



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

**JAMES PALMER**  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE &  
PETERBOROUGH MAYOR

- Date:** Wednesday 5 August 2020
- Time:** 10.30am – 2.50pm
- Venue:** Meeting held remotely in accordance with The Local Authorities (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Meetings) (England) Regulations 2020
- Present:** J Palmer (Mayor)
- A Adams – Chair of the Business Board
- Councillors A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council,  
C Boden – Fenland District Council, R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council, S Count – Cambridgeshire County Council,  
L Herbert – Cambridge City Council (to 12.50pm), J Holdich – Peterborough City Council (to 2.45pm) and B Smith (to 1.20pm) – South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Co-opted Members:** Councillor D Over (Vice Chair, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority), J Bawden – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group and Councillor R Bisby – Acting Police and Crime Commissioner
- Also in attendance:** Councillor L Dupré, Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
John Pye, Independent Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee (Item 1.8 only: Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2019/20)

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

The Mayor stated that there would be a two minute silence held at 11.00am for VJ Day 75, marking 75 years since the end of World War 2. This was always a poignant day for the people of Cambridgeshire as the Cambridgeshire Regiment had served in the Far East during World War 2 and experienced great suffering, including on the Burma Railway. The Mayor offered his prayers to the people of Beirut following the dreadful explosion which had occurred the previous day.

The Combined Authority's response to Covid-19 had formed a major part of its output since the Board met last at the beginning of June. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had been announced as a pilot area for the National Re-training Scheme and £2.9m of funding had been brought forward for active transport across the region. Michelle Donelan MP, Minister of State for Universities, had attended the announcement of Anglia Ruskin University as the Higher Education partner for the new University of Peterborough and planning permission had been submitted for the first phase campus. The previous day, the Government had also announced a funding contribution of £3.6m towards Phase 2 of the project. Soham

Railway Station was another long-awaited project for which approved planning permission had now been received, with construction due to start in September 2020. The Mayor continued to press for the station to be operational by the end of 2021 which would be a full year earlier than previously scheduled. A Full Business Case had been produced for rejuvenating Wisbech's rail connections, contractors to build the car-park at Whittlesey Station and plans to resolve key transport issues around Huntingdon and St Ives. The previous day the Mayor had been proud to attend the topping out ceremony for the first £100k Homes in Fordham. He believed this new model of housing to be even more essential given the effects of Covid-19 on jobs and the housing market. A further 296 affordable homes had been approved in Fenland, Peterborough and Huntingdon, taking the Combined Authority three quarters of the way to the target of 2000 new affordable homes set by Government. Tying all of this together was the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro. The Board would be discussing some details of this during the meeting and the Mayor expressed his thanks to Cambridge Ahead, Dr David Cleevely, Professor John Miles, Duncan McGunn and David Dickinson for their work in support of this project.

The Mayor congratulated Jessica Bawden on her appointment as the Director of Primary Care at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Bailey made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 3.1: £100m Affordable Housing Programme Proposed Variations to Schemes that form investments from the £40m revolving fund in relation to loans to the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company, a company which was wholly owned by East Cambridgeshire District Council. She had taken advice from the Monitoring Officer and confirmed that it would be in order for her to remain in the meeting for consideration of this item and vote.

Kim Sawyer, Chief Executive, made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 3.2: Proposal for a Corporate Vehicle to bring forward the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM). The Board was being recommended to appoint Ms Sawyer as one of three interim directors of the CAM Special Purpose Vehicle until the appointment of the substantive Board members. Ms Sawyer had taken advice from the Monitoring Officer who had confirmed that it would be in order for her to present the report to the Board.

Councillor David Over made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 3.2: Proposal for a Corporate Vehicle to bring forward the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) in relation to his son who worked for Atkins and had responsibility for underground infrastructure.

Mayor James Palmer made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 3.2: Proposal for a Corporate Vehicle to bring forward the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) in relation to his position as the political leader in relation to the CAM project.

Councillor Holdich made a declaration of interest in relation to Item 5.1: University of Peterborough Full Business Case. He had taken advice from the Monitoring

Officer and confirmed that it would be in order for him to remain in the meeting for consideration of this item and vote.

**550. MINUTES OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY ANNUAL MEETING ON 3 JUNE 2020**

Councillor Smith noted that minute 536 stated that the final version of the Complaints Policy would be brought to the following meeting of the Board, but that it was not included on the meeting agenda. The Monitoring Officer stated that it had actually been agreed that the final version of the Complaints Policy would be approved by the Mayor and circulated to the Board. If Members were dissatisfied with the revisions made following the discussion at the last meeting the policy could be brought back to the Board.

Subject to this correction, the minutes of the Combined Authority annual meeting on 3 June 2020 were approved as an accurate record.

**551. PETITIONS**

No petitions were received.

**552. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

One public question had been received in relation to Item 3.2: Proposal for a Corporate Vehicle to bring forward Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) and this was taken when that report was discussed. One question had been received from County Councillor Tim Wotherspoon on Phase 2 of the Non-Statutory Strategic Spatial Framework. A copy of both questions and written response are available to view at Appendix 1.

**553. FORWARD PLAN**

Councillor Herbert asked when the CAM Outline Business Case (OBC) would be added to the Forward Plan. The Mayor stated that a substantial piece of work had been carried out by Dr Cleavelly and his team and he felt that it would be wrong to put forward the OBC without taking account of this. There had also been some delays due to Covid-19. He currently expected the OBC to be considered in January 2021, but would keep the Board updated on this.

Councillor Herbert asked that a report on the Covid-19 response should be brought to the Board in September 2020 and that this should include the economic challenges faced in the next few years. The Mayor agreed that a report from Directors on the interventions across the county's towns and cities in response to Covid-19 would be timely.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Approve the Forward Plan.

**554. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD AND COMMITTEES 2020-21: UPDATE**

The Board was advised of a number of changes to the membership of the Executive Committees and the Business Board.

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

- a) appoint the Members and substitute Members nominated by constituent councils to the Combined Authority Board, Executive Committees, Business Board, Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Audit & Governance Committee for the municipal year 2020/2021 (Appendix 1);
- b) Note the named representative and substitute representative for each organisation as set out in the report.

**555. REGISTERED OFFICE CHANGE: CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY COMPANIES**

The Board was advised of a change to the registered office of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and its subsidiary companies following the departure from its previous offices at Alconbury Weald. John Hill, Chief Executive, confirmed that this was a procedural matter and did not imply any decisions regarding the organisation's temporary or permanent location. At present, three options for temporary accommodation were being analysed and the results would be taken to a future Leaders' briefing.

The change of the registered office of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and its subsidiary companies was noted.

**556. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE 2019-20**

Mr John Pye, Independent Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, presented the Committee's third annual report to the Board. This included details of an attempted fraud that had occurred in September 2019. He had been quickly alerted to this by officers and the Audit and Governance Committee had concluded that the handling of the issue and the lessons learned had been very effective. The Committee would be undertaking various development sessions before the end of the year including a joint skills development session with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Quoracy was an issue for the committee and this would be considered as part of the Constitution review which would be reported to the Board in September 2020. There had been no need to bring any matters to the attention of the Combined Authority Board during the reporting year outside of normal business which was a positive position. Mr Pye concluded by commending officers' open, transparent and positive engagement with the Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Herbert asked for more information about the scale of the attempted fraud in September 2019 and whether the money involved was recovered. Mr Pye stated that the sum had been around £15,000 and confirmed that this had been recovered.

