



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board Meeting: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 28 July 2021

Time: 10.00am – 2.18pm

Venue: Main Hall, Burgess Hall Events and Conference Centre, One Leisure,
Westwood Road, St Ives PE27 6WU

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council, Councillor W Fitzgerald, Statutory Deputy Mayor – Peterborough City Council, Councillor R Fuller (to 1.43pm) – Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor N Gough (to 1.30pm) – South Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, Councillor E Meschini – Cambridgeshire County Council

Apologies: Councillor L Nethsingha, substituted by Councillor E Meschini; Councillor B Smith, substituted by Councillor N Gough; and Councillor E Murphy

41. Announcements, apologies, and declarations of interest

The Mayor announced that the Combined Authority received £20 million per year Gainshare funding from Central Government. The Government had recently been reviewing progress on the Authority's investments as part of its national Gateway Review process. Following this work, the Mayor was delighted to report that the Combined Authority had passed the first of its scheduled Gateway Reviews. This meant that the next five year tranche of Investment Funds had been successfully unlocked. This would amount to funding of £100 million from Government over the next five years, starting in 2021-22. Luke Hall MP, the Minister for Regional Growth and Local Government, said in his letter advising of this decision that he was pleased to see that improving co-operation and collaboration was one of the Mayor's priorities as Ministers saw a shared vision amongst local partners as key to delivering on the Combined Authority's ambitions. This decision by Government provided the certainty

to continue investing in programmes as the Combined Authority moved into its next phase.

Apologies for absence were reported as set out above.

Mr Adams made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 4.4: Business Board Expenses and Allowances Scheme in relation to his role as Chair of the Business Board (minute 65 below refers). Mr Adams left the meeting for the duration of this item and the vote.

42. Minutes of the meeting on 30 June 2021 and Action Log

The Mayor stated that following the service of a Requisition at the previous meeting, a detailed response had been provided to the Requisitioners. Whilst fully respecting the importance of the Requisition process and the need for members of the Board to have an opportunity to check and challenge actions, the Mayor encouraged members, in the spirit of the Board's joint endeavours and a desire to save costs, that discussion with officers should take place. He was confident that they would be supportive and available for such discussions.

The minutes of the meeting on 30 June 2021 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor. The action log was noted.

43. Petitions

No petitions were received.

44. Public questions

No public questions were received.

45. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan was reviewed. Councillor Bailey noted that a further report on the format of Business Board meetings had been discussed at the previous meeting, but that this was not included on the Forward Plan. The Monitoring Officer stated that this work was in hand and would contain more complete information on the potential impacts. A report on the format of Business Board meetings would be added to the Forward Plan.

Mr Adams asked that in future the Forward Plan included on the Board's agenda should identify any changes made since it was last published. The Mayor endorsed this suggestion.

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

Approve the Forward Plan.

46. Lead Member Responsibilities

At the Combined Authority Board's annual meeting on 2 June 2021 the Mayor had set out his wish to create two new Lead Member roles to focus on climate change and public health. Following publication of the report a revised Table 1, setting out the key responsibilities for the proposed new Lead Member roles for the Environment and Climate Change and Public Health, had been circulated electronically to the Board and published on the Combined Authority's website. This reflected the Lead Member's role as champions on these issues together with suggestions which had been received from the Director of Public Health in relation to the public health portfolio. The Mayor stated his wish to appoint Councillor Smith as Lead Member for the Environment and Climate Change and Councillor Boden as Lead Member for Public Health.

Councillor Boden stated that he had discussed this appointment with the Mayor and their shared commitment to improving public health. He requested a change to the description of the Lead Member for Public Health's responsibilities to include, 'Promoting reductions in health inequalities across the Combined Authority area.' With the consent of the meeting this was accepted.

Councillor Gough asked that the wording of the responsibilities for the two new lead member roles should be amended to read, 'To act *as Lead* and champion in the cause of...', to make it consistent with the language used in the Constitution to describe the existing Lead Member roles. With the consent of the meeting this was accepted.

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

- a) Note and agree the responsibilities for the Environment and Climate Change lead member portfolio, subject to the adding the following wording:

'To act as Lead and champion in the cause of:'

- b) Note and agree the responsibilities for the Public Health lead member portfolio, subject to the adding the following wording:

'To act as Lead and champion in the cause of:
Promoting reductions in health inequalities across the Combined Authority area.'

- c) Note and agree the Mayor's nominations to the new lead member portfolios:

- i. Councillor Chris Boden: Lead Member for Public Health
- ii. Councillor Bridget Smith: Lead Member for the Environment and Climate Change

47. Appointment process for two Independent Persons

The Board was invited to appoint two Independent Persons in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. The legislation required that Independent Persons should be

available to consider issues relating to Member conduct or complaints. The Combined Authority currently had one Independent Person appointed to the Audit and Governance Committee and two vacancies.

Councillor Bailey commented that the requirement that Independent Persons should not be an active member of a political party was somewhat subjective. Given the need to have confidence in the impartiality of the appointees her preference would be for this to be amended to a requirement that they were not members of a political party. With the consent of the meeting this was accepted.

