



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## **CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY: MINUTES**

**Date:** Wednesday 26 June 2019

**Time:** 10.30am – 1.40pm

**Venue:** Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge CB3 0AP

**Present:** J Palmer (Mayor)

Councillors A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, C Boden – Fenland District Council, G Bull – Huntingdonshire District Council (to 12.05pm), L Herbert – Cambridge City Council, R Hickford - Cambridgeshire County Council, J Holdich – Peterborough City Council and B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Professor A Neely – Vice Chair of the Business Board (to 12.50pm)

**Co-opted** J Bawden (Clinical Commissioning Group) (to 12.55pm) and Councillor D Over (Vice Chairman  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority)

### **370. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies were received from Councillor S Count, substituted by Councillor R Hickford, A Khalid (substituted by Professor A Neely) and J Ablewhite, Police and Crime Commissioner.

Professor Neely declared a non-pecuniary interest at Item 3.4: Local Industrial Strategy Update in relation to his involvement with Project Spring (minute 382 refers).

### **371. MINUTES – 29 MAY 2019**

The minutes of the meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

### **372. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

### **373. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions were received. The Mayor stated that a number of comments had been received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and that these would be heard when the relevant agenda item was reached.

### **374. COMBINED AUTHORITY FORWARD PLAN**

The Mayor stated that the Forward Plan was published on the Combined Authority website and updated regularly. It had been published most recently on 24 June 2019. He invited Councillor L Dupre, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's comments on this item.

Councillor Dupre commented that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had expressed concern at the timing of the publication of the Forward Plan which meant that it had not been available for review when the Committee met on the morning of 24 June 2019. The Committee sought an assurance that in future it would be published in time to be considered by the Committee. The Mayor stated that this would be addressed.

Councillor Herbert asked for more information about the reports listed for the July Board meeting on the CAM Metro: July 2019 and Transport Funding. Ms Sawyer, Joint Chief Executive, stated that these related to funding decisions which might need to come forward to the Board for decision in July 2019. Greater clarity would be available during the course of the month as work progressed. Councillor Herbert asked that this should be shared with members of the Board and with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Forward Plan was noted.

### **375. APPOINTMENTS TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**

The Mayor stated that he had been advised of a number of changes to Committee appointments since the last meeting and that a revised Appendix 1 had been tabled setting these out. He invited Councillor Dupre, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's comments on this item.

Councillor Dupre noted that the Combined Authority was currently reviewing its Constitution and governance arrangements and that this might have an impact on the functions and membership of the committees. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had asked to be provided with a comprehensive list of appointed senior officers at the Combined Authority. The Committee had also asked the reasons for the amendments to the allocations to Executive Committees for 2019/20 and whether the Board would ensure that frequent governance changes did not get in the way of the Authority achieving its strategic objectives, noting that governance changes would also affect how Overview & Scrutiny worked.

Ms Sawyer, Joint Chief Executive, confirmed that she would provide a list of appointed senior officers and stated that she would also be happy to take the Overview and Scrutiny Committee through the proposed changes to governance arrangements before these were presented to the Board for approval. Appointments to Committees were made by Council Leaders and could be amended by them at any time.

Councillors Bailey, Boden and Bull advised of further appointments relating to their respective Councils. These were:

- East Cambridgeshire District Council: Councillor A Bailey (substitute member of the Skills Committee);
- Fenland District Council: Councillor C Seaton (substitute member of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee);
- Huntingdonshire District Council: Councillor J Neish (substitute member of the Housing and Communities Committee).

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

Note and agree the updates to the membership of the committees for 2019/20 or until such time as the revised governance arrangements are approved, as set out in the revised Appendix 1 which was tabled at the meeting and in accordance with further verbal updates from Board members.

### **376. BUDGET MONITOR UPDATE**

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupre, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's comments on this item.

Councillor Dupre asked if the Committee could be provided with more clarity on schemes and associated funding and if the Finance team could provide a clear correspondence between lines in the budget and decisions by the Authority.