Councillor Smith noted that half of freedom of information requests (FOIs) had been dealt with outside of the required timescale and asked how this could be improved. The Monitoring Officer stated that the officers would be looking both at capacity and the end to end process to see how to meet this deadline. He had not been in post during the period covered by the annual report, but would look at past cases to inform this work.

Councillor Bailey expressed her thanks to Mr Pye and the members of the Audit and Governance Committee for their work which required diligence and attention to detail. The Mayor endorsed this comment and also commended officers for their openness and diligence.

The Annual Report of the Chair of Audit and Governance Committee for 2019/20 was noted.

## **557. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2019-20**

The Monitoring Officer drew the Board's attention to the recommendations of the Bus Review Task and Finish Group which would require a response within two months. At the request of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee he also highlighted the issues around quoracy which the Committee had experienced and the recommendations which the Committee had made to the Housing and Communities Committee in February 2020 (paragraph 3.12 of the report referred).

Councillor Count expressed reservations about the way that the report was laid out, commenting that he would have expected any specific recommendations requiring the Board's attention to have been submitted as a separate report. He also felt that it was unnecessary to remind the Board of its duties on the face of the recommendations. The narrative described the Committee's full work programme across the year, whereas he would have expected a precis highlighting any issues where a Board response was needed. Some of the business included was a matter for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee itself rather than for the Board, such as whether a Task and Finish Group should continue its work. He further noted that work on the bus routes' review was already underway. Councillor Count was content to support the recommendations, but felt there was room for improvement when the report was submitted next year.

Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, commented that this was the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's first annual report and that the Committee would be happy to consider how it could be improved next time.

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

- a) Note the Annual Report of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Audit and Governance Committee for 2019/20 (Appendix 1) and provide any feedback to the Committee.
- b) Consider the recommendations of the Bus Review Task & Finish Group approved by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 April 2020 and provide a response within two months of receipt of these

recommendations as per the Constitution of the Combined Authority. The response should indicate what (if any) action the Combined Authority or the Mayor proposes to take and publish such response.

- c) Note the recommendations of the CAM Task & Finish Group to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

## **558. BUDGET MONITOR UPDATE**

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

The report provided an update on the budget position for 2020/21 and reflected the carry forwards from the previous year which had been detailed at the previous meeting in June 2020. The Adult Education Budget and Growth Service budget were both ring-fenced funds. The capital position included the additional funds which had been received from Government in relation to active transport and which would be transferred to the two Highways Authorities.

Councillor Herbert noted that £15m of the £100m housing capital grant due in 2019/20 had been deferred pending a review in September 2020 to enable the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to be satisfied that sufficient progress had been made with the £100m housing programme delivery. He asked for the total amount being withheld from the Combined Authority by Government and whether this was still under dispute. Councillor Herbert's understanding was that the £100m funding would be delivered over five years as five tranches of £20m and he further sought clarification of whether the dispute related to the £40m revolving fund. The Chief Finance Officer stated that in addition to the £15m not yet received for 2019/20 there was a further £30m due in 2020/21, so in total £45m of the £100m affordable housing programme funding was still awaited. The Mayor stated that a meeting would be taking place with MHCLG in September 2020. His understanding was that the debate was solely around the timeline for the five year housing delivery programme, with MHCLG now saying that the deadline for delivery was March 2021 rather than March 2022. He noted that the programme had been delayed for seven months at its outset by MGCLG. The Mayor was working with MHCLG on this and was confident that the matter would be resolved.

Councillor Bailey commented that it was self-evident that the final projects would not be delivered until 2022 as the final tranche of funding would be drawn down in 2021.

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

- a) Note the revised budget for the 2020-21 financial year.
- b) Note the reduction in expected costs for the Garden Villages project in 2020-21 per paragraph 3.7.

**559. £100M AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME PROPOSED VARIATIONS TO SCHEMES THAT FORM INVESTMENTS FROM THE £40M REVOLVING FUND**

Councillor Bailey made a declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting in relation to this item. Minute 549 above refers.

The Mayor stated that the report contained six 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. He asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

The report set out the position in relation to five schemes where construction had been delayed due to Covid-19. Officers were in discussion with the borrowers about the issues which they faced and recommended a combination of loan extensions and interest free periods to help maintain the financial viability of the developments and to ensure the delivery of the planned affordable housing units. If approved, this would be subject to a clawback mechanism on a sliding scale.

Councillor Smith commended the inclusion of a clawback facility within the recommendations, but expressed reservations about the proposals. She sought more information about why the proposed extension of the loan facility and interest-free period was much longer for two of the projects. She further asked whether officers had discussed a more modest deal with the borrowers or whether the report was simply recommending the terms which the developers had requested. The Director of Housing and Development stated that the Haddenham and Ely MOD sites were much bigger schemes so the impact on them had been proportionately greater. It was for this reason that a longer loan extension and interest-free period was proposed for these projects. Commercial discussions had taken place with all of the borrowers and the recommendations reflected officers' best advice to the Board. These reflected a cautious approach to the duration of the extension which the borrowers would require to avoid the need to return to the Board seeking further extensions in the near future. Officers had also taken into account the need to be realistic about the speed at which the open market units would sell in the current climate as it was these sales which would finance the loan repayments.

Councillor Herbert commented that he had expressed reservations about these projects from the early stages and that he had expressed further reservations about the Board's decision in March 2020 to approve the provision of a new loan facility of £9.637m which he had judged to be hasty in the evolving context of Covid-19. However, he wanted to see these projects succeed to help address the shortage of housing in Cambridgeshire and so would not be voting against the proposals. He noted that he had not heard of similar requests being made from those developers where money had been paid as a grant.

Councillor Count commented that there appeared to be some misunderstanding around the question of risk in this context. In his capacity as the then Portfolio Holder for Investment and Finance he had been keen to examine the proposals for the £40m revolving fund in detail to ensure a large degree of comfort regarding the arrangements. This included ensuring that the Combined Authority would be well protected in the case of a default on a loan as it held the long-term security of having a first charge over the land concerned. Post Covid, the primary objective would be to build more affordable housing. To achieve this the Combined Authority would be making grants of £60m and had also devised a way to loan out the remaining £40m to deliver more affordable housing beyond the five year period covered by the original deal without really changing the risk element to the Authority. There might be some loss of interest on the loans, but not on the sum of the loan itself. Each scheme had been looked at individually to establish how it sat within the market place and as such each scheme needed an individually tailored solution. On the basis of the exempt appendices he had comfort as the Lead Member for Investment and Finance that the recommendations relating to each scheme reflected their individual situation. If the proposals were not agreed the developments might not proceed at all and he judged the priority must be to get the housing built rather than the potential loss of interest. Councillor Count commented that the issue of state aid had been an area of concern to him, but he had been reassured by the report by Bevan Brittan (Appendix 4 refers) and was entirely satisfied with the proposals from a finance perspective.

