



## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 27th January

Time: 10.30am – 1.32pm

Present: Mayor J Palmer

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council, Councillor S Count – Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, Councillor J Holdich – Peterborough City Council, Councillor Jon Neish – Huntingdonshire District Council and Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Co-opted Members: Councillor R Bisby, Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and Councillor D Over, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority

Apologies: Councillor R Fuller, substituted by Councillor Jon Neish  
Co-opted member J Bawden, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

Also present: Councillor L Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### 623. Announcements, apologies and declarations of interest

The Mayor remembered all those affected by the events being commemorated on Holocaust Memorial Day. He also offered congratulations to Ross Renton on his appointment as the Principal of ARU Peterborough.

Apologies for absence were reported as set out above.

Councillor Smith declared an interest at Item 4.2: London Luton Airport Arrivals Consultation, in that the proposed change to aircraft stacking arrangements would have a significant impact on the village where she lived. Minute 641 below refers.

### 624. Minutes of the meeting on 25 November 2020

The minutes of the meeting on 25 November 2020 were approved as an accurate record. A copy will be signed by the Mayor when it is practical to do so.

## 625. Petitions

No petitions were received.

## 626. Public questions

No public questions were received. A number of questions had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and these were heard under the relevant items

## 627. Forward Plan

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

Approve the Forward Plan dated 14 January 2021.

## 628. Change in Membership - Transport and Infrastructure Committee

The report advised the Board of changes to the membership of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee which had been notified to the Monitoring Officer by Cambridgeshire County Council. The Constitution permitted the Monitoring Officer to accept such changes to ensure a full complement of members at committee meetings, but required that they were reported to the Board for ratification.

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

Ratify the appointment of Councillor Mark Howell as the representative of Cambridgeshire County Council on the Transport and Infrastructure Committee in place of Councillor Ian Bates, and the appointment of Councillor Ian Bates as substitute member in the place of Councillor Roger Hickford.

## 629. Appointment of Combined Authority Returning Officer

John Hill, Chief Executive, left the meeting for the duration of this item.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1.

The Board was invited to appoint John Hill as the Combined Area Returning Officer (CARO) for the Mayoral election to be held on 6 May 2021. The Combined Authority was required by Regulation to appoint a CARO from within the Authority's own officers or those of its constituent councils. Mr Hill had been the CARO for the 2017 Mayoral election and would be the Police Area Returning Officer (PARO) for the 2021 election of the Police and Crime Commissioner. The cost was expected to be met from within the budgetary provision for the election, but if this position changed it would be reported to the Board.

Councillor Herbert noted some apparent confusion around the timing of the 2021 election given that the Secretary of State had previously indicated that elections might be postponed until July. If this should be the case he was concerned that there was quite a gap in the meetings schedule around May which could impact on the Combined Authority's work. He was also concerned about whether the budget was accurate. The Mayor stated that the latest information from Government was that elections would go ahead in May as planned, but if this position changed the Combined Authority would react as necessary.

The Monitoring Officer stated that it was vital to appoint a Returning Officer now to allow preparations to be made in expectation of a May election. Should the situation change he would revert to the Board on this.

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

Appoint John Hill, Chief Executive, as the Combined Area Returning Officer for the purposes of Article 6 of the Combined Authorities (Mayoral Elections) Order 2017 for the Mayoral election to be held on 6 May 2021.

## 630. Performance Report

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

The Performance Report set out details of delivery against key metrics. The Board was advised that ratings for the Combined Authority's key projects based on outturn data to the end of December 2020 and the housing metric had been updated with recent 2019/2020 data.

Councillor Herbert commented that that the Board had repeatedly been advised that a resolution to the delayed £45m for the Affordable Housing Programme (AHP) was imminent and asked when this would be resolved. The Mayor stated that he remained confident that a solution would be found with Government. In the meantime, the Combined Authority had continued to bring forward affordable housing projects, including through the £100k Homes programme and the Revolving Fund which were delivering affordable housing at no cost to the taxpayer. Councillor Herbert commented that the delivery of the £70m AHP in Cambridge City would be delivered by March 2022, the same timeframe as the Combined Authority's AHP, and he invited the Mayor and the Lead Member for Housing to visit when it was safe to do so to see the progress which had been made.

Mr Adams asked whether there was anything which the Board as a whole or individual Board members could do to help. The Mayor stated that all of the Board members who had been party to the original discussions with Government about the AHP were clear that they had signed up to a five year delivery deal. The Authority was in a strong position to meet or even exceed the target contained in the Devolution Deal and remained committed to delivering that commitment.

Councillor Smith commented that following meetings with senior officials at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), her impression was that the discussions around the end date for delivery would be resolved imminently. She judged that the question was more around value for money and the per unit subsidy level. The Mayor stated that the £40m revolving fund would continue to deliver in perpetuity and the subsidy sum would continue to decrease over time.

Councillor Holdich commented that it had been clear from discussions at the outset that civil servants did not like the deal, but it had been approved by Ministers and there had been no mention at that time of a £25k subsidy cap. Delivery had initially been delayed for 9-12 months while the necessary legislation was put in place and a number of opportunities had been lost as a result of this delay, including around 157 houses in Peterborough. In his view the Combined Authority had done a good job in delivering affordable housing in difficult circumstances, and a subsidy of around £35k represented good value for money.