The Chief Finance Officer stated that revenue table at paragraph 2.2 set out the Grant Income for 2019/20. This included a number of funding streams including revenue gain share, Mayoral capacity funding, funding streams inherited from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and draw down from the Energy Hub. Around £800k additional income was expected to be generated from investments. The capital programme at Appendix 2 set out four types of activity: schemes over which the Combined Authority exercised direct control; schemes previously identified and costed; passported funds which allocate funds received from central Government; and growth funds which were funded through the transfer of balances from Cambridgeshire County Council. The original budget for 2019/20 had been agreed by the Board in January 2019. The carry forward of underspends from the previous financial year had subsequently been approved by the Board in May 2019.

Councillor Herbert asked for an update on the Kings Dyke scheme and whether it would be delivered on budget. The Mayor stated that the Combined Authority remained committed to delivering the Kings Dyke scheme in a timely manner. However, he had lost confidence in the delivery mechanism previously brought before the Board. He had held discussions with Cambridgeshire County Council and the Council was currently in discussion with contractors. Once those discussions had been completed the position would be reviewed. At this stage it was not certain that the £6m budget would remain unchanged, but a report would be brought to the Board when the position was clear. In the meantime, the Mayor continued to work closely with both the County Council and Fenland District Council.

Councillor Hickford commented that the County Council was hoping to be able to provide the Combined Authority with an options paper by the end of the week with the aim of meeting the following week for discussions.

Councillor Holdich welcomed the helpful clarification that the scheme would be going ahead and commented that the Board would want to be clear that the proposals were financially sound.

Councillor Boden commented that the benefit cost ratio for the Kings Dyke project was very high. He welcomed the assurances given by the Mayor and his clear statement of support. He also welcomed the speed with which the County Council would be providing the options paper given the pressing need for a timely resolution.

Councillor Smith commented that she judged that there continued to be a lack of clarity in relation to Capacity Funding and that she remained of the view that the Board should have sight of this expenditure. She asked the maximum amount of expenditure which the Chief Executives could authorise. Ms Sawyer, Joint Chief Executive, stated that the Capacity Fund had been created to allow flexibility around emerging issues. For example, it had been used recently to fund work on the impact of growth on public services in response to concerns expressed about this by the Board. It would not be used to fund work without reference to the full Board.

Councillor Herbert commented that the Combined Authority held significant reserves. He asked the size of the reserves held currently and why there was no report on the investment of those reserves. He commented that these reserves could perhaps be used to finance some affordable housing schemes rather than making use of the £100m Affordable Housing Scheme budget. The Chief Finance Officer stated that at the start of the 2019/20 financial year the Authority was holding approximately £125m in reserves. Investments were included as part of the Treasury Management reports which were submitted to the Audit and Governance Committee. The Combined Authority was currently being supported by Peterborough City Council's Treasury Management specialists, but was in the process of appointing its own specialists. Once appointed they would be tasked to look at ways of being more creative with the Authority's cash balances. Risk and liquidity would be key considerations and this would impact on the rates which could be achieved.

Councillor Bailey commented that she objected to the suggestion that money was being diverted from the £100m Affordable Housing scheme budget. The Devolution Deal had contained reference to the creation of a revolving fund for affordable housing projects as a way obtaining maximum benefit from the funds available and allowing them to outlast the original funding period.

Professor Neely commented that from the Business Board perspective he would find it helpful to have some macro-categorisation within the report to illustrate where funding was going, for example to transport, skills or housing projects.

The Mayor commented that Councillor Herbert was asking the Board to look at whether there were different ways for the Combined Authority to invest its reserves. He was happy for this to be done, but noted that much of the money contained within the reserve was already allocated to projects.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the updated financial position of the Combined Authority for the year
- b) Note the status of the Statement of Account for 2018/19

**377. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME SCHEME APPROVALS: JUNE 2019: ALEXANDER HOUSE, ELY**

The Mayor stated that there were three schemes for discussion on this occasion and that he proposed to consider each in turn. The proposals relating to Alexander House, Ely contained two exempt appendices and he asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss these. No request was made.

The Mayor invited Councillor Dupre, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to share the Committee's comments on this item.

Councillor Dupre asked if the Board could confirm that the Combined Authority was authorised to, and in a position to give commercial loans. She further asked how the loan was being secured and how the interest rate compared to the market and whether a revised condition to increase the percentage of (16%) affordable housing units (to be provided from the total of 25 units) could be approved.