Councillor Bailey commented that whilst it was correct that two of the projects under discussion belonged to the East Cambridgeshire Trading Company (ECTC) it was open to all constituent council members to put forward proposals for funding through the £40m revolving fund and she encouraged them to do so. She wanted to see the Combined Authority supporting both the open housing market as well as the affordable housing sector. It was unsurprising that the loan agreements should need to be re-profiled in the light of current circumstances and this would also allow projects to continue at a Covid-safe pace. It was important that the build rate should be commensurate with the sales rate, hence the need for larger projects to be structured over a longer period. Similarly it had been decided that nine of the ECTC housing units would be offered for rental rather than sale at this point as the rental sector was stronger at present.

Councillor Herbert commented that he appreciated the broader reasons behind the proposals set out by his fellow Board members. Some strong points had been made and on this basis he would be supporting the proposals.

Councillor Boden welcomed the wide-ranging and thorough debate of the proposals in his capacity as the Lead Member for Housing. In his view, the Board either re-structured the loan arrangements or accepted that they would default. The re-structuring model reflected that being used by a number of major financial institutions at present and made the greatest financial sense. The net amount of interest which might be lost might also be less than suggested due to the clawback provisions which would be put in place. In his judgement there was also less risk to housing delivery if the current developments were to continue rather than the Combined Authority taking over the land following a default on the loan. Whilst this would change the profile of the revolving cash flow it did still remain within the allotted £40m so, unless circumstances were to change, there would be no need to ask for this sum to be increased.

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

Approve variations to schemes that form investment from the £40m revolving fund, specifically approval of changes to the terms and conditions of pre-existing loans in response to the impacts of COVID 19 as shown in a) to d) below;

- a) Approve extensions to the duration of the existing facility agreements with Laragh Homes and The East Cambridgeshire Trading Company as shown in the table below:

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Borrower</b>	<b>Proposed extension to facility agreement in months</b>
Haddenham CLT (Loan)	ECTC	24
Ely MOD Site (Loan)	ECTC	20
Alexander House Ely (Loan)	Laragh Developments	4
Linton Road, Great Abingdon (Loan)	Laragh Developments	6
Histon Road (Loan)	Laragh Developments	7

- b) Approve the grant of interest free periods with Laragh Homes and The East Cambridgeshire trading company as shown in the table below:

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Provider / Lead Partner</b>	<b>Interest free period in months</b>	<b>Starting from</b>
Haddenham CLT (Loan)	ECTC	24	01/04/2020
Ely MOD Site (L, Cambridge loan)	ECTC	6	01/08/2020
Alexander House Ely (Loan)	Laragh Developments	2	01/08/2020
Linton Road, Great Abingdon (Loan)	Laragh Developments	3	01/08/2020
Histon Road, Cambridge (Loan)	Laragh Developments	5	01/08/2020

- c) Interest free periods referred in b) above will be subject to a 'clawback' provision. Upon a final project reconciliation between the borrower and CPCA, the interest forgone through the interest free period will be recovered on a sliding scale if at the end of the project the actual profit is above the revised profit now being forecast for each project as a result of the Covid-19 impact.

- d) Increase the permitted number of drawdowns in each facility agreement to reflect the longer term of each loan facility.
- e) The Director of Housing and Development to be given authority to document the variations to the facility agreements as outlined in a)- d) above and undertake the end of project reconciliation/s assessing the potential recovery of the benefit of the interest free period against final project profit outcome for each project.

The Mayor welcomed the Board's unanimous support for the proposals. Business was looking to both central and local government at this difficult time and the Combined Authority could have a significant positive influence on the county's economy. There had already been significant interventions, via the Business Board, to get funding into local business. These proposals demonstrated the Combined Authority working alongside business in the delivery of housing.

#### **560. PROPOSAL FOR A CORPORATE VEHICLE TO BRING FORWARD THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AUTONOMOUS METRO (CAM)**

Declarations of interest in this item were made at the start of the meeting by the Mayor, Chief Executive Kim Sawyer and Councillor David Over. Minute 549 above refers.

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

One public question had been received in relation to this item from Michael Page, a local resident. A copy of the question and written response are attached at Appendix 1.

Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, stated that the CAM Special Purpose Vehicle would help to promote and deliver the CAM. The CAM project was about delivering a new public transport network for Cambridgeshire which was fast, reliable and sustainable, would provide infrastructure and unlock housing. The CAM was one of the biggest projects being undertaken by a combined authority anywhere in the country and was of national significance. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (the CPIER) had set out the challenges which the county needed to address in order to continue to grow and the CAM project would respond to these. The Chief Executive expressed her thanks to all of those who had supported the work on this to date including Cambridge Ahead and Sir David Higgins, for his transformational insights into why a company was needed to take this forward. The CAM was not just about a better transport network – it would be trackless, autonomous, affordable and create zero emissions. The proposals before the Board were designed to structure that innovative thinking into the new company structure. This would enable some highly expert members to join its Board together with a Chief Executive, Director of Strategy and a Director of Engineering to provide the expertise and capacity required for a project of this size and complexity. The report before the Board reflected initial thinking on remuneration and allowances, but subsequent work suggested that the figures included were exceptionally low. The Chief Executive therefore proposed that

officers should investigate this further and come back to the Board on this point. Whilst there was a need to approve the initial business plan now this would be heavily influenced by the Chair when they were appointed and officers would also come back to the Board on that. At this stage funding was sought to enable work to be progressed over the next few months with continued support from Deloitte. A further report would be brought in September 2020 which would seek agreement on the arrangements for working with partners and integrated working with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

Councillor Herbert commented that he was an enthusiastic supporter of the CAM and wanted it to work. However, the business plan presented in January 2019 was quite different to what was being presented now. The Mayor had said earlier in the meeting that the CAM Outline Business Case was now likely to be brought before the Board in January 2021 (minute 553 above refers). In his view, the Board needed to know what that was and where it was going before it set up an expensive administrative structure to support it. As such, he did not believe that the time was right to set up a special purpose vehicle. The Combined Authority already had transport professionals and Councillor Herbert judged that it was for the Board to take the lead in setting out what was required. He felt that the business plan was too vague at this stage and the costs and overheads were not yet known. He emphasised the importance of partnership, including with the GCP.

Councillor Smith commented that she was committed to the CAM. However, the Board was also the guardian of public money and it was Board members' duty to ensure that it was spent in the right timeframe and in the right way. When this was last discussed she had highlighted that there were no options appraisals or risk appraisals to allow comparison of all of the options. She felt that this was not satisfactory with regards to transparency. She noted that there was no reference to the local planning authorities in relation to the Garden Village programme and commented that the proposals felt rushed. The governance structure within the report showed the Combined Authority subsuming the governance of the GCP which she felt suggested predetermination. The report and appendices formed a long and complex document and had not been discussed at the Leaders' strategy meeting the previous week. Councillor Smith asked whether the advert for the Chair of the proposed new company had been published before the Board had approved the proposals and whether the routes proposed were consistent with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and CAM Sub-Strategy.

