructure Committee had approved proposals to develop a Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) Sub-Strategy to the Local Transport Plan (LTP) on 6 March 2020. Subject to the Board's agreement, a 12 week online consultation would be launched and the results presented to the Board at its meeting in July 2020.

Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Herbert, moved an amendment to recommendation (b) to the report that the Board:

- (b) Agree for a public consultation exercise to be conducted in relation to the proposed Sub-Strategy with the results of that consultation being brought back to a further meeting of the Combined Authority Board. **Prior to publication of the consultation to agree that officers amend the**

draft CAM sub-strategy to ensure that the role of existing and emerging Local Plans in determining future growth is explicit, and that the potential part CAM contributes in supporting those Plans is also made clear.

Councillor Herbert spoke in favour of the amendment, commenting that there were a significant number of consented planning applications which would be delivering new housing and supporting growth, but that developers wanted the security of knowing these would be supported by the necessary transport infrastructure. He emphasised his view that local transport plans must underpin local plans.

Councillor Smith stated that she was supportive of the CAM project and acknowledged the infrastructure deficit which the Combined Authority faced. However, she judged it was important to recognise the sovereignty of each District's Local Plan. She wished to see those projects on which her District's Local Plan was dependent going ahead without delay. She expressed concern at the report's assertion that all elements of the CAM proposals were essential components of the overarching LTP vision when there might not be sufficient funding available and it was not yet possible to envisage what post-Covid work patterns might look like. Councillor Smith judged that there was a need to be clear about the delivery phases for each element of the CAM.

Councillor Count commented that his understanding was that some elements of the CAM project would be delivered earlier than others to support immediate growth. Officers confirmed that the Sub-Strategy set out the overall vision for the CAM, but that within this there were still many sub-projects to be developed, many of which linked to Local Plan proposals.

Councillor Fuller expressed some sympathy with the amendment, commenting that there was a need to recognise that Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council were in a slightly different position in relation to their Local Plans than other constituent councils. None of the planned growth in Huntingdonshire was dependent on the CAM, but he suspected that this would not be the case in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City and he asked how the CAM Sub-Strategy would fit in with local planners' deliverability test. Officers stated that the Sub-Strategy document stated that components of the CAM project should be in support of strategic sites and that there had been discussions with local councils around this.

Councillor Bailey commented that so far the Board had been unanimous in its support of the CAM proposals brought before it. She agreed that Local Plans were sovereign and that they did determine future growth, but was unclear on the need for the amendment.

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

The Mayor invited comments on the original recommendations contained in the report. Councillor Herbert expressed the hope that careful consideration would be given to the consultation responses which were received. He noted that the Local Transport Plan had only been agreed by the Board in January 2020 and suggested that returning to it so soon could cause developers to worry. Having spoken with all members of the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), the University of

Cambridge and local business representatives their view was that decisions should be taken in the summer to support much needed housing and development projects. He would respond constructively to the consultation, but remained of the view that the consultation should recognise the content of Local Plans and on that basis would be abstaining from the vote. The Mayor stated that he did not feel that there had been a lack of desire at any stage within the GCP to create the right framework. However, he judged that the GCP's vision did not take into account the wider challenges facing the county. There had been a reliance on short-term thinking in relation to transport solutions around the county. This did not mean that short-term measures could not be considered, but this should not be done without consideration being given to the need beyond Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Bailey commented that the draft consultation document contained a single reference to freight capacity which she judged to be somewhat anomalous as there was no further narrative or analysis around this issue. She felt this could be confusing and suggested it might be omitted.

Councillor Smith judged that more clarity was needed around the timeframe for other sub-strategies which would be coming forward and asked to see details on this.

Councillor Count asked for more information about the timings indicated and whether it was possible these might be exceeded. He further asked for more information around the role of both segregated and non-segregated transport options and commented that in addition to recognising the CAM's role in supporting new employment growth it was important to recognise that it would also be serving existing employment sites. Councillor Count stated his belief that the Combined Authority had a duty to continue supporting growth in the south of the county, but noted that once again nothing was planned in relation to the north of the county and the Fens. In his judgement it was an incomplete plan as it was not seeking to equalise opportunity across the county. Officers stated that if it was possible to over-achieve against the timetables described this would be done. Technical advice was being obtained in relation to segregated and non-segregated transport options and there was scope to add in additional stopping points.