The Mayor stated that so far as he was aware, the answers to all of these questions were contained in the report. He asked officers to send a note highlighting where in the report each point was answered to enable Councillor Dupre to feed this back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Board was invited to consider the provision of a commercial loan facility of £4.84m to Laragh House Developments Ltd for a scheme of 25 units based on the heads of terms detailed in the exempt Appendix 1. This would deliver four affordable units which the market was not obliged to provide. The loan would be secured against a charge on the land on which the property sat and it was due to be repaid by February 2021. A profit-share element had been negotiated which was projected to deliver around £350k which would be recycled into future projects through the revolving fund. Officers deemed the project to be relatively low risk.

Councillor Boden commented that the report did not make clear that the profit share would be used to fund additional affordable housing schemes through the revolving fund and that it was important that this was placed on the record. He offered his support to the proposals.

Councillor Smith expressed concern at the loss of employment opportunities from a site which was currently being used to provide office space. She understood that converting office space into housing was generally held in low regard and she judged it was inappropriate for the Combined Authority to put money into this project. She questioned how the Authority could be satisfied that the accommodation provided would be of sufficient quality and expressed concern about whether adequate outdoor play space would be available to families with children. In her view, this was primarily an investment when the Board's focus should be the provision of high quality affordable housing for people in greatest need.

Councillor Herbert commented that as a lecturer on planning he too had some concerns about the proposals and wanted to understand better the reasons behind this particular project and its inception. The building was located on a main road with windows overhanging the pavement and it was proposed to remove the existing parking provision. The City of Ely Council had recommended that the planning application be refused. If agreed, £35.5m of the £40m revolving fund for affordable housing provision would have been committed to projects in and around Ely. The Director for Housing and Development stated that Laragh Homes were aware of some of the other loans and grants made by the Combined Authority and had made an approach. They did not have

the necessary funding to deliver the project at speed and without support it might not happen at all. Should the Board support the proposals it would deliver affordable housing where none had previously been planned. A charge would be taken upon the land as security against the loan so it was commercially sensible. Most of the capital commitments within the £40m revolving fund had a quick cash flow turnaround meaning funds would regularly be released to support further projects across the county. At present the site housed a dilapidated office building with no long-term lettings. There was an outstanding planning consent, but it was understood that variations were being considered. If approved, the loan would be subject to obtaining the necessary planning consents.

Councillor Bailey commented that the site was located within her own Division and she knew it well. The proposals constituted a regeneration project. Part of the remit of the £40m revolving fund was to look at the conversion of office space to affordable housing where this was appropriate and there was a clear need for this type of affordable housing within the centre of Ely. She judged that the Board should encourage more schemes of this type which offered a quick turnaround with some profit which would be used to fund additional affordable housing schemes. The site was located close to two play parks and the riverside area and had a zebra crossing nearby. Building controls would ensure the quality of the provision.

Councillor Herbert commented that the scheme proposed that those purchasing the properties put up 80% of the cost with the remaining 20% as rent, so he did not consider the four units to be affordable housing. He was also concerned that they might be purchased as second homes. The Director of Housing and Development stated that the four units would be offered to local people.

Councillor Smith commented that she took no comfort from officers' assertion that without the Combined Authority's support the developer might not otherwise be able to proceed with the project and called for a recorded vote. The Mayor stated that there was no need for a recorded vote. It was common practice in cities to convert unwanted commercial space into housing and he could not understand how Councillor Herbert could have a different understanding of affordable housing from that within the central Government specification.

Councillor Boden commented that shared ownership did have a role to play in affordable housing provision and in his view should be a significant part of the Combined Authority's affordable housing programme. He disagreed with Councillor Smith's assertion that converting office space into accommodation was generally held in poor regard as it continued to be successfully deployed in many urban areas. However, given the make-up of Cambridgeshire he did not expect to see many schemes of this type brought forward. Given the reservations expressed on several occasions by Councillor Herbert in relation to the £40m revolving fund he suggested a report on the principle of the revolving fund might be added to a future agenda to allow the Board to discuss this again.

Councillor Holdich commented that he was on record as saying that he opposed the conversion of office space into accommodation in relation to experiences in Peterborough. However, he was reassured by Councillor Bailey's comments as the local Member that this was the right approach in this instance. On that basis he was content to support the proposals.