Councillor Bailey commented that Ministers needed to decide whether they wanted to continue funding affordable housing in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough or not. The only thing stopping delivery was the perverse decision by Government to stop the flow of money. It was unreasonable to suggest that the Combined Authority should have been delivering affordable housing before it was formally established and the Board was united in its belief that the end date for delivery was March 2022. In her judgement, a subsidy of £34-35k per unit in some of the most expensive areas for property in the country represented unarguable value for money and at present sixteen schemes were on hold pending the release of funding. Local residents wanted these houses, and if Ministers wanted the Combined Authority to deliver them they needed to release the funding to enable it to do so.

It was resolved to note the Performance Report.

### 631. Combined Authority Monitoring and Evaluation Framework 2021

The Devolution Deal that created the Combined Authority included a requirement that the Authority maintained a monitoring and evaluation framework. This was to ensure that the projects in which the Authority invested had the right outputs to achieve the desired outcomes. The version before the Board had been shared in draft with Government in November 2021 and was described overall as excellent, although going forward it would need more detailed evaluation on projects now in construction.

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

Adopt the monitoring and evaluation framework for 2021.

### 632. Combined Authority Business Plan and Annual Report 2021-22

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

The Board was invited to review the Combined Authority's third business plan, which this time included a section on how delivery of key projects compared to the position in the last business plan. The document had been renamed the Business Plan and Annual Report to better reflect its focus and it was proposed to bring a refresh to the Board in September 2021. If approved, the final version would be published in February and would include copies of the budget and medium term financial plan which were being considered elsewhere on the agenda.

Councillor Smith asked what plans were in place to cement the Combined Authority's implementation of doubling nature into actions and whether the Fens biosphere project would be re-visited. She further asked whether the Independent Commission on Climate Change had the capacity to advise on doubling nature. The Mayor stated that he had been in negotiation with those looking to double nature across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and had encouraged them to engage with the Independent Commission on Climate Change. He had also been in discussion with local farmers to look ways to include them in the doubling nature initiative as agriculture was the major industry in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and played a vital role in both the local and national economies. He did not wish to pre-empt the Commission's work, but he did want to see practical and achievable recommendations coming to the Board.

Councillor Smith commented that the report stated that the first eight £100k Homes had been completed and allocated, but that there was no information on how many £100k Homes the Combined Authority aspired to build. She further commented that the biggest carbon burden related to transport and she felt there was an urgent need to start signalling what mitigations were being put in place in relation to the road schemes mentioned in the report. If claims were being made that projects were reducing carbon emissions she felt that these should be quantified. The Mayor stated that £100k Homes were a bespoke product and that there were between 40-50 in the pipeline across the county. However, demand for the first eight £100k Homes in Peterborough had been huge and gave an indication of the extent of the need which existed. In relation to the carbon burden of road transport, the Mayor noted that improving the flow of traffic and reducing congestion also reduced the emissions associated with queuing traffic. Work on the A47 also included plans to increase the flood defences as part of the project which would open up wetland opportunities.

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

- a) Review the draft 2021/22 Combined Authority Annual Report & Business Plan attached at Appendix 1 and consider any appropriate amendments;
- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executives to finalise the Annual Report and Business Plan for publication in the light of the views of the Combined Authority Board.

### 633. Relationship between Risk and Change Control

The Board was invited to adopt the Relationship between Risk and Change Control document recommended by the Audit and Governance Committee. The document was

designed to refine the Combined Authority's evolving approach to risk management and change control and confirmed the Authority's new risk appetite for projects.

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

- Approve the adoption of the Relationship between Risk and Change Control document as recommended by the Audit and Governance Committee.

The vote in favour included at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) present and voting.

## Part 2 - Finance

### 634. Budget Monitor Update Report January 2021

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1.

The report provided an update on the 2020/21 budget position and capital programme as at 30 November 2020. The forecast revenue outturn showed a favourable variance of around £4.6m which was mainly due to a combination of the previously reported reduction in the forecast spend on the Health and Care Sector Work Academy (£2.2m) and Adult Education Budget (AEB) Devolution Programme (£0.9m) together with an updated forecast spend on the Bus Review Implementation which was now predicting a £1.2m underspend. The underspends on both the Health and Care Sector Work Academy and the Bus Review Implementation project were due to delivery being slipped to 2021-22 which meant that there were no expected savings from these projects if carry-forwards were approved at the end of the financial year. The Board was also asked to note that additional grant funding of around £136k had been received to support business following the exit from the European Union.

The forecast capital outturn showed a forecast underspend of £25.8m. Officers would be reviewing all forecast underspends to determine at year end how much of this sum represented genuine savings and how much was slippage. A report would be brought to the Board in March seeking approval of carry forwards where appropriate.

The Board was invited to approve the movement of £900k from the subject to approval to the approved budget for the Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Programme. This had previously been reported to the Board in September 2020, but due to an administrative error the Board had been invited to approve the movement of £1,040k rather than the £1,940k required. The £900k now being sought represented the balance.

The Board was also invited to approve an in-year update to the Treasury Management Strategy to reflect advice received from the Combined Authority's Treasury Management Advisors. This would remove the total cap on investment, but retain the £25m cap per individual investment.