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

Agree the appointment process and role description to recruit two Independent Persons, subject to the following amendment being made:

‘The Independent Person will not be:

~~An active~~ A member of a political party’

The vote in favour included two thirds of Members or their Substitutes present and voting.

48. Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel to review the Members Allowance Scheme

This report was withdrawn to enable officers to investigate whether an Independent Remuneration Panel might be established with one or more constituent councils. The constituent councils would be consulted and a report would be brought to the next meeting.

49. Performance Report and Devolution Deal Update

The Board received a report setting out delivery to the end of June 2021 and a six monthly update on delivery of Devolution Deal commitments as requested by the Board in November 2020. The latest gross value added (GVA) figures showed a reduction and this might reflect the significant loss of jobs in Peterborough following the liquidation of Thomas Cook. Going forward, the format of the performance report would be refreshed to reflect the Mayoral objectives of ‘the three C’s’ of compassion, co-operation and community.

Councillor Boden expressed disappointment at the GVA figures and the failure to meet even the baseline given that the Combined Authority’s purpose was to double GVA. He expressed concern that this might be indicative of an increase in the divergence between the most and least successful areas within the Combined Authority’s geography and asked whether it would be appropriate to report the results separately for different areas in future reports. The Mayor stated that he shared Councillor Boden’s concerns about differentials in growth in different areas and asked officers to look at how this might be expressed in future reports.

Councillor Herbert suggested that leaders should discuss this issue. There was consensus in the wish to see growth benefits across the county, but he felt that there was sometimes an element of levelling down rather than levelling up. He would like to see a fuller description of progress to date against Devolution Deal commitments before the end of the year, to be considered either by the Board or at a Leaders' strategy meeting. Councillor Boden agreed, commenting that in his view there was a need for more discussion around the strategic way forward to manage growth. The potential overheating of the economy in the south of the county presented a challenge, but also an opportunity to reconcile the differing needs of the north and the south. However, this must support levelling up. Councillor Fuller concurred, commenting that it would not help the north of the county to starve the south. He further agreed that it would be timely for the newly constituted Board to look in more detail at progress to date on Devolution Deal commitments to give Government confidence.

Councillor Bailey commented that in looking at affordable housing targets it was important to take account of the significant role this would play in doubling GVA. She further commented that housing data appeared to be missing from the graph and asked why this was the case. She judged that the references to world class connectivity were no longer particularly accurate if the CAM project was not pursued and also that a new plan was needed with regard to Enterprise Zones rather than waiting for action on this from Government. With regard to the Ely North rail junction upgrade, it had always been the stated policy that this would only be supported if road access was maintained. She asked that the Mayor should review whether he was comfortable with this commitment and, if so, re-state it.

Mr Adams commented that this information and the granular data which lay behind it was fundamental to the work of the Business Board. It would also be helpful for forward forecasts or projections to be included on the dashboard, given that many of the investments were initially delayed due to problems with the former local enterprise partnership (LEP). He felt that mapping out these forward projections would also offer comfort to the Board with regards to GVA and job projections.

Councillor Boden asked for clarification regarding the lack of housing data for 2020/21 which had been raised by Councillor Bailey. He further commented that the information relating to health was somewhat out of date and did not reflect how integrated working between health and social care had progressed. Officers stated that housing data had not been included as the most recent figures were not yet available. It would be incorporated into the Performance Report as soon as it was available. The information relating to health and social care would be revisited in future reports.

The Mayor thanked Board members for their helpful interventions and asked that these should be reflected in future iterations of the report.

The Performance Dashboard and Devolution Deal commitments update were noted.

50. Change to the order of business

The Mayor stated his intention to vary the order of business from the published agenda to consider item 3.7: Angle Holdings Directorships as the next item of business, followed by Item 3.1: Future Transport Strategy and OneCAM Ltd. There were no objections

51. Angle Holdings - Directorship

The Mayor left the meeting room for the duration of this item and the vote. The Statutory Deputy Mayor took the chair.

The Board was invited to approve the removal of the former Mayor, Mr James Palmer, as a director of Angle Holdings Ltd and to appoint Mayor Dr Nik Johnson to the board of directors.

Councillor Fuller sought clarification of why the Mayor had left the meeting for this item and whether this arose from a disclosable pecuniary interest. The Monitoring Officer stated that there was no requirement for the Mayor to leave the meeting for this item and that he did not have a disclosable pecuniary interest. He had chosen to do so in order that the Board's decision should not be constrained by his presence. This was the convention at the Combined Authority, but he would be happy to review this practice.

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

- a) Approve the removal of Mr James Palmer as a director of Angle Holdings Limited;
- b) Approve the appointment of Mayor Dr Nik Johnson as a director of Angle Holdings Limited;
- c) Note that Angle Holdings Limited will complete the appointment, and relevant regulatory filings.

The Mayor returned to the meeting room after the vote and resumed the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

52. Future Transport Strategy and OneCAM Limited

This key decision was added to the Forward Plan on 15 July 2021 under general exception arrangements.

The Mayor stated that he wanted to acknowledge the contentious nature of this issue. During the mayoral election campaign he had made clear that he did not support the CAM project. Following his election he had been pressed by the media for a decision on this, but he had learned that this was not a matter for the Mayor to decide alone but one for the Board. He expressed the hope that Board members would feel fully included in the development of a new transport plan.