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

- a) Approve the provision of a commercial loan facility of £4.84m to Laragh House Developments Ltd for a scheme of 25 units based on the heads of terms detailed in the exempt Appendix 1
- b) Authorise the Director of Housing and Development, in consultation with Legal Counsel and the Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance, to conclude any necessary legal documentation to secure the loan, to include taking a charge upon the land.

**378. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME SCHEME APPROVALS: JUNE 2019: LUMINUS, HUNTINGDONSHIRE**

The Mayor noted that the proposals relating to Luminus, Huntingdonshire contained two exempt appendices and he asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss these. No request was made.

The Board was invited to commit grant funding of £618,800 from the £100m Affordable Housing programme to deliver fourteen new affordable homes for social rent at seven sites in Huntingdonshire. The proposed scheme by Luminus (now called Chorus) was ready to commence with an estimated completion date of autumn 2020. The proposals were endorsed by Huntingdonshire District Council.

Councillor Herbert asked how many homes would be demolished if the scheme proceeded and what the net increase in homes would be. Officers stated that they understood that only outbuildings would be demolished rather than any existing homes, but undertook to provide this figure outside of the meeting.

On being proposed by Councillor Bull, seconded by Councillor Hickford, it was resolved unanimously to:

Commit grant funding of £618,800 from the £100m Affordable Housing programme to deliver 14 new affordable homes for Social Rent at seven sites in Huntingdonshire.

**379. MOD SITE ELY – APPLICATION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

The Mayor stated that the rescission motion to the Special Council meeting at East Cambridgeshire District Council on 19 June 2019 had been successful. This meant that no further report to the Board was required regarding the Ministry of Defence site scheme in Ely. The Mayor stated that he deemed this to be an exceptional scheme and was glad that it would be progressing. If any similar opportunities existed elsewhere in Cambridgeshire he urged Board members to bring these forward for consideration.

The report was withdrawn.

**380. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME – PROPOSED ACQUISITION**

The Mayor stated that due to the commercially sensitive nature of the proposal the public report was necessarily circumspect about the details of the proposed acquisition. Board members had though had sight of the full proposal contained in the two exempt appendices to the report. He asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss these exempt appendices. No request was made.

The Board's approval was sought to the acquisition of a site in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for the sum of £1.225m, based on the heads of terms detailed in exempt Appendix 1. The intention was to secure a new planning consent for a residential scheme of approximately 60 residential units. This should enable a policy compliant scheme with 30% affordable housing which equated to approximately 18 affordable housing units which would not otherwise have been provided.

Councillor Herbert asked at what stage the balance of funding would be requested, whether it was possible to share publicly what the cost per unit was expected to be and how much internal and external space would be available per unit. The Director of Housing and Development stated that a further report would be brought to the Board when planning consent was anticipated. The project could be delivered via the DevCo once this was established or through a joint venture. The development would comprise a mixture of one to four bedroom units and more detail was contained in the exempt appendices.

Councillor Smith commented that, if, approved, this would represent another employment site being given up to housing. She asked whether an assessment had been done on redeveloping the site for employment purposes rather than housing. The Director for Housing and Development stated that the current commercial use comprised mainly storage with four people employed across a four acre site. The availability of the site suggested that there was no appetite from the market for commercial development.

Councillor Holdich commented that the site was surrounded by residential developments so he saw no reason why planning permission for a housing development would not be granted. Many projects took a long time to come to fruition so speed of delivery was a key consideration. Councillor Bull concurred with this view.

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

- a) Approve the acquisition of a site in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough for the sum of £1.225m, based on the heads of terms detailed in the exempt Appendix 1.
- b) Approve the expenditure of £332,335 in costs on the acquisition (including stamp duty) and to prepare, submit and secure a planning consent for a residential development scheme on the site.
- c) Authorise the Director of Housing and Development, in consultation with Legal Counsel and the Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance, to conclude any necessary legal documentation to secure the acquisition and planning permission.

### **381. MAJOR ROAD NETWORK AND LARGE LOCAL MAJORS**

The Board considered a report which set out the proposed projects for submission to the Major Road Investment programme and the Large Local Majors programme and how these related to the Combined Authority's strategic objectives.

Councillor Smith, seconded by Herbert, proposed that recommendation (a) be amended to read:



- a) Approve the projects to be submitted for the Major Road Networks (MRN) and Large Local Majors (LLM) investment programmes *and to include the A505*.