Councillor Herbert noted that the CAM update report had been withdrawn from the meeting agenda, but that a lot seemed to be happening with the project including the appointment of Mott McDonald as a design contractor and high expenditure on Deloitte. He asked for more information about the basis of the £1.4m expenditure on the CAM outline business case (OBC) including an update on the value for money of this expenditure and the work done by Deloitte for £1.6m. The Mayor stated that that this information was all in the public domain and a further report on the CAM containing more information would be brought to the Board in March 2021. The aim with the CAM project was to deliver something exceptional and beyond the scope of the projects usually undertaken by local authorities. In order to do this the best advice was needed and this was the role of Deloitte. The OBC would be developed over the next twelve months. There was undoubtedly a cost involved in delivering the best system, but there would also be a cost to not delivering a transformational project. Housing need was acute, but the existing transport network did not allow this to be met across the county. The Chief Finance Officer stated that that the £1.4m budget line for the CAM was the original budget approved by the Board and related mainly to work on the essential tunnel system. A further budget line related to the writing of strategies and work streams on CAM development. These had been brought before the Board in August and September 2020. Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, acknowledged that the reports to the Board in August and September 2020 had asked for a lot of money to support a different approach to the CAM project and that the Board had not yet seen any outputs against this. She acknowledged the request for more visibility around how use of this funding was progressing in public reports and would see this was taken on board moving forward. The Mayor stated that if the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wanted to take the issue of CAM finance to the Committee he would be happy for this to be discussed.

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

- a) Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date.
- b) Approve the movement of £900k from Subject to Approval to Approved budget for the Digital Connectivity Infrastructure Programme.
- c) Note the Chief Finance Officer's acceptance of additional funding to support business through the EU exit grant and associated expenditure.
- d) Approve the amendment to the limit on investment balances held with Money Market Funds in the current Treasury Management Strategy.

## 635. Mayor's Budget 2021-22

The Board was invited to approve the draft Mayor's budget for 2021/22.

Councillor Herbert asked where the Communications Team sat in relation to the Mayor's budget. Officers stated that the Communications Team was included within the Combined Authority budget and that it had five members of staff and reported to John Hill, Chief Executive. Councillor Herbert commented that he was keen that the

Combined Authority should publish its Purdah rules, including around communications. Mr Hill confirmed that this would be done.

Cllr Bailey commented that she judged the Mayor's budget represented good value for money in comparison with other Combined Authorities, noting that it was not proposed to levy a precept as was the case in some other Combined Authorities and that the Mayor did not claim all of the allowance to which he was entitled.

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

Approve the Mayor's draft budget for 2021-22.

In accordance with the Constitution this was a recorded vote:

	For	Against	Abstain
Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Anna Bailey	X		
Councillor Chris Boden	X		
Councillor Steve Count	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert			X
Councillor John Holdich	X		
Councillor John Neish	X		
Councillor Bridget Smith	X		
Mayor James Palmer	X		

The vote in favour contained at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, or their Substitute Members.

#### 636. 2021-22 Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan 2021-25

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's questions on this item. A copy of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix 1.

The Chief Finance Officer stated that officers had carried out the budget setting process for 2021/22 in accordance with the timetable agreed by the Board. Budget preparation had taken account of the level of reserves brought forward from previous financial years and of expected annual funding streams from 2021/22 onwards to ensure that spending plans continued to be affordable. In accordance with Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, the budget had been based on robust estimates and the level of reserves, including the £1m contingency reserve, were expected to remain at a prudent level over the lifetime of the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP). Feedback from the consultation on the draft budget had been discussed at a recent Leaders' Strategy meeting and none of the suggestions received were considered of sufficient significance to require any amendment to the draft budget or the MTFP. There was no proposal to levy a precept in the 2021/22 financial year.



Councillor Herbert commented that during discussions with Government in 2017/18, including with the then Secretary of State, there had been a commitment that there would be a Devolution 2. The capital programme set out in the report effectively represented a dwindling asset over the next four years and he asked at what point there would be discussions with Government about the additionality which the Combined Authority could add going forward. Councillor Herbert judged that there would be value in having a clear process to evidence to Government that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough represented a sound investment in addition to pursuing individual funding opportunities. Unemployment was rising significantly due to Covid and he judged there was a need to make the case for supporting bounce-back as well as long term growth. The Mayor stated that discussions had been taking place with Government to attract additional funding into the area for projects including the Cambridge Northern East Fringe, Peterborough ARU, A10 junction upgrades and Cambridge South Station. So, whilst it was a diminishing fund, other new funding was still being brought into the area via the Combined Authority. The Combined Authority prospectus set out the Authority's ambitions for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and he would continue to lobby Government for what was needed.

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

- a) Approve the revenue budget for 2021/22 and the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2021/22 to 2024/25.
- b) Approve the capital programme 2021/22 to 2024/25.

In accordance with the Constitution this was a recorded vote:

	For	Against	Abstain
Austen Adams	X		
Councillor Anna Bailey	X		
Councillor Chris Boden	X		
Councillor Steve Count	X		
Councillor Lewis Herbert			X
Councillor John Holdich	X		
Councillor John Neish	X		
Councillor Bridget Smith			X
Mayor James Palmer	X		

The vote in favour contained at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, or their Substitute Members.

## 637. Transport Levy 2021-22

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

The Board was invited to approve the amount of the Transport Levy for 2021/22 and its apportionment between Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council in the Combined Authority's capacity as Transport Authority. In previous years, the Combined Authority had also delegated a number of duties to the two Highways Authorities, but from March 2021 these would be discharged by the Combined Authority. The apportionment of the levy had been agreed by the S151 Officers for both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

Councillor Bailey drew attention to the cost of concessionary bus fares in comparison to the actual budget sums available. Whilst she did not oppose concessionary fares, she judged that this had a disproportionate effect on rural areas like East Cambridgeshire and Fenland as greater use was made of concessionary fares where more bus services were available. She welcomed the Combined Authority taking a more direct role in future and the opportunity to have more control over routes and to establish a strategic network of bus services. The Mayor acknowledged the work done by the two local Highways Authorities in previous years. Covid had created a difficult time for the bus industry, but it had also allowed an opportunity to re-evaluate the position and to hopefully bring forward a more balanced bus and transport network across Cambridgeshire Peterborough, including the rural network.