The Chief Executive stated that the report had two purposes. Firstly, to report her decision to stop task orders in relation to the delivery of the work of OneCAM Ltd and

the recommendation of the Board of OneCAM Ltd that the work of the company be suspended until a comprehensive review of the OneCAM programme and the Local Transport Plan had been completed and to authorise a material reduction in the activity of OneCAM Limited pending a final decision in relation to the CAM Programme. The second purpose was to task officers to produce a report in September 2021 looking at what would come after the OneCAM project and also to provide an update on revisions to the Local Transport Plan and report the outcome of a review on the use of consultants in the delivery of this work. The Chief Executive stated that she had listened to concerns expressed by the Board around her decision to suspend task orders and that lessons would be learned from this. Going forward, no decisions of this type would be taken without the Board being consulted in advance.

Mr Adams expressed concern at the delay in taking a final decision on the CAM programme which was tying up significant sums of money. He expressed the hope that a decision would be possible when a further report was brought to the Board in September 2021. He expressed further concern of the linkage of this decision with the revised Local Transport Plan (LTP) given that it seemed unlikely a meaningful position on the LTP would have been reached by September as public and stakeholder consultation would be required. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that the September report would set out the current position on the LTP update in the light of the changing local and national situation. The evidence base had changed during Covid which had challenged existing baselines. His preliminary thinking was that this might look at how learning from the CAM programme could be applied more widely across the Combined Authority area as part of the levelling up agenda.

The Mayor stated that it was important that the decision on the CAM programme was not something which was entirely driven by Mayoral decision. The CAM was a vision of the previous mayor, but it was not one which he shared. By democratic mandate a mayor had been chosen who had articulated a clear vision not to proceed with the CAM, but he wanted to see the benefits of the learning from the CAM felt across the Combined Authority area.

Councillor Bailey commented that in her view it was shocking that a project agreed by the Board had been dismantled without consultation. She felt that these decisions should have been taken together and she thanked the Chief Executive for recognising that this did not happen. She noted that an email had been sent from the Mayor saying that work on the CAM had stopped and asked which parts of the Constitution had allowed the Mayor and the Chief Executive to end an agreed programme unilaterally. Councillor Bailey noted that the Chief Executive was also a director of OneCAM Ltd and whilst she was in no way suggesting any impropriety she did feel that this was a conflict of interest. She further noted that the Chief Executive's decision had not been reported to the Board as required. Councillor Bailey stated her belief that it would have been better to have brought this decision to the Board and stated that she and Councillor Fuller had referred this matter to the Audit and Governance Committee for review. With regard to the Mayor's democratic mandate, she noted that the Mayor had not won the vote in all of the areas within the Combined Authority's boundaries and that as such she deemed consultation to be key. The CAM was not solely about Cambridge City and its environs, but would overtime in her view support the levelling up agenda across the region. Councillor Bailey highlighted the potential benefits of intellectual property rights arising from the CAM and concerns

from business at the loss of the CAM project . She also questioned how Cambridge access issues would be addressed if it was not progressed. In her judgement the calibre of the individuals which the CAM programme had attracted spoke to its value. The Mayor's power over the Combined Authority's budget meant that he had the power to end the CAM programme, but in her judgement a decision to do so would lead to the £10m invested in the project under the previous mayor being wasted.

Councillor Herbert expressed his respect for the strength of Councillor Bailey's views. However, the Mayor had won the election having been clear about his belief that there were better transport solutions than the CAM. In his view there had been multiple beaches in governance arrangements during the previous mayor's term of office. The decision before the Board at this stage was solely to suspend action pending decisions being made in September. In Councillor Herbert's view there was a need for a more practical focus on what could be achieved in the next ten years and how this might be integrated with what was already being done in the different geographies around the county in order to tackle and fund the transport needs of the county as a whole. Councillor Herbert's preference would be to take more time before refreshing the LTP as it had been revised several times already. It would be important to consult fully on this and he emphasised the need which he saw to identify alternative options where there were gaps in provision.

Councillor Fuller commented that he shared the concerns which Councillor Bailey had expressed around the governance of this decision-making process and would await the views of the Audit and Governance Committee on this. In his judgement there was a need to move beyond offering comparisons with governance issues under the previous administration and to focus instead on ensuring good governance going forward. The Mayor's democratic mandate was not in doubt, but he noted that many votes had also been cast in favour of the previous mayor and his CAM strategy. Councillor Fuller expressed some concern that buses seemed to be the Mayor's only alternative to the CAM. Whilst he judged that an excellent bus network would be of real value it did not represent a world class transport option and was not in his view what local business and residents would want. Given that the Mayor now had full access to information on the CAM which he had not had previously there would be nothing wrong in him looking at the issue again.

Councillor Gough commented that the revision of the LTP was in his judgement a critically important piece of work which would have ramifications for Local Plans, the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) and constituent councils. He questioned whether this could be done by September and about the engagement which would take place with constituent councils. With regards to the use of consultants, he would be more concerned if consultants were not used and the work did not get done. He sought an assurance that the comprehensive review that was required could be done within this timeframe.