Councillor Herbert commented that he recognised the importance of improving the A10. However, he felt that the report did not contain an assessment of all of the options available to the Board. He asked what the process had been for assessing potential projects and why the three projects set out in paragraph 3.2 of the report had been selected. He further asked why the A47 had not been included and whether it was possible to put forward additional projects for consideration. The Interim Director of Transport stated that the three projects set out in paragraph 3.2 (A10 dualling, A10 junctions and A1139 Eastern Industries Access Phase 2) were included in the twelve priority projects contained in the Business Plan which had been agreed by the Board in January 2019.

Councillor Bailey commented that there had previously been criticism of the number of projects in which the Combined Authority was involved. As a result, a careful process of prioritisation had been carried out and twelve priority projects had been agreed by the Board. All Board members would have projects within their own areas which they wished to see progress, but to add these on an ad hoc basis defeated the object of the prioritisation process which had been carried out. Councillor Bailey emphasised that she was not decrying the need to improve the A505, but that she judged that the Board should focus on progressing the twelve priority projects which it had collectively agreed.

Councillor Smith commented that the condition of the A505 had implications for neighbouring councils and its improvement was consistent with the Combined Authority's objectives and the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report. She judged that its inclusion in the projects submitted by the Combined Authority would resonate well with Government. At worst, the proposal would be rejected, but its inclusion would send a strong message to Government, local businesses and residents.

The Mayor stated that there was no suggestion that the A505 was not in need of investment. However, there were many roads across the Combined Authority area which needed investment. Councillors Smith and Herbert had both strongly advocated slimming down the number of projects on which the Board should focus its attention and the decision to focus on twelve priority projects had been unanimously endorsed by the Board. However, this did not mean that the Mayor and Board did not continue to support the need for improvements to the A505. The options study currently being conducted would give clear direction on how this was progressed in future, taking into account the CAM metro project.

Councillor Boden commented that it was important to adopt a common set of criteria against which projects could be assessed and not to be parochial. As the newly appointed Portfolio Holder for Spatial Planning he needed to take a wider view and in the long term he judged that the answer to the county's transport needs was many more public transport options. On that basis it was right to provide a significant public transport alternative to the A505 in the form of the CAM metro. The impact of the CAM metro should also be an important factor in the Board's consideration of all related transport projects.

Councillor Hickford commented that as a local Member for the A505 it was hard not to be parochial in his wish to see improvements. County council officers were already engaged in significant work on this and he was disappointed to learn that the Department for Transport had not set out when they would next invite submissions for MRN or LLM investment programmes for those projects not included in the current

round. He sought an assurance that the need for improvements to the A505 would be kept clearly in mind going forward if it was not included in the current submission round. The Mayor confirmed that this would be the case and reiterated that he was committed to improving the road network as part of the wider transport strategy, including key routes such as the A505 and A1307.

On being put to the vote, Councillor Smith's amendment was lost.

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

- a) Approve the projects to be submitted for the Major Road Networks (MRN) and Large Local Majors (LLM) investment programmes
- b) Agree to aim to secure a local or third-party contribution of at least 15% of the scheme costs for each project if approved.
- c) Authorise the Director of Delivery and Strategy, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, to finalise the MRN/LLM submission and liaise with the England's Economic Heartland partnership.

### **382. LOCAL INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY: UPDATE**

Professor Neely declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to his involvement with Project Spring. He took part in the debate and voted in favour of the proposal.

The Board was invited to note the final version of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) which had been agreed with Government and the final stages of national sign-off.

Councillor Smith commented that she had recently been appointed as the political lead for the OxCam Arc on environmental issues and that she believed it would be important to embed environmental issues within the LIS. To this end she proposed an amendment to the recommendations, seconded by Councillor Herbert, to include an additional resolution to:

- c) Give consideration to endorsing the 'doubling nature' vision in the Local Industrial Strategy and to a joint launch event with Natural Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Smith also outlined a number of detailed points which she would like to see incorporated into the delivery plan and undertook to provide officers with these in writing.