As the recommendations related to the Local Transport Plan the Board noted that a vote in favour by at least two thirds of all Members or Substitute Members appointed by the Constituent Councils, to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council or their Substitute Members, was required for the vote to be carried.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Holdich, it was resolved by a majority, including votes in favour by the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, to:

- a) Note the draft Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) Local Transport Plan Sub Strategy that sets out the vision for the CAM metro as a whole, against which schemes contributing to the CAM will be considered; and

- b) Agree for a public consultation exercise to be conducted in relation to the proposed Sub Strategy with the results of that consultation being brought back to a further meeting of the Combined Authority Board.

The Mayor called a short adjournment at 12.07pm. The meeting resumed at 12.27pm

BY RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

521. LANCASTER WAY A142/ A10 ROUNDABOUT IMPROVEMENTS

The Board received a report seeking approval to a new additional budget of £1,168,243.20 from the 2020/21 single pot allocation to reflect current cost estimates for the Lancaster Way A142/ A10 Roundabout Improvement Scheme and to grant delegated authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Mayor, to approve a reduction in the scope of the scheme to enable delivery of the BP Roundabout alone in the event of the risks set out at in the report materialising. The proposals were considered at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 6 March 2020 and were unanimously endorsed by those present. The decision was deferred from the Mayor's decision-making meeting on 25 March 2020 on the basis of advice that this was not a decision which could be taken by the Mayor under his general power of competence. Correspondence received after the publication of the Combined Authority Board agenda had raised the possibility of increased costs and the need for side letters which had not been known when the proposals were considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee.

Councillor Count commented that this project had a benefit-cost ratio of 80-120 and was of real importance to the people of East Cambridgeshire. He therefore proposed an amendment, seconded by the Mayor, which would avoid unnecessary delays whilst leaving the final decision on whether to approve any additional budget and Covid risk to the Combined Authority Board, to:

- a) Approve a new additional budget of £1,168,243.20 from the 2020/21 single pot allocation to reflect current cost estimate, including a 20% risk allowance.
- b) Grant the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Mayor, delegated authority to **either (i)** approve a reduction in the scope of the scheme to enable delivery of the BP Roundabout alone in the event of the risks set out at paragraph 2.7 of the report materialising **or (ii) to conduct a review of the budget and timetable for the project should there be any further costs arising and refer approval of any additional budget to the Transport Committee.**
- c) **Delegate authority to an extraordinary Transport Committee to approve additional budget for the scheme subject to a full account from the Highways Authority of the reasons for the budget and an assessment of the risks for Covid.**

d) Agree that the Transport Committee are authorised to approve any additional budget and Covid risk subject to ratification of that budget at the next Board meeting.

Councillor Bailey stated that this project was imperative for East Cambridgeshire. Improvements were already planned to the BP Roundabout which would be funded through S106 monies, but without the additional improvements planned for Lancaster Way the full benefit of these works could not be delivered. However, it was important to make clear that this would still be only an interim mitigation in order to establish realistic public expectations around what would be delivered. The District Council was mindful of the issues raised by cyclists, pedestrians and riders and in the longer term would want to see their needs also recognised. Given the current reduction in traffic due to Covid-19 it would be an optimum time to get on site. Councillor Bailey expressed thanks to all partners and stakeholders for their work on progressing these proposals.

Councillor Smith welcomed the sensible checks and balances which the amendment would put in place.

As the recommendations related to the Local Transport Plan the Board noted that a vote in favour by at least two thirds of all Members or Substitute Members appointed by the Constituent Councils, to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council or their Substitute Members, was required for the vote to be carried.

On being put to the vote, the amended recommendations were approved unanimously.

522. ST NEOTS RIVER GREAT OUSE NORTHERN CROSSING CYCLE BRIDGE

The Board considered a summary of work to date on the St Neots Foot and Cycle Bridge and Regatta Meadows. This confirmed that the projected construction costs now exceeded the allocated budget and sought the Board's agreement that the scheme should not proceed as it no longer met the requirements for value for money set out in the Combined Authority's Assurance Framework. It was proposed that the £3.1m of capital funding currently allocated to the project should be re-allocated to projects in delivery of the St Neots Market Town Masterplan. This proposal was unanimously endorsed by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 6 March 2020.

Councillor Fuller commented that there was some disappointment in St Neots that the cycle bridge proposals would not go ahead, but the key point was that the money would still go to the town. Huntingdonshire District Council had big ambitions for St Neots and this money would be used to help deliver those.

As the recommendations related to the Local Transport Plan the Board noted that a vote in favour by at least two thirds of all Members or Substitute Members appointed by the Constituent Councils, to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council or their Substitute Members, was required for the vote to be carried.