Councillor Boden expressed disappointment in relation to the governance issues, but welcomed the learning that was being taken and was prepared to draw a line under this once the Audit and Governance Committee had completed its review. In his judgement, the Mayor's democratic mandate and his role in relation to the budget meant that he had power under the Constitution on this. He had had robust discussions with the previous mayor around the CAM programme, but new transport solutions were needed to support the growth required in the Cambridge City area for business and housing. In his view this did not need to be a world class programme,

but it did need to work and to meet that need. He wanted to see the growth potential of the south of the county spread to the north and believed that there was a need for a mass transport system in Cambridgeshire and the surrounding area and more responsive transport systems. In addition to the loss of the £10m which had been spent to date on the CAM programme if it was not progressed he also wanted to highlight the loss of time before a new scheme could be put in place to support the doubling of GVA. He did not feel that an alternative to the CAM programme was being put forward to achieve the objectives of sustaining growth and sharing it across the Combined Authority area.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that as a new member of the Board he had not been closely involved in the CAM programme. However, he felt that stopping the programme on the basis of a pre-election promise without looking at the full implications of that decision might not be a sensible thing to do. If the programme was to end, he asked why that should not be done immediately and urged the Mayor to take control and articulate a vision for transport in the future to avoid a vacuum. Peterborough City Council was keen to develop innovative transport systems including the electrification of public transport and he would task officers to work with the Combined Authority on this. He would also like to see an innovative transport strategy across the county.

Mr Adams sought clarity from officers around the timeline of the revised LTP. The Director of Delivery and Strategy said that it was envisaged that a non-statutory consultation would begin in November 2021 with final decisions being taken around April 2022 to align with the new financial year.

The Mayor stated that he recognised the concerns around this issue and for this reason he had allowed time for Board members to comment at length. There had been some very helpful interventions and he had heard some good things as well as some things he disagreed with. He was ready to move on, but wanted to do this in a co-operative fashion. Discussions would take place with the Core Steering Group which comprised the Combined Authority, the GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as the two statutory highways authorities and he had asked the Transport and Infrastructure Committee for advice on engagement with Members. In response to a question from Councillor Bailey about how the other constituent councils would be involved the Mayor stated that he was confident that the Director of Delivery and Strategy had heard the necessity of constituent councils being consulted. An improved relationship with the GCP would also offer a real opportunity to produce an LTP that would deliver for all.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Herbert, it was resolved by a majority of those present and voting to:

- a) Note the decision of the Chief Executive to stop task orders in relation to the delivery of the work of One CAM Limited.
- b) Note the recommendation of the Board of One CAM Limited that the work of the company be suspended until a comprehensive review of the One CAM programme and the Local Transport Plan be completed, and authorise a material reduction in the activity of One CAM Limited pending a final decision in relation to the CAM Programme.

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

- c) Request that the Chief Executive and the Director of Delivery and Strategy bring a report to the September meeting of the Combined Authority Board recommending future steps in relation to the One CAM project and the further use or permanent closure of One CAM Limited
- d) Request that the Chief Executive and the Director of Delivery and Strategy bring a further update on revisions to the Local Transport Plan to the Board in September along with the outcome of a review on the use of consultants in the delivery of this work.

The meeting adjourned from 11.46 to 11.54am.

53. Budget Monitor Report – July 2021

The Board received an update on the 2021/22 budget position and capital programme as at 30 June 2021. As it was still quite early in the financial year there were only a few material variations. Additional funds received included a £3.4m increase in grant income for the year which was reported previously to the Board in June 2021 and three grants relating to the Adult Education Budget devolved grant, Growth Hub grant and the Energy Hub's core funding where the awarded grant was greater than predicted. Covid continued to impact revenue expenditure while on the capital programme the main variances related to the A10 dualling project, where Department for Transport funding was awaited, and the CAM project. The Board's attention was drawn to a recommendation from the Business Board to amend the budgets for the Local Growth Fund management costs for 2021/22 and 2022/23. The transport response fund and advanced connectivity workstreams were now subject to a review of consultancy work and the findings of this would be reported to the Board in September 2021.

The Mayor stated that he would not be supporting recommendation (c) to approve £350k of 'Subject to Approval' funds from the Transport Response Fund budget for Advanced Connectivity Options pending further work on this.

Councillor Bailey asked for a definition of the area covered by the description 'the Fens and north of the area' in relation to the advanced connectivity workstream and whether the area covered by East Cambridgeshire District Council would be included or excluded from this definition. She commented that some parts of East Cambridgeshire scored lowest for transport access and connectivity. The Mayor stated that East Cambridgeshire was included within his transport vision. The reference was intended as part of a narrative around looking at the south and the north, but future reports would have a clear definition of what geographical areas were covered when references were made to the Fens or to the north of the Combined Authority area.

Councillor Fuller commented that if a report was issued in the Mayor's name then it was assumed that it reflected his vision. On this basis he found it difficult that the Mayor was not now supporting one of its recommendations.

Councillor Gough commented that it would be important that the evidence base and analysis for the Local Transport Plan (LTP) was sufficiently granular to speak to the significant differences which occurred within individual districts.