Professor Neely commented that the version of the LIS before the Board reflected the changes requested by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and that apart from factual corrections he judged that any further changes were unlikely to be accepted. However, Councillor Smith's observations could be picked up in the delivery plan. The Business Board had been requested to make explicit reference to the relative underfunding of public services within the region. BEIS had removed this reference from the draft, but discussion was continuing to get something of this reinstated into the final text. The delivery plan would also need to make clear the proposals which were consistent with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report. Publication was anticipated in the week commencing 15 July 2019.

Councillor Holdich commented that he felt that the reference to the underfunding of public services in Cambridgeshire was of such importance that it should be included in a covering letter or as an addendum to the report if it could not be included in the main body of the text. The county's capacity for further growth would be compromised without up-front funding of the public services need to support this.

Jessica Bawden endorsed this view, commenting that she judged the Board should fight as hard as it could to include the commentary on public service funding needs within the main body of the report. Local NHS Trusts were under significant financial pressure already and it was not possible to keep increasing the county's population without funding the public services needed to support it.

Councillor Boden commented that he welcomed the intent behind Councillor Smith's amendment and the environmental and societal gains which the 'doubling nature' vision offered. However, he judged that this should be the subject of a separate and considered discussion rather than being added to the LIS at this late stage.

Councillor Herbert commented that the LIS was a really welcome document and he wanted to give credit to the work which had gone into producing it. He was fully supportive of Councillor Holdich's suggestion of a covering letter or addendum to address the issue of public service funding if this could not be included in the main text as local authorities could not deliver growth without the funding required to deliver core public services. Councillor Herbert asked whether the fourteen recommendations contained in the CPIER report might also be included in the covering letter or addendum as this had also been an excellent piece of work.

Councillor Over commented that the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service had been deemed the second best in the country based on recent reports. However, funding issues meant that it was now looking at reducing the water carrying capacity of appliances, longer response times to incidents and increased response times for on-call fire fighters.

Councillor Bailey commented that in her capacity as the Chair of the County Council's Adults Committee she fully endorsed the inclusion of reference to the need for appropriate funding of public services and she judged it would be bizarre and remiss not to include it at least in a covering letter. If possible, she would want this to recognise the cumulative impact across the public services. Councillor Bailey asked that it should be recorded that the Board had endorsed the proposed covering letter regarding public service funding and that the Business Board would continue to press for this to be included in the main body of the LIS if possible.

Councillor Smith commented that she endorsed all of the concerns which her fellow Board members had voiced in relation to public service funding. In relation to her amendment, she had consciously phrased it in terms of the Board giving consideration to the 'doubling nature' vision to establish a conversation. Getting this right would make Cambridgeshire a better place for residents and business alike. Councillor Boden commented that he would welcome such a conversation. His concern was that attaching it to the LIS could derail the process for its final sign-off by BEIS.

The Mayor stated that he was not keen to include the reference to 'doubling nature' at this late stage without due consideration. However, he was supportive in principle of the vision and suggested that the Board might instead take a report at its next meeting which would form the basis for a well-informed debate. On the basis of this proposal Councillor Smith stated that she was content to withdraw her proposed amendment.

The Mayor thanked the Business Board and the Director of Business and Skills for producing an exceptional Local Industrial Strategy. He judged that this would put the Authority in a good position with Government which had also recognised it as a high quality piece of work.

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

- a) Note the final version of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Industrial Strategy as agreed with Government
- b) Note the final stages of nation sign-off for the Local Industrial Strategy in the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) template style prior to publication

## **BY RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY**

### **383. QUALITY CHARTER FOR GROWTH**

The Board considered a report from the Housing and Communities Committee which sought approval to adopt the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter for Growth principles to guide the Combined Authority's work in supporting new developments across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, to adopt a strengthened set of principles on cohesion and to support the planned activity to secure implementation of a revised charter. It sought to encourage innovative design and quality of construction on large scale projects and reflected Recommendation 6 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report: To undertake a review of the Quality Charter for Growth.

Councillor Boden commented that he strongly supported the Quality Charter which he saw as being about people and their place in development. The focus was on better design at minimal additional cost to create better, more sustainable and cohesive communities. He endorsed the recommendation that officers explore the introduction of a quality Charter Mark scheme that would apply to exemplary developments that advanced the principles of the Quality Charter.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was in agreement with the views expressed by Councillor Boden. In his view there was a particular need to focus on large scale developments and he emphasised partnership with District Councils.