Councillor Holdich noted that there were around two and a half million concessionary fare users and commented that it was a pity that it was not possible to charge £1 a trip to provide better services elsewhere.

Councillor Count confirmed that he was content with the apportionment proposed. He acknowledged the opportunity provided by Covid to re-evaluate the position in relation to bus services and noted that the Combined Authority was compiling information on franchising in order for this to be considered more fully in the future. He judged that a strategic core vision would be needed for the services which the Authority aspired to deliver. The Mayor commented that it was imperative that any future delivery model should complement the CAM and not compete with it.

On being proposed by Councillor Count, seconded by Councillor Holdich, it was resolved unanimously to approve the amount and apportionment of the Transport Levy for the 2021-22 financial year as set out below:

Total Levy: £13,039,675

Peterborough City Council: £3,793,659

Cambridgeshire County Council: £9,246,016

The vote in favour included at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils, to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, or their Substitute Members.

## Part 3 – Combined Authority Decisions

### 638. CAM Update January 2021

This report was withdrawn.

### 639. Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus - Approval of Third Tranche of Project Proposals

The report contained two appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The Mayor asked whether any Member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No Member expressed the wish to do so.

The Board was invited to approve the third tranche of project proposals submitted under the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Market Towns Programme Investment Prospectus. The projects were designed to support the Covid recovery as well as growth. Fifteen projects had been approved so far as part of the first two tranches of applications and had been awarded around £4.8m of grant, attracting around a further £3.8m of match funding. All project applications had been independently assessed and the next tranche of project proposals was due to be brought before the Board in March 2021.

Councillor Neish commented that Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) warmly welcomed the capital which had been made available through the programme and was pleased that all of its project proposals had been approved by the independent assessor. HDC had also drawn up a reserve list of projects should further funding be available, demonstrating its ambition to support its high streets.

Councillor Count commented that it had been a long time since market towns had been able to attract this type of funding. Lots of innovative ideas had been brought forward and as one of the county councillors representing March he particularly welcomed the proposed project which would transform the town.

Councillor Herbert commented that the challenges faced by both town and city centres were bigger than ever. He hoped that it would be possible to do some collaborative work on how best to rejuvenate local town and city centres going forward and to think about how they will operate. The Mayor endorsed these comments and offered his thanks to the Leaders of all of the constituent councils for their work in support of the market towns programme. He also highlighted the investment which had been made in Cambridge City centre and the cathedral area in Peterborough. He judged that it was right that the Combined Authority continued to invest in its towns and cities and to continue lobbying Government for the funding needed.

Looking ahead to the Covid recovery, Councillor Smith commented that village centres had been vital to rural communities during the pandemic. Going forward, she would like

to see some collaborative work between the Combined Authority, the Business Board and district councils to see what could be done to regenerate those village centres, including the pub trade which had suffered greatly. The Mayor stated that, to date, the Business Board had invested £55m into businesses across the Combined Authority area, including £17m into businesses in South Cambridgeshire. He agreed that the Combined Authority should continue to do all it could to support the local economy. He also looked to Government to bring forward more schemes like 'eat out to help out' following its success last summer.

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

Approve project proposals received under Market Towns Programme and in response to town centre Covid-19 recovery received from Fenland, East Cambridgeshire, and Huntingdonshire to the sum of £4,143,079.

#### 640. Business Growth Service - Growth Company Board

The Business Growth Service Growth Company Board had held its first meeting on 4 December 2020. This had identified four issues which required the approval of the Combined Authority Board in accordance with the Growth Co shareholders agreement. The original Shareholder Agreement approved by the Board in July 2019 set out a structure where Angle Holdings Ltd would be the sole shareholder. The revised Shareholder agreement reflected the new structure in which Angle Holdings Ltd would initially be the sole shareholder in the Growth Co, but the Growth Co would then issue further shares which would be purchased by the Combined Authority.

Councillor Herbert commented that there were some really good projects associated with this work, but that he found the report unclear. He asked for more information about the proposed use of the £5.4m of funding and what percentage of this would be the cost of the overheads associated with setting the company up. Councillor Herbert further commented that going forward he judged it would be good to focus on the core objectives and how it could support recovery. The Director of Business and Skills stated that a special purpose vehicle (SPV) had been created to fund the Business Growth Service. The £5.4m was a Local Growth Fund equity investment from the Business Board which effectively converted the capital investment into revenue. The total budget for the Business Growth Service was around £26m and the cost of running the SPV for three years was around £800k. He would confirm the exact figure outside of the meeting. The Mayor stated that the BGS was a vehicle to bring in the finance to invest in the economy of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and help tackle the impact of Covid.

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

- a. Approve the appointment of Barclays Bank as Company Bankers.
- b. Approve amendment of the Accounting Reference Date from 31st August 21 to 31 March 2021.