Mr Adams asked whether there was a risk that the proposed £350k for Advanced Connectivity Options could become redundant or misaligned with the revised LTP. The Director Delivery and Strategy stated that a reactive budget had been set already, but that this was subject to Board approval. The Chief Executive stated that the Board had decided under the previous item to support a review of the use of consultants in revising the Local Transport Plan (minute 52 above refers). In the light of that decision this recommendation was no longer required as the September report would seek approval for what consultants would be used and the budget. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that work would begin without external support.

The Mayor stated that consultants had an important role to play, but he was concerned that there seemed to have been excessive expenditure on consultancy in some parts of the organisation. This was being addressed.

Councillor Bailey asked whether the expertise needed to carry out this work existed in house. The Director of Delivery and Strategy stated that he had a good team and that this work would be accommodated.

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

- a) Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Herbert, it was resolved by a majority of members present and voting to:

- b) Approve the recommendation from the Business Board to amend the budgets for the Local Growth Fund (LGF) management costs for 2021-22 and 2022-23.

54. Zero Emission Bus Regional Areas (ZEBRA) Phase 2

The Board was invited to consider a proposal to make a submission to the Department for Transport (DfT) for funding for electric buses to replace diesel vehicles for some services in Cambridge. The fast-track process offered by the DfT would not allow time for a business case to be brought before the Board before the end of August 2021 submission date so the Board's agreement was sought to delegate authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to prepare and submit the business case. This would represent the first step towards achieving the significant challenge of all routes being served by alternatively fuelled buses by 2030. It was proposed that 30 diesel buses would be replaced by 30 electric buses and that charging points would be installed at their depot and at Babraham Park and Ride. This would be in addition to the two electric buses being trialled by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP). The Board would be advised of the outcome of the bid.

Councillor Boden commented that in his view the buses themselves seemed unproblematic, but the challenge would be the infrastructure needed to support them. It would be important to establish whether there would be sufficient grid capacity at the bus depot and Babraham sites to support these buses before the bid was submitted. He also saw value in conducting a rough cost benefit analysis, although this need not necessarily form part of the submission. The Head of Transport stated that three members of the Energy Team were working with power suppliers on this. The infrastructure required to support a longer term capacity of 60 buses was being also being addressed now and the power supplier was confident that they could meet the necessary capacity requirements.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that Peterborough City Council (PCC) had a 20 year transport vision and it would be great to participate in this scheme. He asked that the Combined Authority should investigate opportunities for the re-location of Stagecoach with some urgency and look at how all bus operators could benefit from in-road charging and wireless charging for electric buses. His officers would work with the Combined Authority on this. The Head of Transport stated that there was a commitment to look at alternatively fuelled buses across the region and that he had already met with PCC's lead highways officer to discuss this and would continue to do so.

Councillor Gough asked whether the Combined Authority would own the new buses and, if so, who would be responsible for on-going costs like maintenance and insurance. The Head of Transport stated that various options were being considered to deliver the most effective ownership mechanism.

Councillor Herbert commented that electric buses were important for the city of Cambridge. Its worst pollution levels were linked to travel hubs used by buses and taxis and he believed that focusing on pollution as well as congestion was crucial. He further commented that there was a need to look at infrastructure challenges beyond roads as the Combined Authority would not in his opinion be able to deliver GVA and employment growth without the electrical capacity and renewables needed.

Mr Adams welcomed the proposal, but asked whether it would give rise to any contingent liabilities going forward. The Head of Transport stated that the bid would stand in isolation as a stimulus to the Combined Authority's ambition.

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

- a) Note the contents of this paper.
- b) Delegate authority for the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport Committee, to prepare, submit and publish a business case to the Department for Transport (DfT) for the ZEBRA Phase 2 application for alternative fuel buses and necessary infrastructure.

55. Phase 3 University of Peterborough – Masterplan and Short-Term Financing

This report contained an appendix which was exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be

in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)). The Mayor asked whether any member of the Board wanted to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was invited to consider making a grant of £100k to Peterborough City Council (PCC) as a contribution to the £300k cost of purchasing a parcel of land for the ARU Peterborough project. If approved, the funds would be taken from the Gainshare Fund. The Board was also asked to approve a short-term cashflow financing proposal for enabling works for Phase 3 of ARU Peterborough project as the majority shareholder in PropCo1. This would be used to finance an outline planning application, business case and project management resource. PropCo1 had sufficient cash reserves and liquidity available to provide this sum and the costs would be recouped from Government funding, although £100k of the £603k would be at risk if funding was not received from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

Councillor Fitzgerald voiced his support for the proposal, commenting that it would be of great benefit to Peterborough and the wider area. The master planning appraisal would advise and inform on a key piece of real estate within Peterborough city centre.

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

- a) Approve a £100,000 grant to Peterborough City Council (PCC), to contribute to the £300,000 Master Planning works,
- b) Give consent as the majority shareholder in the Peterborough HE Property Company Limited (Prop Co 1) to allow Prop Co 1 to consider and approve a short term cashflow financing proposal for Phase 3 of the University of Peterborough (UoP).

The meeting was adjourned from 12.46pm to 12.49pm.

56. Change to the order of business

The Mayor stated his intention to vary the order of business from the published agenda to consider item 4.1: Strategic Funding Management Review July 2021 next. There were no objections.