Councillor Smith commented that it was important to ensure that the Quality Charter was fit for purpose. South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council officers would be happy to provide District Council input in support of this.

Councillor Bailey commented that she too was in total support of the recommendations and that officers at East Cambridgeshire District Council would also be happy to provide input. She asked that, if approved, the Board's support for the Charter should be drawn to the attention of local planning authorities. She welcomed the idea of the Charter Mark which would show planning authorities that an application. She hoped that this might encourage local planning authorities to take a more pro-active approach on replacing trees lost during development and to encourage planting in new developments.

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

- a) Adopt the Quality Charter for Growth principles (including additions in Appendix 1 of the attached Committee report) to guide it's work on new developments across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough;
- b) Adopt a strengthened set of principles on cohesion (as set out in Appendix 2 of the attached Committee report)

### **384. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LEWIS HERBERT**

The Mayor invited Councillor Herbert to speak to his Motion, which was seconded by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was aware that there was a lot of work going on in relation to the affordable housing programme. The Director of Housing and Development had given a presentation to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 24 June 2019 which had referenced the delivery of the 2000 affordable homes by contained in the Devolution Deal. However, achieving this by March 2022 remained a challenging target. Approval had been given for 777 homes to date, but the Combined Authority was not delivering these directly. In order to deliver 2000 homes on the timescale required he judged that the Combined Authority needed to aim to exceed this figure to allow for any programme delays. Councillor Herbert judged that there was a need to be clearer on the geographical need for affordable housing within the county. At present work had actually started on only around 140 homes representing just 7% of the 2000 homes required, which he considered was not good enough. The Board also had yet to see proposals for the £100k homes referenced by the Mayor. The time left to deliver the 2000 homes was decreasing and this was why he was requesting a report to clarify the trajectory against milestones.

Councillor Smith commented that her recollection was that the figure of 2000 affordable homes was the minimum which the Authority was looking to deliver, but with the ambition to deliver more than this if possible. The Motion was designed to enable Board members to fully understand the delivery programme and to satisfy themselves that the spread of investment was meeting identified need. As such she hoped that it would be viewed as constructive.

The Mayor stated that the commitment to affordable housing within the Devolution Deal was familiar to all Board members. He clarified that to date approval had been given for 814 new homes. The figure of 2000 affordable homes was not a ceiling and this was recognised by the £40m revolving fund which would be used to finance additional homes. Once the Authority had delivered the 2000 affordable homes referenced in the Devolution Deal he judged that there would be scope to go back to Government to seek more funds. The Combined Authority was also creating wealth to enable it to deliver more affordable homes. He judged that there was a need to provide freehold homes at affordable rates where the mortgage would cost less affordable rent properties in the same area. There were significant areas of need and deprivation within the county which needed to be addressed. The Mayor judged that the Director of Housing and Development and his team had done exceptional work to date and he expected to see significant fruition continuing between now and 2022. His intention was to create a rolling fund of housing investment which would continue across future Mayoral terms.

Councillor Bailey commented that the Authority could not rely on housing associations to deliver all of the homes required. She judged that a mixture of models was needed to meet the variety of need and experience across the county. She described the Community Land Trust model in East Cambridgeshire which was able to deliver homes

at less than social rental value where needed and commented that it was critical for young people to opportunities for affordable home ownership. Councillor Bailey noted that the Housing and Communities Committee received a quarterly report detailing spend by geographical area, but judged that allocating spend to specific geographical areas would constrain the Authority and could prevent it from acting quickly when opportunities in other areas arose.

Councillor Boden commented that given the imperative to deliver at least 2000 by 2022 he would not want to constrain delivery. Based on a geographical assessment of need for affordable housing Fenland would score highly, but it was important to avoid being parochial. He noted the difference in the definition of 'affordable' in different parts of the county and commented that he felt there was a need to be more innovative to deliver the homes that were needed.

Councillor Herbert commented that he had not stipulated that the programme should be split by district, but that he did want to be able to monitor the geographical spread of projects. If his Motion was unsuccessful he hoped that the Board would still take a report to look at this issue.

### **385. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Combined Authority will meet next on Wednesday 31 July 2019 at 10:30am in the Council Chamber, Fenland Hall, County Road, March, PE15 8NQ.

(Mayor)