Ms Sawyer, Chief Executive, confirmed that the advert for the Chair had already been issued as this was needed in order to be ready to make a recommendation to the Board on the appointment by September. The purpose of the CAM Sub-Strategy was to offer further detail around the content of the LTP, so to be compliant with the CAM Sub-Strategy it must also be compliant with the LTP. The Mayor stated that a previous Leaders' strategy meeting had focused solely on the CAM.

Councillor Bailey commented that if the Board was committed to the CAM project it needed to approve these proposals. There was a need for a dedicated and skilled group of people to take a project of this type forward and this was not something for the Board or for the Combined Authority's existing officer team. The CAM would bring new opportunities to deprived areas and combat economic disparity across the region. In her judgement this was exactly the right time to take this step

and she urged the Board to act as a united organisation to deliver this for Cambridgeshire.

Councillor Count commented that there were two separate discussions taking place. The first was about the CAM project itself, which the whole Board supported. The second was around the proposal to create a special purpose vehicle which was currently before the Board. Cambridgeshire attracted world class talent to the area in addition to its home grown talent. However, when they arrived they found a second class infrastructure. Whilst improvements to the road and rail networks remained important the county also needed a viable and sustainable alternative and the CAM offered this. Reference was often made to the CAM adhering to the principles of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) report. However, unless an arm of the CAM went to the Fens it would in his view increase the disparities which existed rather than addressing them. Opening up the Fens in this way would allow people living there to access the job market and economic opportunities across the county. Decreasing the size of the CAM vehicles would reduce the size of the tunnels needed for the underground section of the network and so significantly reduce the cost of the project. Councillor Count commented that it was a borderline decision for him on whether now was the right time to create a special purpose vehicle. His preference would be to recruit only the top team at this stage rather than to the whole structure as he felt the OBC and funding strategy was needed before going further on this. He commented that a further report would be needed on this. Councillor Count welcomed the positive references to the GCP within the report. He noted that the report referred to the Combined Authority deciding routes, but commented that he did not think it was intended that the Combined Authority and the SPV would be involved in the detail of the routes.

The Mayor commented that he understood that there was some nervousness around timescales and the apparent rush. However, the CPIER report had been clear that if the county's transport was not sorted by 2030 the economy would start to go backwards. The East West rail project was happening and would bring a significant number of new people into the area who would require the equivalent of a new town the size of Cambridge to accommodate them. The CAM would allow the delivery of this to be shared across the region. Having consulted and taken advice from those who had delivered major infrastructure projects both nationally and worldwide it had become clear that this was not something that could be delivered by local government. It was for this reason that the Board was being recommended to approve the creation of a SPV. The Mayor commended the ambition which the proposals demonstrated and was proud to recommend them to the Board.

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

- a) Approve the incorporation of the CAM SPV.
- b) Appoint the following interim directors until the confirmed appointment of the members of the Board, following an external recruitment process:

Kim Sawyer, Chief Executive  
John Hill, Chief Executive

Jon Alsop, Chief Finance Officer

- c) Approve the company Articles.
- d) Approve the proposed process for recruitment of the Board members, at Appendix 7, and note the expected levels of remuneration as set out in paragraph 6.9.
- e) Note the corporate support to be provided by the CPCA to the SPV.
- f) Approve the Mayor as representative of the CPCA as non-voting shareholder director to attend the interim and substantive Board.
- g) Note and approve the proposed governance structures and committees of the CAM SPV at Appendix 4.
- h) Approve the draft initial Business Plan in the confidential Appendix 6, and request that a further report be brought back to the September meeting of the Combined Authority Board seeking approval for:
  - a. The initial Business Plan
  - b. The initial equity investment
  - c. The proposed board members and chair
  - d. The Shareholder and SPV Agreement
- i) Note and approve the mobilisation expenditure and approve the drawdown of £1,400,000 from the Medium-Term Revenue Financial Plan to progress the consultancy work set out in section 5.
- j) To approve the £1m Equity Investment in the CAM SPV from Capital Gainshare as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- k) Subject to the approval of the Local Growth Fund application for £1m, to approve the use this to take an equity subscription of shares in the CAM SPV.

Councillor Bailey sought confirmation of Councillor Herbert's vote. Councillor Herbert confirmed that he had voted against the recommendations.

Councillor Herbert left the meeting.

## **561. A10 JUNCTIONS AND DUALLING**

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

The A10 was identified as a key project within the Combined Authority Business Plan and represented an important transport link for freight, public transport and

private vehicles. Corridor studies which had been undertaken as long ago as 1992 were already recognising the growth and congestion issues which existed. Currently, the route suffered from both serious congestion and an unsatisfactory safety record. The Combined Authority business plan identified the A10 as one of its key projects and bids relating to the A10 had been submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) for its Major Route Network (MRN) and Large Local Majors (LLM) funding schemes in 2019. Due to Covid-19 a virtual public information exhibition had been arranged which had attracted 6535 unique visits and resulted in almost 800 comments and emails. These comments and Member feedback would be taken into account in scoping the Outline Business Case (OBC) and a working group had been set up to look at the Milton Interchange. A benefit cost ration (BCR) of 2 or more indicated high value for money and all of the options except one had a BCR above 4.

The Mayor expressed his personal thanks to the Head of Transport and his team for their work on this project.

Councillor Smith stated that she could support the report recommendations as they still included the option of just choosing the junction improvements. South Cambridgeshire District Council's position was that it did not support the full dualling of the A10, but that it did support the junction improvements. Having looked at the feedback from residents she commented that this did not in her view show strong support for any of the dualling options, but there were least objections to the junction improvement options so she expressed the hope that would be taken into full consideration. She noted that widely different figures were shown in relation to cycling packages and commented that she would want to be sure that they were comparing like with like and would like to see more information generally on walking and cycling options. She welcomed the establishment of a working group to look at the issue of the Milton Road junction, but felt there was a need to assess other ways of achieving the economic benefits. She did not feel that the report fully considered the issue of increased demand or how the project could contribute to the Combined Authority's zero carbon emissions ambition. Councillor Smith further commented that all of the options appeared to have attracted more negative comments than positive. The Head of Transport stated that all of the options in the report included better facilities for cyclists, walkers and equestrians and that segregated cycling routes would represent a significant improvement.

Councillor Smith left the meeting.