57. Strategic Funding Management Review July 2021

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

The Strategic Funding Management Review July 2021 had been considered by the Business Board on 21 June 2021. Project pipeline preparations were on-going with around £350m projects being priced, although it was possible that only £90m of funding might be received so the Business Board was focusing on how funds could be

targeted to deliver the Business Board and Combined Authority's strategic objectives. In addition to providing project updates the report set out the Business Board's recommendation to reject a project change request from Cambridgeshire County Council relating to the Wisbech Access Strategy Project. The project had initially been awarded £10.5m of Local Growth Fund monies to deliver five junctions. The project was revised in 2020 to deliver three junctions at a cost of £6.5m. The project had been due for completion by March 2021, but had failed to meet this deadline. Cambridgeshire County Council had submitted a further project change request to deliver three junctions at the cost of an additional £9m. The funds would cover the procurement of land, design costs and project management. The Business Board recognised the value of the project, but was mindful that the project had twice failed to meet its delivery milestones and had expressed concerns around value for money and the precedent which would be set by approving a request when little progress had been made to date. The Business Board had the option of repatriating the LGF funding and had suggested that any recovered funds could be recycled to the Wisbech area, subject to the required business cases being submitted and approved.

Mr Adams commented that the Business Board was very sympathetic to the project as originally submitted in 2018. However, there had already been one project change request approved and now a further request had been submitted. There was logic to the proposal to proceed in order to get the project to shovel-ready status. However, the Business Board made decisions on LGF funding proposals based on committed project outcomes and deliverables and the project in its current format did not meet that criteria. If the Business Board had chosen to support this further project change request it would have set a precedent for other projects receiving LGF funding. For these reasons, the Business Board had unanimously rejected the further project change request. However, if there was an alternate way of getting the project to a shovel-ready position without compromising the integrity of the Business Board's decision-making process then he considered this would be the best possible compromise. Mr Adams expressed his frustration at repeatedly seeing the costs and timeframes of infrastructure projects drift.

Councillor Bailey expressed her respect for the principled decision which the Business Board had taken based on LGF funding conditions. However, she was also deeply concerned that the project might not progress when it was so badly needed. She asked whether the expenditure to date would be lost if a decision was taken to repatriate the remaining £3.97m. She further commented that she felt the reference to one of the available options delaying construction between three to six months to be unhelpful as it assumed that construction would take place when it was not yet clear whether it would proceed. Officers stated that there had been spend to date of £2.09m. The total cost of taking the project to a shovel-ready position was £3.97m, which meant there was £3.97m LGF funding which could be repatriated. The County Council's options analysis was confident that the funding could be found to re-procure, but this was optimistic without the guarantee of funding.

Councillor Boden commented that he shared Mr Adam's frustration at the processes leading to overspends on construction projects and that whilst this was widely seen it was no excuse. However, the Wisbech Access project was essential to allow economic growth and increase prosperity in the most deprived town based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation. The expansion of housing and business in Wisbech was dependent on this project and if it did not proceed the effects would be felt both in Wisbech and the surrounding areas. In his judgment, it made sense to get the project

to a shovel-ready stage. The County Council had stated that it was ready to have the land acquisition in place and if it stalled now there was the potential for the whole project to be lost. He suggested referring the decision back to the Business Board unless an assurance could be given that the remaining £1.88m needed to get the project to a shovel-ready state could be found from within the Combined Authority budget.

The Director of Business and Skills stated that there was £3.97m allocated to the project in the subject to approval balance allocation in the medium term financial plan (MTFP) following the approval of the first project change request. A further report could be produced seeking the Board's approval to use this existing budget to fund the land acquisition. The Chief Finance Officer stated that the assurance framework required that the release of subject to approval funds required the completion of a business case to demonstrate that it represented good value for money. The Combined Authority's resources were limited and it was good practice to ensure that all projects were subject to the same assurance process. On that basis, his preferred option would be to bring a further report to the Board setting out the position. The Monitoring Officer stated that the Mayor had comprehensive decision-making powers and whether he chose to exercise these or bring such a decision back to the Board was a matter for him.

Councillor Boden, seconded by Mr Adams, proposed an additional recommendation that the Board:

Support, in principle, the use of £1.88m of existing medium term financial plan (MTFP) budget to complete design work and land acquisitions for the three remaining schemes within the Wisbech Access Strategy project, subject to the business case being received by the Board.

On being out to the vote, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

The Mayor stated that he shared the Board's frustrations at the overspends and delays seen on infrastructure projects. He was committed to improving the life chances of the residents of Wisbech, but he also wanted to make sure that any decisions were made properly and in accordance with good governance. On that basis, a further report would be prepared by officers and the Board would convene in August for this to be considered.

It was resolved to:

- a) Reject the Project Change Request for the Wisbech Access Strategy Project.
- b) To note that officers will work with Wisbech Access Strategy Project lead to explore all implications and consequences of next steps for the project and report to next Combined Authority Board meeting.
- c) Note the other programme updates contained in the report to the Business Board on 14 July 2021.
- d) Support, in principle, the use of £1.88m of existing medium term financial plan (MTFP) budget to complete design work and land acquisitions for the three

remaining schemes within the Wisbech Access Strategy project, subject to the business case being received by the Board.