- c. Approve amendment of the Company's name at Companies House from Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Business Growth Co Ltd to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Co Ltd.
- d. Approve access for staff employed in Growth Co, to the NEST Pension Scheme with a total contribution of 10%, of which there is a 5 % minimum employer contribution.
- e. To grant the Monitoring Officer delegated authority, in consultation with the Director of Business and Skills to agree a final Shareholder Agreement in substantively the same form as is set out in Appendix 1 and to execute the agreement and any related deeds of adherence and succession or of amendment and restatement necessary to substitute it for the previous Shareholder Agreement approved by the Combined Authority.

#### 641. A16 Norwood Improvements

The Monitoring Officer corrected the voting arrangements contained in the report. Special voting arrangements applied to the recommendations as they related to transport funding. This meant that a vote in favour required the support of at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, or their Substitute Members to be carried.

The Norwood site and adjacent site were expected to provide 2945 dwellings and the strategic outline business case contained a package of measures to improve transport in the area. These measures would be further developed at outline business case stage. The proposals had been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 6 January 2021 where they were endorsed unanimously. The project had a benefit to cost ration (BCR) of 3.2 which was high. Going forward, further work would be undertaken to refine costs and a public consultation would take place.

Councillor Holdich expressed his thanks to the Mayor and the Combined Authority for the work on this project which would unlock the potential for significant housing development. Work was continuing to resolve the number of affordable homes on the site, but he was confident that this would be achieved. The Mayor expressed the hope to see some £100k Homes included in the development.

Councillor Smith commented that it would be good to see how this scheme linked into an overall sustainable transport strategy for Peterborough and that she would like to see this as the OBC progressed.

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

Approve the drawdown of £630,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to produce the Outline Business Case. This includes £320,000 carry forward from the current financial year subject to approval budget.

The vote in favour included at least two-thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils to include the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, or their Substitute Members.

## 642. London Luton Airport Air Space (Stack) Consultation

Councillor Smith declared an interest in this item, in that the proposed change to aircraft stacking arrangements would have a significant impact on the village where she lived. Minute 623 above also refers.

The Board was invited to discuss the Combined Authority's response to the National Air Traffic Service (NATS) consultation on proposed changes to the arrivals flightpath and stacking arrangements for London Luton Airport. Two options had been proposed, both of which included stack options that required planes to circle at or above 8,000ft over parts of Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire. Potential areas of concern included noise pollution and air pollution. If approved, the proposed changes would not be implemented before February 2022. The report proposals had been discussed by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 6 January 2021 where they were endorsed unanimously.

Councillor Smith stated that she had written jointly with her county councillor and neighbouring Bedfordshire councillor to local MPs on this issue to voice their objections. In her judgement, stacking aircraft above quiet countryside would create and audible and continuous noise which would have a negative impact on quality of life. She judged that it would make better sense to stack over areas that were already noisy, like urban areas or the A1.

Councillor Neish stated that the proposals had been discussed by Huntingdonshire District Council. The need to stack aircraft somewhere was accepted, but concern had been expressed about the lack of information provided by the NATS. He also noted that the 8,000ft altitude was measured from sea level, so the stack would be lower over high ground. Many residents were concerned by the proposals and it was unclear what alternatives had been considered.

The Mayor acknowledged the concerns expressed, but noted that the A1 passed through both Huntingdonshire and Peterborough so might not represent the best alternative site for the stack for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as a whole.

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

Delegate authority to the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to respond to the consultation on behalf of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, reflecting the Committee's discussion.

## 643. Greater Cambridge Partnership Consultations - Waterbeach to Cambridge and Eastern Access

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

The Greater Cambridge Partnership's consultations on Waterbeach to Cambridge and Eastern Access had closed in late December, but an extension had been agreed for the Combined Authority's response to enable the proposals to be discussed by both the Transport and Infrastructure Committee and by the Board. In relation to Waterbeach, it would be essential to understand how the proposed scheme would align with the recent improvements made to the rail network and services between Waterbeach and Cambridge and to understand how the scheme would complement those improvements rather than creating a duplication in services. The scheme should also support and enhance environmental sustainability, including the delivery of net gains on biodiversity. As the scheme was developed it would be essential that due consideration was given to the requirements of the CAM and the A10 improvements and to ensure that it did not have an adverse impact on the capacity and flow of the Milton Interchange. With regard to the Eastern Access, the main concerns related to ensuring that components of the scheme were integrated into development plans for that part of the city to decrease dependency on private car use. This included ensuring that it would complement the wider CAM project, especially the tunnel section, and making sure that it did not adversely impact on the operation of the Fen Ditton and Milton Interchange junctions. The report was discussed by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 6 January 2021 and the recommendations had been endorsed unanimously.

Councillor Herbert commented that it was important to work in partnership on this. The benefit cost ration (BCR) assessment of the A10 found that improvements to public transport were vital, placed ahead of junction improvements or the expansion of the A10. The proposals were not just about the Waterbeach to Cambridge connection, but also the traffic which could use these transition points to join the public transport network. The route was also in the Local Transport Plan. The Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) would though give any proposals full consideration. Councillor Herbert further suggested it would be useful to arrange a separate meeting between himself, the Mayor and Councillors Count and Smith to discuss matters further.

Councillor Smith commented that she understood that the GCP's route had previously been accepted and she was concerned that seemed now to be a move to re-direct money to station improvements.

The Mayor commented that rail capacity between Waterbeach and Cambridge had doubled, so he did not understand why people would be taking the bus to do the same journey. A station would be needed for the Waterbeach Barracks development. If the GCP was to fund that now it could recover its costs from the developer. However, the Mayor accepted that the Combined Authority could only make representations on this.