Councillor Count commented that the financial case was presented in accordance with Green Book principles as this was how Government would assess projects. The main aim of all of the Combined Authority's projects was to make people's lives better, so it was also important to look at the benefits to the county in addition to the economic benefits. The BCR figures within the report were correct, but looking solely at the BCR figures provided only part of the picture. Councillor Count asked that officers should look again at how BCR figures were extrapolated to better reflect the actual sums involved, plus the wider benefits. He further asked whether the Board could dismiss some of the options at this stage if they chose. The Head of Transport stated that all of the options in the report had been presented to the Department for Transport so officers were bound assess these in order to identify the final two or three options to go out to consultation.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the report which built on the earlier work on options for A10 which had been done by the County Council. She thanked the Head of Transport and officers for their work, including recognising the significance of the Little Thetford junction and for the protection provided around active transport users. East Cambridgeshire District Council had responded to the consultation and its priority was dualling the A10 all the way to the BP Roundabout and improving the junctions along it. Capacity issues along this transport corridor were impacting both on the quality of life of local residents and economic opportunity for the area. Delays on the A10 were also having an impact on many other roads in the area and in her opinion junction improvements would do little to address these in comparison to dualling the A10. The indicative alignment that was handed over from Cambridgeshire County Council to the Combined Authority in relation to the A10/A142 BP Roundabout showed that roundabout being taken out of the road structure and the road going west. Councillor Bailey asked that officers should investigate how this pinch point would be managed if the road did not take that proposed alignment. She was also keen to understand what the solution for safe crossing of the A10 would look like in the in the BP area for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. If possible, Councillor Bailey's strong preference was for the proposed segregated cycle path to be sited off-road. In relation to public transport, East Cambridgeshire District Council was keen that the Combined Authority should explore extending the CAM into the Ely and Stretham areas from Waterbeach. Councillor Bailey commented that it was not correct to say that all of the options had attracted more negative comments than positive as Option D, full offline dualling, had attracted more comments in support than against.

The Mayor commented that to describe the A10 as just a road was to misunderstand its significance. As well as being a local route between Ely and Cambridge 45% of traffic was using it as a gateway to travel beyond Ely or Cambridge. It was also the main freight route for businesses in the Fens. He supported the inclusion of cycle routes in the options being considered and would look into opportunities for the CAM.

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

- a) Approve the Strategic Outline Business Case and agree in principle to proceed to Outline Business Case, subject to the outcome of funding discussions with the Department for Transport;
- b) Note the views of residents and businesses in response to the Virtual Public Exhibition.

The meeting was adjourned from 1.27pm to 1.40pm.

## **562. A141 HUNTINGDON CAPACITY STUDY AND THIRD RIVER CROSSING**

Emerging findings in early 2020 had suggested the need to expand the A141 Huntingdon Capacity Study to include the potential third river crossing. A desktop environmental study had been conducted as part of this work. This demonstrated that the northern bypass option would support greater growth than a third river crossing. Modelling had also indicated that a more strategic intervention was

required for parts of St Ives and a further report would be brought forward regarding the proposed package of 'quick wins'.

Councillor Fuller welcomed the proposals on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council and thanked the Mayor for bringing forward these proposals at pace. The Devolution Deal which pre-dated both the Mayor's election and Councillor Fuller's election as Leader of Huntingdonshire District Council had included a commitment to investigate a potential third river crossing. It was therefore absolutely right for the Combined Authority to have done so. Now that work had been concluded those living locally were pleased that the environmentally damaging third river crossing proposal had been replaced with the current recommendations. Huntingdonshire District Council also welcomed the proposals relating to St Ives, including the 'quick wins' around cycling, walking and tackling congestion pinch points.

The Mayor commented that a third river crossing had been discussed for a long time, but the redevelopment of the A14 and the A141 allowed a better solution locally as well as enhancing the route to Chatteris and beyond. The Mayor stated that he was absolutely committed to public transport and active transport, but also to supporting business and agriculture across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

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

- a) Note the outcomes of the A141 and Huntingdon Third River Crossing Study.
- b) Approve the drawdown of budget of £350,000 for undertaking a Strategic Outline Business Case for the A141.
- c) Approve the drawdown of budget of £500,000 from the Subject to Approval budget within the Medium-term Financial Plan for undertaking a Strategic Outline Business Case and further develop a package of Quick Wins.

This included votes in favour by five of the seven constituent council members of the Board, including the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

### **563. MARKET TOWNS PROGRAMME: APPROVAL OF MASTERPLANS FOR EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE (ELY, SOHAM AND LITTLEPORT)**

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

The Combined Authority had made a commitment to produce Masterplans for 11 key market towns around the county. Those for Ely, Soham and Littleport represented the final three Masterplans to be submitted to the Board for approval. They had been produced with the intention of identifying key interventions to support the growth of gross value added (GVA) and also, more recently, Covid-19 recovery. The proposals were supported by East Cambridgeshire District Council and there was a commitment to undertaking further stakeholder engagement during the implementation phase.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the proposals on behalf of East Cambridgeshire District Council as representing the culmination of a lot of hard work, with each Masterplan reflecting the individual character of the towns concerned. The Masterplan for Littleport focused on improving quality of life and sought to address high levels of residents commuting out. This included projects relating to the town centre and station gateway, infrastructure to support housing development and the creation of a country park. The Soham Masterplan centred on a resilient town centre and the growth and transport development needed to support the high street and increase footfall. It also looked to build on the existing agri-tech industry and included visionary work looking to exploit the network of waterways. The Ely Masterplan was focused on the station gateway project, city centre digital connectivity and Covid-19 recovery.

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

Approve the East Cambridgeshire Market Town Masterplan Action Plans produced for Ely, Soham, and Littleport.

#### **564. OX-CAM ARC REPRESENTATION**

The Board considered proposals for its nominations to the Ox-Cam Arc Leadership Executive. It was noted that Cambridgeshire represented 23% of the Arc's population and in recent years 40% of its gross value added (GVA) growth.

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

- a) Note the Combined Authority's status as the Arc Growth Board for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- b) To nominate the Leaders and substitutes listed at paragraph 4.2 to the Arc Leadership Executive:
  - i. The Mayor
  - ii. Leader of Cambridgeshire County Council (substitute Cllr Roger Hickford)
  - iii. Leader of South Cambridgeshire District Council (substitute Cllr Lewis Herbert)

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

#### **TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY**

#### **565. A1260 JUNCTION 15 TRANSPORT STUDY: OUTCOMES OF OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**

The Board considered a request to approve the drawdown of £470k to produce a Full Business Case and detailed design for the A1260 Junction 15 project. These

proposals were discussed at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 8 July 2020 where they were unanimously endorsed by those present.

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

Approve for the drawdown of £470,000 from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to produce the Full Business Case and detailed design.

This included votes in favour by five of the seven constituent council members of the Board, including the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

#### **566. A1260 JUNCTION 32/ 33 TRANSPORT STUDY - OUTCOMES OF THE OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**

The Board considered a request to approve the drawdown of £500k to produce a Full Business Case and detailed design for the A1260 Junction 32/33 project. These proposals were discussed at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meeting on 8 July 2020 where they were unanimously endorsed by those present.

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

Approve the drawdown of £500,000, from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to produce the Full Business Case and detailed design.

This included votes in favour by five of the seven constituent council members of the Board, including the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

#### **567. MARCH AREA TRANSPORT STRATEGY PROGRESS REPORT**

The Board considered a request to begin work on an Outline Business Case and preliminary design for the March Area Transport Strategy and to approve the required drawdown of £1m to fund this. These proposals were discussed at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 8 July 2020 where they were unanimously endorsed by those present.

Councillor Count thanked officers for their report and endorsed the collaborative working between the Combined Authority, the County Council, Fenland District Council and March Town Council which had produced it. The proposals had been well received by the public in his home town of March and he was fully supportive of the recommendations. He further commended Councillor Jan French for her role in chairing the meetings which had informed the report.