Councillor Gough left the meeting at 1.30pm.

58. Market Towns Programme - Approval of Change Requests for Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire to Extend Funding Expenditure Timelines

The Board was invited to approve two requests submitted by Huntingdonshire District Council to extend the funding timelines of the St Neots Future Hugh Street Fund Scheme and the St Neots Masterplan (Phase 1) and a request from East Cambridgeshire District Council to extend the funding timeline on their remaining Market Towns budget allocation for the towns of Ely, Soham and Littleport.

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

- a) approve the request received from Huntingdonshire District Council to extend the funding timeline on their Market Towns budget allocation of £3,100,000 to March 2024 as match investment to the St Neots Future Hugh Street Fund Scheme.
- b) approve the request received from Huntingdonshire District Council to extend the funding timeline and spend profile on their remaining budget allocation of £609,655 to March 2023 for St Neots Masterplan (Phase 1).
- c) approve the request received from East Cambridgeshire District Council to extend the funding timeline on their remaining Market Towns budget allocation of £2,144,000 to March 2023 for the towns of Ely, Soham and Littleport.

59. March – Future High Streets Funding Bid: Additional Combined Authority Match Funding

The report contained four appendices which were exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)). The Mayor asked whether any member of the Board wanted to discuss the exempt appendix. No member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was advised that Fenland District Council had applied for an additional £1.1m additional Combined Authority funding for the March Future High Street Fund (FHSF) Programme. The Board had previously approved funding of £900k for this project. Should the Board decide to approve any additional funding this would be managed through the Market Towns Programme for consistency. An independent evaluation of the proposal had been carried out in accordance with the assurance framework. This had identified the four options which were set out in the report, although these were for the Board's information only and did not constrain its decision. No officer recommendation had been made. If the additional funding was

not approved there was a risk that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) might reduce or withdraw its funding award meaning that the project might no longer be viable. If the Board was minded to approve the request for additional funding a full business case would be required as the funding was currently within the subject to approval section of the medium term financial plan.

Councillor Boden commented that he supported Option 1, to approve the request for an additional £1.1m. The planned schemes would be transformational for March which was a town which was second only to Wisbech on the Index of Multiple Deprivation. If approved, it would also unlock the MHCLG funding.

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

- a) Consider the four options identified from the independent appraisal report in response to Fenland District Council's application for an additional £1.1m of Combined Authority funding towards the March Future High Streets Fund Programme under Market Towns Programme.
- b) Approve the additional £1,100,000 requested by Fenland District Council (Option 1), subject to the business case being received by the Board.

The meeting was adjourned from 1.43 to 1.47pm.

Councillor Fuller left the meeting at 1.43pm.

60. Digital Skills Bootcamps

This key decision was added to the Forward Plan on 16 July 2021 under general exception arrangements.

The Board was informed of the success of a competitive consortium bid to the Department for Education (DfE) which had been led by the Combined Authority for the delivery of Digital Bootcamps in the East of England. This would provide support to 805 learners aged 19 or over who were either in employment and looking to upskill or who were currently unemployed in the period to March 2022. There were two approved delivery partners and an early decision was required due to the urgency of mobilising the contract.

Mr Adams commented that it would be useful to share an evaluation of the data with the Business Board when this project was completed in 2022 to inform future work.

The Mayor welcomed the successful bid, but commented that he was not keen on the 'bootcamps' terminology.

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

- a) Approve the contract for Skills Bootcamps, Wave 2 Lot 1 and associated funding for the delivery of Digital Bootcamps in the East of England. The contract value is £1,826,250 with delivery of the Bootcamps to be complete by 31 March 2022.

- b) Delegate to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, authority to award and enter into contracts with consortia partners.

61. Investment Fund Gateway Review

The Board was invited to note that the Combined Authority Investment Fund had successfully passed its first Gateway Review and the consequent confirmation of the next tranche of £100 million Gainshare funding. As the next Gateway Review approached there would be an expectation to show delivery outcomes and this would be tied in to the format of future performance reporting.

Mr Adams expressed his thanks and congratulations to all involved in securing this outcome.

Ministers' decision that the Combined Authority Investment Fund has passed its first Gateway Review, and the consequent confirmation of the next tranche of £100 million Gainshare funding was noted.

62. Active Travel

The Board was advised that in order to be considered for the next stage of Active Travel Funding proposals would need to be submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) by 8 August 2021. As the Board would not meet again before that date it was being invited now to agree the approach to be taken. The Combined Authority had received £2.9m under the previous funding round which had been shared across Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City Council (PCC) as the two local highways authorities. Three areas were proposed for the next funding round. These were active travel capital funding projects, where both CCC and PCC were currently working up schemes; mini hollands, where expressions of interest by both CCC and the Greater Cambridge Partner (GCP) were being worked up; and GP prescribing of active travel as part of the social prescribing offer. Officers were engaging with the CCC Public Health team on this.

The Mayor stated that he was pleased to see GP prescribing of active travel amongst the proposals and that he would be happy to work with officers and the medical profession on developing this strand.