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

- a) Agree that work on the St Neots Foot and Cycle Bridge should cease and the project be removed from the Combined Authority's Business Plan; and
- b) Agree that the £3.1m CPCA funding allocated to the project be re-allocated to projects within the St Neots Masterplan.

SKILLS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

523. ADULT EDUCATION BUDGET INNOVATION FUND

The Board considered proposals to attach a further budget line to the Adult Education Budget (AEB) and to use half of these funds for the AEB Innovation Fund. The remaining 50% would go back into the two existing projects. The Innovation Fund would be used to support the response to Covid-19 and also to fund medium and long-term projects. The market welcomed the proposal.

Councillor Holdich, Lead Member for Skills and Chair of the Skills Committee, commented that there was a need in the current climate to find different ways to educate people and that much of the funding would be directed to online learning. The proposals had been considered by the Skills Committee on 27 April 2020 and were endorsed unanimously.

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

Approve the carry forward of 50% of the 2019-20 underspend on the "AEB Devolution Programme – ITP and grant " funding lines and ring-fence this for the Innovation Fund in the 2020-21 Budget, up to a maximum of £500k.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY

524. CONSENT TO THE ADOPTION OF A REVISED BUSINESS PLAN FOR ANGLE DEVELOPMENTS (EAST) LIMITED

The Mayor declared an interest in this item and left the meeting for the duration of the item and the vote. The two Joint Chief Executives, the Monitoring Officer and the Director of Housing and Development also left the meeting for the duration of the item and the vote. The chair passed to Councillor Holdich, Statutory Deputy Mayor and legal counsel was provided by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

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

An initial business plan for Angle Developments (East) Ltd was approved by the Board in March 2019. The business plan was meant to be subject to regular review and further iterations would be brought before the Board in due course. The revised business plan had been considered by the Housing and Communities

Committee on 27 April 2020 and was recommended to the Board for approval by a majority of those present.

Councillor Herbert commented that in setting up a local authority company it was necessary to know that there was a gap in the market. A lot of public money was involved in this company and he asked what difference it would make. Officers stated that the development company was one of a number of tools used by the Combined Authority to deliver the revolving fund element of the programme. The types of activity the company might engage in included direct development, joint ventures, infrastructure enabling and recovery and identifying and seeking out opportunities from the portfolios of the constituent councils.

Councillor Smith commented that she had abstained from the vote on this proposal at the Housing and Communities Committee meeting on 27 April 2020 and that she intended to do so again. She had consistently voted against any Combined Authority schemes to convert commercial holdings into residential properties. She sought clarification of the changes between the existing business plan and the revised version before the Board, noting that original projections had estimated a surplus of around £1.5m whereas the revised version before the Board was showing a potential loss of £126k. Councillor Smith further asked whether Angle Developments (East) Ltd would be the Combined Authority's only vehicle for delivering £100k Homes. Officers stated that the original business plan had been designed to show how the company might work and had been quite generic. The revised plan reflected the changes being made following the appointment of a chairman and as the company became more established. To date, the Combined Authority Board had approved two loan requests submitted by the Development Company, but one of these had subsequently been rejected by the company following further work. The financial projections included in the revised business plan were based on at least eight projects being undertaken during 2023/24. Opportunities for delivering the £100k Homes initiative would be looked at in all contexts including through joint ventures and loan agreement and the challenges would be the same as those faced by any affordable housing proposals. The Development Company was not the only route by which they would be delivered.

Councillor Holdich asked for the name of the chair of Angle Holdings Ltd. Councillor Boden advised that Brian Stewart OBE had been appointed by the Board as the Chairman of both Angle Holdings Limited and Angle Developments (East) Limited.

Councillor Count asked that in future when the Board was being asked to approve changes to an existing document that these should be shown as tracked changes in addition to any narrative. He noted that whilst the revised business plan had been considered and endorsed by the Housing and Communities Committee on 27 April 2020 it had been approved by the Angle Holdings Board on 18 March 2020 and so reflected a very different situation to that being experienced at present in the light of Covid-19. On that basis, he was content to support the adoption of the revised business plan before the Board, but would expect Angle Holdings to bring forward a further revised business plan in due course reflecting the changed situation. Councillor Bailey concurred with this view and further commented that she expected most £100k Homes to be delivered through initiatives such as land value capture, loans from the £40m revolving fund and joint ventures rather than through the Development Company.

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

Consent to the adoption of the revised business plan for Angle Development (East) Limited at Appendix 3.

525. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD

The Mayor returned to the meeting and resumed the chair. Arrangements for the next meeting of the Combined Authority Board would be confirmed nearer the time.

(Mayor)

Combined Authority Board 29 April 2020
Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Item 1.4: Petitions and Public Questions

Q1: The Overview & Scrutiny Committee is concerned by the delay in the appointment of a Chairman of the Independent Commission on Climate Change. Can the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have a statement on the progress on an appointment, and on the progress of work in this area, and when the Committee might expect some engagement with the Chairman once appointed?

Response:

The Mayor has had productive discussions regarding the Chair of the Commission. Any appointment will be made by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Mayor. There are challenges in launching the Commission at the current time, but the Mayor sees the Commission as a priority and he has asked officers to explore appropriate ways to make that happen as soon as possible. Tackling the impact of climate change is vital to meet the Mayor's ambition of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as a world-class place to live, learn and work. Once appointed, there will be a discussion with the Commission on the timescale for their work. As part of their work the Commission will want to get inputs from a wide range of stakeholders. This would include meeting directly with the Board, not the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Q2: The answer provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in March on the plans by Homes England to proactively fund accessible homes and homes that tackle climate change indicated an allocation of £125 million of government monies is being made available through the Care and Support Specialised Housing Fund. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee recognises this will be used to develop new affordable homes, which meet the needs of older people and disabled adults. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee has heard that, to date, just one disabled family has been assisted in the Combined Authority area. Can the Board assure the Overview & Scrutiny Committee that the Combined Authority will be doing all it possibly can to improve the accessibility of new homes and to achieve homes that meet the 2050 carbon-neutral target?

Response:

The Care and Support Specialised Housing Fund (CASSH) is a separate fund to help with the development of specifically specialised housing. Continuous market engagement bidding for up to £125m funding under CASSH Phase Two was opened on Friday 8th June 2018, extending the fund by a further three years up to 31st March 2021 when the current programme ends.

Officers understand funding remains available to develop specialist affordable housing schemes for older people and adults with disabilities or mental health problems.

Applications from developers or registered providers for this fund should be made via Homes England who administer it and they will assess each scheme proposal.

With regard to improving accessibility and carbon neutral issues, policy and decision making lies with local planning authorities and the policies they adopt within their local plans. Local Authorities' local plans usually include guidelines for criteria like accessibility, access and tackling climate change. Building Regulations must also be followed to ensure correct insulation and construction standards and requirements are met.

Q3: The Overview & Scrutiny Committee has expressed some reservation around the transparency of the process to date regarding the Combined Authority headquarters move to Ely. Can the Committee therefore be supplied with details of the process, both to date and moving forward, and when the Board is expected to be asked to make the decision regarding the lease at Alconbury and any new lease to be entered into?

Response:

The Combined Authority keeps under review its operational and revenue costs, and the opportunity to realise a very significant saving has arisen on the lease to the Alconbury site.

This required a quick response and commitment to realise, and officers are now working on detailed terms and will bring the matter before the next Board meeting so that members can review the opportunity, confirm the Lease surrender and discuss alternative sites.

Item 3.3: Local Transport Plan – CAM Sub-Strategy

Q4: When and how does the Combined Authority intend to publish the results of the recent public consultation on the CAM Metro, and how does it intend to use the response to guide its future work on this scheme?

Response:

Consultation closed on 3 April 2020 and the analysis is currently underway. The consultation report will be incorporated into the ongoing OBC work. We expect to publish the report by mid to late summer. A community update letter will be provided on the CAM consultation website in the next couple of weeks once the analysis on the consultation is finished. The new letter will include details of the key findings of the consultation.

Item 6.1: £100m Affordable Housing Programme: Approval of Revised Business Plan for Angle Developments (East) Ltd

Q5: What have been the additional set-up costs of the Angle Holdings traded companies as it is stated that some of these costs would have been incurred in any case?

Response:

The costs associated with setting up Angle Holdings Ltd and Angle Developments (East) Ltd are as set out in Appendix 2 to the Board paper. These include legal costs associated with the creation of the companies' statutory documents including the articles of association and the shareholder agreement. The report states that it is the majority of the 'operating' costs, rather than the 'set up' costs, that would have been incurred by the Combined Authority anyway. These include staffing costs for existing Combined Authority staff seconded to the Development company and a recharged share of service support costs, for example legal, finance and I.T., which would have been incurred whether the business was conducted within the Combined Authority or the subsidiary companies.