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

- a) Approve commencement of the Outline Business Case and preliminary design.

- b) Approve the drawdown of £1.0m for production of the Outline Business Case and preliminary design.

This included votes in favour by five of the seven constituent council members of the Board, including the representatives of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

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

### **SKILLS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY**

#### **568. UNIVERSITY OF PETERBOROUGH FULL BUSINESS CASE**

The Board was invited to approve and adopt the Full Business Case to mobilise the creation of Phase 1 of the new University of Peterborough project and to delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Growth, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Financial Officer, to develop the key documents required to establish a Special Purpose Joint Vehicle. The proposals had been developed in line with Treasury processes and had been considered by the Skills Committee on 6 July 2020 where they had been unanimously endorsed by those present. Since the report was published there had been a successful launch of the University of Peterborough's Higher Education partner, Anglia Ruskin University. An application for planning permission had been submitted the previous week and the aim was for the Anglia Ruskin University Peterborough to open in September 2022.

Councillor Holdich commented that the Board had inherited a scheme from the former Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which was going nowhere. Thanks to the influence of the Mayor and the Combined Authority and to Mace the scheme would now happen. He expressed further thanks to the members of the Business Board for their work around the business case which established that it was fit for purpose now and going forward. Councillor Holdich expressed the view that this was the best thing to happen to Peterborough in 50 years.

Austen Adams commented that the Business Board had been particularly interested in the economics of the project, whether it would be sustainable and the potential risks. The delivery partners' detailed delivery model had been tested rigorously and the proposals had received the full and unanimous support of the Business Board.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to the Director of Business and Skills, the Skills Strategy Manager and to Mace for their exceptional work and professionalism in developing the University of Peterborough project which had allowed the Government to support Phase 2 of the work.

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

- a) Approve and adopt the Full Business Case to mobilise the creation of Phase 1 of the new University of Peterborough project.

b) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Growth, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Financial Officer (Section 73), to develop the following key documents for the Special Purpose Joint Vehicle:

- 1) Prop Co Articles of Association.
- 2) Collaboration Agreement.
- 3) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Services Agreement.
- 4) Shareholder's agreement.

#### **569. INTEGRATED ECONOMIC, BUSINESS AND SKILLS INSIGHT PROGRAMME**

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 is attached at Appendix 2.

The Board considered proposals for the consolidation of all business and skills activities and to evaluate the efficacy of past and future projects. A large element of this would relate to Covid-19 and as part of this a Covid-19 impact report would be submitted to the Skills Committee, Business Board and Combined Authority Board in September 2020. The proposals were considered by the Skills Committee on 6 July 2020 where they were endorsed unanimously by those present.

Councillor Holdich commented that the Combined Authority was to be commended for acting so quickly under the Mayor's lead. Much had been achieved already and he looked forward to the further update in September.

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

- a) Approve the consolidation of the Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SME) Observatory budget and the Local Growth Fund (LGF) Top Slice and Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Support Funding as detailed in Table 1, to resource the commissioning.
- b) Approve the consolidation of the Adult Education Budget Programme costs, National Retraining scheme and Apprenticeships as detailed in Table 2, to resource the commissioning.

#### **570. CAREERS AND ENTERPRISE COMPANY REVIEW**

The Board was advised that the Careers and Enterprise Company had been taken over as a legacy contract from the former Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Only one member of staff from the original team had remained and two new partners had been taken on to deliver the service given the current importance of careers and workforce. On 29 May 2019 the Combined Authority Board had requested an update report on the service after a year. The report before the Board discharged that request.

The Annual Review report was noted.

## **571. GROWTH COMPANY CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

On 27 November 2019 the Combined Authority Board had endorsed the Business Growth Service Outline Business Case and agreed to the establishment of a Growth Service Management Company, initially to be a wholly owned subsidiary of Angle Holdings Limited. The report before the Board sought approval of the corporate governance arrangements for the Growth Company. These proposals were discussed at the Skills Committee meeting on 6 July 2020 where they were endorsed by a majority of those present. The Growth Service Full Business Case would be submitted to the Skills Committee, the Business Board and the Combined Authority Board in September 2020.

Councillor Count asked about the position in relation to the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). Officers stated that the ERDF element had gone through the approval process. It was hoped that the September report would be able to give more information on the funding and when it was expected to be received. It was noted that there was often a gap between funding being approved and it being received.

On being proposed by Councillor Holdich, seconded by Councillor Count, it was resolved unanimously by those present to:

- a) Approve the business case in Appendix 1.
- b) Approve the business plan in Appendix 2.
- c) Approve the composition of Growth Co Board of Directors to include an independent director.
- d) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills to approve the appointment of the Independent Director for the Growth Co, following an open and transparent recruitment process.
- e) 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 Growth Co.
- f) Approve the execution of the deed adherence and accession, contained within the shareholder agreement for Angle Holdings Ltd.

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

### **BUSINESS BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMBINED AUTHORITY**

## **572. ACCELERATED 2021 LOCAL GROWTH FUNDING ALLOCATED TO THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY BUSINESS BOARD**

Accelerated Access to the 2021 Local Growth Funding (LGF) budget allocation amounting to £14.6million had been provisionally offered to the Business Board on

the basis that it would note the process by which these funds were awarded, agree a plan to deploy the awarded funds and formally accept the offer of this new tranche of Local Growth Funding from the Cities and Local Government Unit.

These proposals were considered at an Extraordinary meeting of the Business Board on 9 July 2020 where they were debated in detail and unanimously endorsed. The Business Board recommended that the funding be deployed to its top ranked priority project, the Greater Peterborough Innovation Ecosystem, subject to it successfully completing the Local Assurance Framework application process which included ratification by the Combined Authority Board. In order to meet the timescale required for a response to Government, the Mayor made a Mayoral Decision on 15 July 2020 to formally accept the allocation of £14.6million accelerated Local Growth Funding on behalf of the Combined Authority, in its role as accountable body for the Business Board. The funding would be managed by the Business Board.

Speaking from his experience of running a local manufacturing company, Mr Adams endorsed the plan to award the funding to the Greater Peterborough Innovation Ecosystem. This would provide an enhanced wraparound system for the new University of Peterborough which in turn would help meet the demand locally for high skills as well as stimulating the supply of high value jobs within the local economy.

Councillor Count expressed his thanks to Mr Adams and the Business Board and to officers for their professional and business-like manner and for the thoroughness and due diligence which had been demonstrated around the decision-making process.

The Combined Authority Board:

- a) Noted the Mayoral Decision on 15 July 2020, on the recommendation of the Business Board, to formally accept the allocation of £14.6million accelerated Local Growth Funding from the Cities and Local Government Unit on behalf of the Combined Authority;
- b) Noted the plan to deploy the awarded accelerated Local Growth Funding to the Business Board's No1 ranked priority project: Greater Peterborough Innovation Ecosystem, subject to it successfully completing the Local Assurance Framework application process including ratification by the Combined Authority Board.