Councillor Boden commented that he was happy to support the proposals, subject to an assurance that the bids would be drawn up in consultation with district councils within the Combined Authority area. The Head of Transport stated that officers were engaging with CCC and PCC on that basis, but that he would take this comment on board.

Councillor Bailey commented that the use of mini hollands in isolation could be problematic and that they needed to be planned alongside wider transport issues. She further commented that consultation with district councils ahead of the first tranche of Active Travel Funding had been very poor and that East Cambridgeshire had not benefitted at all due to the parameters around that funding. Proposals around traffic flow in Soham and Ely town centres had been rolled forward, but these were

not now being progressed by the county council so East Cambridgeshire would not be benefitting from the second tranche of funding either. Instead, the district council was looking to progress several projects themselves, but this represented significant investment for a small local authority. Councillor Meschini commented that she would discuss this issue with colleagues at the county council.

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

- a) Agree the approach to submitting active travel funding proposals to the government set out in this paper.

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

Business Board recommendations to the Combined Authority

63. Business Board Annual Report and Delivery Plan

The Board was invited to approve the Business Board's annual report for 2022/21 and its annual delivery plan for 2021/22.

Mr Adams commented that the Business Board had also recommended a new budget of £15k be approved to produce both a publishable and digital version of the annual report and delivery plan. This was considered important in order to document and publicise the Business Board's achievements since it was established. This would then be used to demonstrate that the funding received by successful bidders was being well managed and well spent in order to attract future funding. The Mayor asked that it be recorded that he endorsed this proposal and wished to acknowledge the good work being done by the Business Board.

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

- a) approve the Business Board's Annual Report (2020-21) and Annual Delivery Plan (2021-22), and approve submission of both documents to the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS);
- b) approve a new budget of £15k to implement design work to develop and produce a publishable version of the Annual Report and Delivery Plan, and digital platform, to better communicate and showcase achievements of the Business Board, to be funded from Enterprise Zones Reserve Fund.

64. Business Board Performance Assessment Framework and Recruitment Process

Mr Adams explained that the Business Board was seeking approval to carry out an evaluation of the Business Board and individual private sector members using monies from the Enterprise Zones Reserve Funds. If approved, the expenditure would be capped at a maximum of £35k (plus VAT). This practice was not uncommon in the

private sector and would apply to all private sector members, including the chair. A number of Business Board members were approaching the point where they would require re-election so the timing was good. The Business Board had challenged officers on the proposed budget which they felt seemed quite high and this was why approval was being sought for a sum of up to £35k plus VAT. It would be delivered for less if this was possible.

Councillor Boden asked whether all private sector members of the Business Board would welcome this process. Mr Adams stated that the proposal had been endorsed unanimously.

Councillor Bailey asked why the work would be funded from the Enterprise Zones Reserve Fund. Officers stated that this had been seen as the most appropriate budget.

The Mayor expressed the hope that the Business Board would continue to attract such excellent candidates as members and that someone with a trades union background might be considered for membership as happened with some other combined authorities.

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

Approve the use of the Enterprise Zones Reserve Fund to fund the evaluation of the Business Board and individual private sector members, to a maximum budget cap of £35k (plus VAT).

65. Business Expenses and Allowances Scheme

Mr Adams made a declaration of interest in relation to this item at the start of the meeting in relation to his role as Chair of the Business Board (minute 41 above refers). He left the meeting for the duration of this item and the vote.

The Board was invited to agree that an amendment be made to the Business Board Expenses and Allowances Scheme to include the option for members to forgo remuneration payments if they wished. The Mayor commented that it was an act of generosity by the Business Board to recommend this.

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

Approve an amendment to be made to the Business Board Expenses and Allowances Scheme to include the option for members to forgo remuneration payments.

Mr Adams returned to the meeting room after the vote.

66. High Performance Computing Study and Roadmap

The Board's approval was sought to commission the development of a feasibility study for the High-Performance Computing and Artificial Intelligence capability to

support the Digital cluster development across the Greater Cambridge and wider Combined Authority area. Capacity in this area was a constraint for some smaller companies needing super computing power. If approved, this work would help retain and strengthen Cambridge's position so that business did not move away. Quotes had been obtained ranging from £25k to over £100k and the recommendation sought approval for a budget of £46k.

Mr Adams stated that this proposal arose in part from a passionate interest in this area by a member of the Business Board, although he wished to make clear that no vested interest was involved.

Councillor Bailey sought clarification of why it was proposed to use Enterprise Zone Reserve Funding for this project. She had asked the same question in relation to the earlier discussion of funding for the Business Board performance assessment framework and recruitment process (minute 64 above refers) and was concerned about the detrimental impact this could have on work in support of enterprise zones. The Director of Business and Skills stated that the Local Growth Fund was the Business Board's main funding source and the current tranche was now fully committed. Enterprise Zone Reserve Funding was given to local enterprise partnerships to use between LGF funding programmes to enable their normal work to progress.

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

Approve £46,000 Enterprise Zone Reserve Funding to commission the development of a feasibility study for the High-Performance Computing and Artificial Intelligence capability to support the Digital cluster development across the Greater Cambridge and wider Combined Authority area.

(Mayor)