Councillor Count commented that he was not the County Council's representative on the GCP, but he was aware of the issues. Projects of this type took a long time to deliver and the need which they were designed to meet could change. He judged the

increased rail capacity to be pertinent to this as he did not like to see multiple transport options following the same route. Instead, it was better to create touch points where travellers could change their mode of transport. He had asked for an officer meeting to be arranged to discuss the position and this would be taking place the following week. He suggested that Member level discussions could take place after that.

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

- a) Consider/ Approve the proposed consultation response commentary in relation to the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Waterbeach to Cambridge proposals, with a recommendation that they are issued on behalf of the Combined Authority;
- b) Consider/ Approve the proposed consultation response commentary in relation to the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Greater Cambridge Partnership's Eastern Access proposals, with a recommendation that they are issued on behalf of the Combined Authority.

#### 644. Amendment to Terms of Reference: Transport and Infrastructure Committee

The report contained a recommendation from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee and had been added to the published agenda as a late report with the agreement of the Mayor.

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

The recommendation was designed to support the Combined Authority in its role as Transport Authority to contribute to discussions in an informed way through the Mayor to GCP meetings.

Councillor Herbert commented that he would support GCP officers attending the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, but noted that the Mayor was already attending GCP meetings as an observer and so questioned how the proposal would add value. However, the GCP would work with whatever system the Combined Authority wanted.

The Mayor stated his belief that it would be important for the Transport and Infrastructure Committee to be involved so that he would be able to take its considered opinion forward to the GCP. He acknowledged that decisions would be for the GCP, but felt that this public discussion was needed.

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

Authorise the Monitoring Officer to amend Chapter 8 of the Constitution of the Combined Authority Board (Transport and Infrastructure Committee), Section 3, to include: 3.2.13 Review matters related to the CAM scheme prepared by the



Greater Cambridge Partnership and make representations to the GCP Executive Board related to CAM matters.

The vote in favour included at least two thirds of all Members (or their Substitutes) present and voting.

## Community Land Trust Business Case

The Board was invited to approve the Community Land Trust Business Case attached to the report at Appendix 1. The proposals had been considered by the Housing and Communities Committee on 11 January 2021 where they had been endorsed unanimously, subject to some specific changes to the business case. These related to the evaluation, a requirement for the affordable housing provision to meet the requirement of each local planning authority and a requirement to engage the local planning authority early in the process. These changes had been reflected in the business which the Board was being asked to approve and were shown as tracked changes for ease of reference.

Councillor Bailey commented that East Cambridgeshire was a big supporter of community land trusts (CLTs) and shared the experience at Haddenham as an example of the potential benefits. Ultimately, 17 properties on that development would be made available to local residents as affordable housing.

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

Approve the Community Land Trust Business Case at Appendix 1 of the report.

## 645. Local Growth Fund Programme Management Review January 2021

Mr Adams reminded the Board that the recommendations for each of the remaining reports had been debated at length by the Business Board and endorsed unanimously and that they were being brought before the Combined Authority Board in its role as Accountable Body.

The report contained two appendices which were exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The Mayor asked whether any Member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No Member expressed the wish to do so.

Project spend to the end of December 2020 was around £93m and was on course to deliver full spend by the end of the programme. All Eastern Agri-Tech funding had been awarded. Monitoring and evaluation of the Local Growth Fund (LGF) was continuing and the report to the Business Board contained an update on LGF recycled funding. The recommendations included project change requests for Cambridge Medipark Ltd Biomedical Multi-occupancy building project and the Cambridgeshire Skills March Adult Education project.

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

- a) Approve the project change request for Cambridge Medipark Ltd Biomedical Multi-occupancy building project;
- b) Approve the project change request for the Cambridgeshire Skills March Adult Education project; and
- c) Note the programme updates outlined in the report to the Business Board.

#### 646. University of Peterborough Phase 2 - Incorporation of PropCo2

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

The Board's approval was sought to delegate authority to officers to develop the legal documentation for the Peterborough R&D Property Co Limited, to approve the company's business plan and to consent to the company entering into a contract with the commercial operator which was successful in the procurement exercise. The proposals had been submitted to the Skills Committee on 11 January 2021 for noting before being considered by the Business Board on 12 January 2021 where they were endorsed unanimously.

Councillor Holdich commented that the question of car parking had been raised recently when the Director of Business and Skills gave a presentation on the project at Peterborough City Council. There would be a reduction in available car-parking in the area, but the Research and Development building would be focusing on green technology and so would be delivering a real benefit.

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

- a) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Growth, the Section 73 Officer and the Monitoring Officer, to develop the necessary legal documentation for the Peterborough R&D Property Company.
- b) Approve the Business Plan for Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd.
- c) Consent to Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd entering into the contract with the commercial operation which is successful in the procurement exercise.

#### 647. University of Peterborough Phase 2 Manufacturing and Materials Research and Development Centre Project

The Board was invited to agree to a £1.13m increase in equity investment from the existing project partner into the Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd. If approved, Photocentric's share in the project would increase from 12.2% to 18.2%. This investment would allow the size of the centre to be enlarged, increasing the available letting area by 16%. The benefit cost ratio was 2.10 and the Combined Authority would not be disadvantaged by the proposal. The Board's attention was also drawn to the project change request form at Appendix 1 relating to Net Zero Manufacturing Material Research and Development Centre. The recommendations had been considered by the Business Board on 12 January 2021 where they were endorsed unanimously.