Councillor Holdich left the meeting.

### **573. GROWTH DEAL PROJECT PROPOSALS JULY 2020**

The Mayor stated that the report contained six 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. He asked whether any member of the Board wished to discuss the exempt appendices. No member expressed the wish to do so.

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

The Business Board had £4.3m of Local Growth Funding available to allocate. Three project proposals had been through the local assurance process and been ranked against the agreed funding criteria. In order of rank these were:

- i. CAM Special Purpose Vehicle (minute 560 above also refers)
- ii. Cambridge Regional College Construction and Digital Refurbishment
- iii. Northstowe Development

The proposals were discussed at the Business Board meeting on 27 July 2020 where it was agreed unanimously to recommend the two highest ranked projects to the Combined Authority Board for funding.

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

- a) Approve funding for the project numbered 1, in table 2.11 based on the project achieving the highest scoring criteria and external evaluation recommendation.
- b) Approve a revised grant funding offer of £2,500,000, for the project numbered 2 in table 2.11 based on the project achieving the second highest scoring criteria and external evaluation recommendation.
- c) Decline project numbered 3 in table 2.11 based on the scoring criteria and this being the lowest scoring project.

#### **574. LOCAL GROWTH FUND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT JULY 2020**

The Board received an operational update on the Local Growth Fund (LGF). There were currently 16 live projects and six projects at pre-contract stage, an increase in two since publication of the report. A change which was required to the Wisbech Access Strategy had been approved by the County Council and a delivery partner had been procured to carry out a piece of work on historic LGF projects.

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

- a) Note all of the programme updates contained in the report to the Business Board on 27 July 2020.
- b) Approve the change request for the Wisbech Access Strategy Project.

#### **575. EASTERN AGRI-TECH GROWTH INITIATIVE FUNDING REVIEW - JULY 2020**

The Eastern Agri-Tech Growth Initiative had been in operation for over six years and its programme criteria had been unchanged during that time. This criteria had now been reviewed in the light of the Covid support rates and it was recommended that it should be revised to increase its attractiveness and impact. If this change was approved a new promotion campaign would be run to advertise this opportunity. There was £1.695m left to award and spend in the period to 31 March 2021 and officers judged that this was achievable.

Mr Adams commended officers for their hard work and agile approach during the past four months to ensure maximum uptake of the available funding alongside managing new asks from Government arising from Covid-19. Integrity, fair play and process were key factors and the previous week a report had been submitted to the Audit and Governance Committee looking across the whole spectrum of activity, including the previous Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Business Board. A year ago the LEP had been found to be broadly compliant with nine recommendations made for improvement. This year, the Business Board had been found to be substantially compliant with all nine recommendations for improvement addressed and work continuing to further refine and improve its processes.

Councillor Bailey expressed her thanks to the Business Board for its careful management and oversight and to officers for the support which they provided to the Business Board.

On being proposed by Mr Adams, seconded by Cllr Bailey, it was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve a change in the criteria for the Eastern Agri-Tech Growth Initiative scheme, raising the grant intervention rate from 25% to 50% on the Growth Grant part of the scheme.
- b) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Growth, to make any further changes in criteria or operation of the scheme to ensure all funds are awarded by end of March 2021.

(Mayor)

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – 5<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2020**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
1.	Mr Michael Page	Mayor James Palmer	<p>In press articles dated 29<sup>th</sup> July the Mayor is quoted as saying that a report on the CAM from the Technology Advisory Committee in May this year is ‘an exceptional piece of work’, that it contains ‘a lot more innovative thinking’ and that it will be a ‘game changer’ in halving previous cost estimates to less than £2bn.</p> <p>Can we please know the membership of this committee and can we have an opportunity to read the report? At the time of writing this question I cannot find it on the CPCA website.</p>
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Mayor James Palmer	Mr Michael Page	<p>The technologically-advanced nature of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro programme means it will continuously evolve and improve. In a fast-changing world, it is vital we seek additional, independent and ongoing technical insight throughout its development.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough has some of the world’s brightest and best on its doorstep and it is right that the Combined Authority engages with that local expertise to help drive this programme forward.</p> <p>The role of the CAM Technology Advisory Committee - the TAC - exemplifies that approach, providing independent technical advice on the development of the CAM, under the guidance of its chair Dr David Cleevely CBE, and supported by leading technical and academic experts.</p>

			<p>As part of its role the CAM TAC has undertaken a review of the previous Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) and on-going Outline Business Case (OBC) work undertaken on the CAM Central Tunnel Section. The resulting report offers bold, innovative thinking on what is potentially possible and deliverable, and proposes that the use of smaller metro vehicles could reduce the cost of CAM from the £4bn indicated in the SOBC to less than £2bn.</p> <p>The TAC's findings are being assessed and will feed in to a joined-up One CAM strategy, which will integrate the project's strands together in one place. But it is important to stress that the report is one part of the ongoing, wider evolution of the CAM, and public engagement and consultation will take place at the appropriate stages of delivery, including details on the latest technologies being considered for implementation.</p> <p>I have requested that a copy of the TAC report is put on the Combined Authority website.</p>
	<b>Question from:</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question</b>
2.	Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	Mayor James Palmer	<p>What has happened to the Non-Statutory Strategic Spatial Framework (Stage 2 was due a long time ago), and where is the current locus for coordination of plan-making across the constituent local planning authorities? We used to have a very effective Joint Strategic Planning Unit headed by John Williamson, and I am wondering how this may have been carried forward into new structures.</p> <p>Supplementary question: One of my hopes for devolution was that we would be able to produce an integrated single sub-regional strategy, combining planning, housing, transport, economy, utilities, and preservation and enhancement of built and natural heritage. So I was heartened to read in the agenda for the Combined Authority Board meeting on 29 May 2019 that "The Non-Statutory Strategic Spatial Framework Phase 2 is being prepared concurrently with the Local Transport Plan</p>

			(LTP). NSSF2 has reached issues stage and these will be consulted on at the same time as the draft LTP". The LTP was also on your agenda that day, and its final version was adopted in January this year, but there is still no NSSF2. What assurances can you give that planning and transport can be quickly knitted back together again?"
	<b>Response from:</b>	<b>Response to:</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Mayor James Palmer	Councillor Tim Wotherspoon	<p>This is an issue for all combined authorities and the reality is that none have yet delivered a spatial plan. I am a great believer in a spatial strategy, but there are legitimate concerns amongst planning authorities that they will lose control. I would welcome more direction on this from Government. It is imperative that we work with Government, local councils, the Ox-Cam Arc, East West Rail and Homes England to create a framework for growth in Cambridgeshire that is beneficial to the whole county.</p> <p>The Combined Authority is working with South Cambridgeshire District Council and others and I believe that we can put a clear solution to Government based on the CAM Metro. I do believe that we need more assurance from Government on where powers lie in relation to planning authorities' powers. We were asked to produce a non-statutory spatial plan, but when you are delivering not just to Local Plans it is difficult to get agreement without a statutory spatial plan.</p>

**Combined Authority Board 5 August 2020: Questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Item 2.1 Budget Monitor Update

Q: Building upon cycle schemes he has funded recently is the mayor able to consider reviewing budgets and move funding towards promoting safe walking and particularly cycling?