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

- a) Agree to the £1.13m increase in equity investment from the existing project partner into the Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd.
- b) Subject to the approval of recommendation (a), to note the new revised total project budget of £19.5 million and the revised shareholding split in Peterborough R&D Property Company Ltd, the Joint Venture Company delivering the project.

#### 648. Local Enterprise Partnership Partnering Strategy

The report provided a summary of collaboration with various other local enterprise partnerships (LEPs) both in the short term and looking to the future. In recent months work had focused on sharing insights and data on the Covid response and this would inform the next iteration of the Local Economic Recovery Strategy (LERS) which would be brought to the Board in March 2021. In the longer term, the focus would shift to implementation and mobilisation. There would also be a focus on an agri-tech growth initiative to include collaboration across the total rural area. Collaboration would also take place across the wider LEP cohort through peer to peer work on best practice and peer reviews.

Councillor Herbert welcomed the links that were being forged with other LEPS, but voiced his longstanding concern about LEP area overlaps. He commented that it was confusing that the exact boundaries had not yet been confirmed and sought confirmation that this work was being advanced. The Director of Business and Skills confirmed that it was intended to bring a report on this to the Board in March and explained that this work had been pushed back while officers had prioritised the Covid response. The proposal before the Board today was about collaborative working with other LEPs. The Business Board had debated this at length and had taken the view that the benefits outweighed the challenges of the mechanics of how it would be put into practice.

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

Approve the Partnering Strategies approach between the Business Board and:

- i. The OxCam LEPs;
- ii. NALEP, GLLEP & SEMLEP; and

iii. The LEP Network.

(Mayor)

## Combined Authority Board 27 January 2021: Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### Item 1.7 – Appointment of Combined Authority Returning Officer

Q: The reports suggests an election in May can be run within the budget envelope already envisioned. With the vast majority of local authorities reporting that they will struggle to run an election this year - is the Combined Authority confident that it can run a fair and free election under Covid restrictions and within the budget envelope suggested?

*A: Estimates of election costs have been received from constituent councils and are being checked by officers. Whilst increased costs are expected due to COVID-19, there are savings to be made from some common costs being shared across a number of other elections taking place at the same time as the Mayoral election. We are currently expecting the overall costs of the mayoral election to be affordable from the election reserve we have built up over the past four years.*

### Item 1.8 – Performance Report

Q: The Combined Authority's flagship £100m Affordable Housing Programme now has a residual RAG status of RED. What plans does the Combined Authority have to address this?

*A: We remain confident that we will receive the finance necessary, but in the meantime we are preparing an action plan in the possible event of an unsatisfactory outcome that will be discussed with Leaders, the Housing and Communities Committee and the Board.*

### Item 1.10 – Combined Authority Business Plan and Annual Report 2021-22

Q: The Business Plan 2021/22 states that 'You will see more active travel, more work towards 'doubling nature' and hammering carbon emissions down to zero.' Can you provide further information and in practical terms about what is meant in practical terms by 'hammering carbon emissions down to zero' especially in regard to the authority's construction and transport projects?

*A: The Combined Authority is committed to the objective of reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2050 and this has been reflected in existing policies such as the Local Transport Plan. The Authority has established the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Climate Change Commission, chaired by Baroness Brown, and the Commission will publish its report soon. The Combined Authority Board will discuss the Commission's recommendations and their implications for the Authority's actions and policies, and will set out its response following publication.*

*The reason we asked Baroness Brown to lead the Commission in this work was because the Combined Authority does have significant construction and transport projects in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. We have an economy that is demanding housing delivery, demonstrated by the cost of housing, particularly in the south of the county. We have a burgeoning economy in Peterborough which is showing consistent growth and we want to make sure that any policy we put forward for growth is sustainable given the rural nature of our county. Projects such as CAM Metro are entirely designed to bring forward sustainable and ecologically sound growth in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and we are doing everything we can now to make appropriate decisions now to hit those targets.*

## Item 2.1 Budget Monitor Update Report January 2021

Q: The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section # notes the CAM Outline Business Case budget of £1.425M – could you advise what stage the Outline Business Case is currently at and how much of the current budget has been spent? Could the detail around this be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee?

*A: This budget line reflects costs associated with the City Tunnel Section of the network. There is no further expenditure expected against this budget line in 2020/21. Over the summer of 2020, during the technical work to support the City Tunnel Section OBC, the segmented approach to delivering the CAM was challenged. Work was initiated to reassess the programme approach. Work is continuing to develop a single programme approach for a single network, referred to as 'One CAM'. Details of the emerging expenditure associated with the new approach was provided to this Board in the CAM update reports in August and September 2020.*

Q: The breakdown of the revenue position under the Delivery and Strategy section # notes the One CAM Innovation Company has £6.84m allocated with nearly £4M of that already spent. How will the remaining £3M be spent by the end of March?

*A: The One CAM company has £1.9M allocated against it for this financial year as an equity investment. That is currently funding the recruitment costs and the non-executive director allowances. The remaining funding is held by the CPCA to support a number of workstreams as set out in the CPCA Board decisions of August and September last year. As in previous years, officers will bring a paper at year end providing an analysis of all underspends and (where appropriate) will recommend the Board to approve the carry forward of any unspent balances to fund activities that may extend into the new financial year.*

## Item 2.3 2021-22 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2021-2025

Q: Forecast expenditure on the CAM Outline Business Case £5M for 2021/22, and £6.5M in years 2022/23 and 2023/24. Will the Outline Business Case be concluded by the end of 2024?