A: The Authority's transport strategy, outlined in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) published earlier this year, aims to provide a real attractive alternative to the private car through encouraging modal shift. Many of our core policies aim to encourage a shift to walking, cycling and public transport: from providing sustainable connectivity to and within new developments, to delivering world-class walking and cycling infrastructure. The Authority's overarching vision is to create a transport system in which walking, cycling and public transport are natural choices for the majority of journeys because they are affordable, healthy, convenient and safe alternatives to the private car. The more people travelling on foot and by bike rather than by private car will help to reduce congestion, improve air quality and safety and create attractive, healthy and thriving streets and communities.

All transport schemes promoted by the Authority need to comply and adhere to our policies, including the promotion of sustainable, active modes. For example, one of the key objectives of the A10 Strategic Outline Business Case is to ensure due consideration is given to the provision of an improved, high-quality cycle route between Cambridge and Ely. In addition, the draft LTP sub-strategy for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro proposes that pedestrian and cycling access should be designed to radiate from CAM stops; and by locating the CAM stops at the optimum location for accessibility helps to reinforce the sustainable transport message.

In addition, I wrote to the Prime Minister, following extensive work with the County and City Council, with a proposal for an active travel package four weeks before the Government announced cash support. Whilst we await the funding secured from the central Government grant, the Authority have provided £2.9 million of cash support to ensure that active travel measures can be implemented in a timely manner. This has meant that the people of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have started to benefit from these improvements in advance of the funding being received from Government.

The Authority remains committed to the delivery of active travel measures and will continue to seek additional funding sources to provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities. For example, we will seek further central Government funding as the National Cycling Strategy is rolled out with an associated £2 billion budget attached whilst continuing to work proactively with partners including Constituent Councils and the GCP to ensure budgets are used most effectively.

Item 3.1 £100m Affordable Housing Programme Proposed Variations to Schemes that form investments from the £40m revolving fund

Q: The report to the Board states that “The lost interest by granting interest free periods will not impact on other areas of the Combined Authority. i.e. the revenue budget does not rely on these funds, but as mentioned earlier in the paper, any interest earned on these loans would be recycled and re-invested into new housing projects. i.e. the loss of interest just impacts on future funds available to support the £100m affordable housing programme.” What—in financial and housing unit terms—is the opportunity cost of this lost interest?

A: The Combined Authority revenue budget is separate from the £40m revolving fund monies, so any interest being forgone from the loans under the £40m revolving fund does not affect the revenue budget. It just means that less interest will be received from the current revolving fund loans and so the £40m revolving fund which is the beneficiary of all loan interest will not increase by as much as it would have if interest was being received in full. The interest that we are proposing not to charge amounts to approximately £656,000. The future availability of the £40m revolving fund with interest that will be being paid should be available to be re-invested into future housing schemes as the current schemes are completed. The alternative to not offering a support package is to put the delivery of some of the houses and repayment of the loans with interest that is due at risk, which could have a far more significant impact. The future opportunity cost of not receiving the interest to be added to the revolving fund will equate to approximately three housing units.

If the Combined Authority used the whole of the £100m Affordable Housing Programme funding to give grants to bring forward affordable housing that would be a good outcome, but at the end of the programme the money would be gone. The use of the innovative £40m revolving fund means that affordable housing is still delivered, but at no cost to the taxpayer as the loaned money is repaid in full. We must stimulate the housing market and create opportunity and this exceptional scheme delivers that.

Item 3.2 Proposal for a Corporate Vehicle to bring forward the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM)

Q: The report to the Board states that “CAM will potentially increase social mobility to Peterborough and the Fens, therefore ‘levelling up’ the region”. Which parts of the Fens will have access to CAM, and when?

A: The proposal for the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro – the CAM - is for a high-quality, fast and reliable ‘metro-style’ transport network which will transform connectivity across the region. During the current and future development stages of the CAM programme, extensive analysis is being undertaken on the proposed CAM network. This analysis includes the potential routing of the CAM across the region and the potential for additional CAM regional routes over and above those already discussed. The analysis will ensure any proposed CAM routes deliver the aims of the CAM programme, meet the objectives of the CAM sub-strategy and will be subject to future technical work and public consultations. As the work on the CAM regional routes is at a very early stage of development, we are unable to provide specific details and timescales for the potential additional routes that may be included in the One CAM Strategy.

It is imperative that we level up opportunities across Cambridgeshire. The CAM project is starting in the south of the county because that is the area of most significant need in this context. But it will also be a means to spread the wealth of that part of the county too.

#### Item 3.3 A10 Junctions and Dualling

Q: The report to the Board states that "there was a spread of opinion about the options". Will the Combined Authority publish the public feedback received in response to the virtual public exhibition?

A: The public feedback received in response to the virtual public exhibition is found as part of the A10 Junctions and Dualling SOBC report as Appendix E – Stakeholder Attitudes.

#### Item 3.5 Market Town Masterplans

Q: A frequent comment during the development of the Market Town Masterplans was that local councillors and communities had not been consulted in their development, or their comments had been ignored. As funds are about to be allocated to the Market Towns to implement the Masterplans, what flexibility will be shown in granting funds to Market Towns for local priorities which are not in the Masterplans created for them, but which have greater local support and in some cases, greater feasibility?

A: Masterplans for Fenland and Huntingdonshire were consulted on through town teams and led by the districts and consultants. For East Cambridgeshire, consultation has been limited due to Covid and lockdown restrictions, however the resulting action plans will be consulted on to shape interventions. This will be led by East Cambridgeshire District Council. In terms of allocation of funds, and given the transformative aims of the Programme, the Combined Authority is especially keen to see movement on the more ambitious projects set out in the Masterplans and prospectuses for growth and will prioritise these. And whilst there will be opportunities for longer term projects, applications will have more chance of approval if they can also demonstrate fast impact, especially to support Covid economic recovery over the next nine months to the new financial year when unemployment impacts of Covid are expected to peak.

#### Item 5.2 Integrated Economic, Business and Skills Insight Programme

Q: How is the Combined Authority balancing the need for urgent action this summer and autumn to address the short-term implications of COVID-19 on business and the economy, with the wish to redesign its medium term COVID-19 recovery focus?

A: Since spring and through the summer so far, the Business & Skills Directorate have mobilised a range of urgent interventions to help our businesses with the impact of Covid-19 such as:

- a 1-2-1 Support Service to help Business access the central Government support initiatives

- a Webinar series on crucial topics to aid the restart of their Businesses
- specially adapted Grant and Micro Grant schemes; and
- augmentation of the forthcoming Business Growth Service in Autumn 2020 to incorporate a period focussed on Recovery.

Alongside this activity, our Economic Recovery Strategy Group (involving all our Local Partners and Stakeholders) has been formulating a Local Recovery Strategy containing near and medium terms proposals and also novel, long term proposals which will help accelerate the recovery of the local economy on a sustainable, greener and more inclusive basis. These proposals will be underpinned by the outcomes/findings of our EBSI Programme.