*A: The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) provides for funding until 2023/24. Work is ongoing to establish a timetable under the One CAM approach, which will be reported to the Board once it is finalised with the DfT and other Government departments.*

Q: Forecast expenditure on the CAM SPV outlined in Appendix 2c is £2M for 2021/22. What is the spend estimate on the SPV beyond 2021/22 and why is this not included in the forecast?

*A: Similarly to the previous answer, work will continue over the next year to confirm the expected on-going costs of One CAM and appropriate funding arrangements to support those costs. This will be for agreement between the CPCA Board and One CAM Limited as to who holds responsibility for the budget and future funding of the project.*

#### Item 2.4 Transport Levy 2021/22

Q: Does the Transport Levy amount sufficiently reflect the enormity of work that has been done and will continue to be done by the Combined Authority in the future?

*A: The paper before the Board explains in the tables at paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 the cost of the functions that the Levy may by law fund, and the functions the proposed levy will fund. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can analyse those it would be very helpful.*

#### Item 3.1 CAM Update

Q: Why has the CAM Update item been withdrawn?

*A: There are no decisions or substantive updates for the Board for this meeting. A full report will be brought to the next meeting of the Combined Authority Board, in March.*

#### Item 4.3 Greater Cambridge Partnership Consultations - Waterbeach to Cambridge and Eastern Access

Q: What is the Combined Authority's position on an alternative public transport mode for travel between Waterbeach and Cambridge? This has previously formed part of the Authority's proposals for the CAM; is this still the case?

*A: The proposed Combined Authority position on the issues raised in the GCP's consultation on the Waterbeach to Cambridge scheme is set out in the papers before the Board. That project forms part over the overall CAM Network.*

*In addition to the development of the CAM scheme, and following the representations made both by the Mayor and by the Combined Authority, Network Rail has completed upgrade works to extend platforms at Waterbeach and Littleport. As a result, the infrastructure between Cambridge and King's Lynn can now support eight-carriage train formations calling at all intermediate stations. This is a significant boost to space and seats on train services. With the introduction of the December timetable, this has meant that following the completion of the work, there are now half-hourly services at Waterbeach and that will be a significant improvement for passengers using the station.*

*The GCP's current plans, which the Mayor has asked them to look at, are to take a busway from Cambridge North Station – which is just over a mile from Waterbeach - around Waterbeach and into Waterbeach Station. The question is whether that is the best way to spend the money at this moment in time or would the money be better spent on upgrading the railway stations that are there. Also, with consideration of the new town which is being built at Waterbeach Barracks, would the route for the potential CAM Metro, where the busway will eventually become the CAM Metro, be better if it went in a corridor alongside the A10. These are just suggestions for the GCP to consider.*

## Item 6.2 University of Peterborough Phase 2 - Incorporation of PropCo2

Q: The plans mention car park provision. What weight has been given to the environmental impact of the proposals in terms of land use and carbon emissions?

A: *The requirement for a car park was a stipulation made by the planners at Peterborough City Council and includes 178 spaces to accommodate:*

- *Up to 250 tenants in the new research building*
- *The replacement 36 spaces allocated for the teaching building, lost as a result of the research building being placed over the land allocated to them; and*
- *An allowance for additional spaces to allow the currently approved on-street parking for the teaching building, to move into an off street car park.*

*Consideration will be given to reducing the number of spaces so as to limit the use of car transport and the feasibility of electric vehicle charging points is being considered.*

*In regard to the environmental impact on the land in use, we have developed a landscape solution that minimises the take up of the public space and attempts to provide a net increase in green space, in comparison with the current land use.*

## Report added to the agenda after publication

### Terms of Reference – Transport and Infrastructure Committee

Q: Could the Board provide some clarity around the decision making structure that will result from the proposals set out to change the remit of Transport and Infrastructure committee?

A: *This question appears to relate to the item “Amendment to Terms of Reference: Transport and Infrastructure Committee” rather than Item 1.6, which is a simple change to the County Council representation on the Transport & Infrastructure Committee.*

*The effect of the proposed amendment to the terms of reference of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee would be to provide a formal mechanism for the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, on behalf of the CPCA as Local Transport Authority, to*



*support the Mayor in his role as a non-voting member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board. This would in turn contribute to the decision making of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Executive Board on matters relating to the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro scheme. The mechanism would be for the Committee to provide the Mayor with representations on CAM matters being considered by the GCP. Final decision making on GCP CAM projects would remain with the GCP Executive Board, subject to any public inquiry process necessary to secure the necessary consents for an individual scheme.*

*The intention is to ensure that the Transport and Infrastructure Committee is fully briefed on pending GCP CAM decision making and can support the Mayor by formulating representations to the GCP, on behalf of the CPCA as Local Transport Authority.*

*The decision making structure would be:*

- The GCP would publish its agendas for Joint Assembly and Executive Board meetings in the normal way.*
- Any reports relating the CAM scheme would be brought to a meeting of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee. The relevant GCP officers would be invited to present the reports and respond to any queries from the Committee.*
- The Committee would formulate any representations on those reports and they would be shared with the GCP by the Mayor.*
- The GCP Executive Board would then have those representations available to it when it made its decisions on CAM matters*

This is all about trying to get a proper process in place around joint working between the Combined Authority and the GCP.