



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 27 October 2021

Time: 10.30am – 1.15pm

Venue: Sand Martin House, Bittern Way, Peterborough PE2 8TY

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

A Adams - Chair of the Business Board, Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council, Councillor W Fitzgerald – Peterborough City Council, Councillor J French – Fenland District Council, Councillor R Fuller – Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor L Nethsingha – Cambridgeshire County Council, Councillor M Smart – Cambridge City Council and Councillor B Smith – South Cambridgeshire District Council

Co-opted Members: Councillor E Murphy – Fire Authority  
Darryl Preston – Police and Crime Commissioner  
J Thomas – Clinical Commissioning Group

Apologies: Councillor C Boden, substituted by Councillor J French  
Councillor L Herbert, substituted by Councillor M Smart

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

The Mayor invited those present to take a moment to reflect on the recent murder of Sir David Amess MP. Some of those present had known Sir David personally and, without exception, spoke of his humour, his devotion to public service and to his constituents, his lack of high ambition and his deep faith. His murder was an assault on the values of democracy and on the foundations of a just and peaceful society. The Board paused for a moment to remember Sir David, his family and friends and to reflect on the important and fragile democratic values which brought the Board together.

The Mayor announced that the Combined Authority had received a Capability Fund 2021/22 Grant Award of just over £558,000. A report would be brought to the Board's next meeting to seek approval for forwarding these funds to Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council for delivery against the funding criteria.

The Mayor stated that the past five months since his election had been some of the hardest of his life. The expectation by some that all of the Combined Authority's problems could be solved instantly was not realistic. He was committed to the principles of compassion, co-operation and community in the Combined Authority's work both internally and externally and he looked forward to working on this with the new chief executive.

Apologies for absence were reported as recorded above. There were no declarations of interest.

## 102. Minutes – 29th September 2021 and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting on 29th September 2021 were approved as an accurate record, subject to some factual corrections in relation to comments by Councillor Bailey. The minutes action log was noted.

## 103. Petitions

No petitions were received.

## 104. Public questions

One public question was received. The question and written response can be viewed [here](#).

## Combined Authority Decisions

## 105. Future Proposals for One CAM Ltd and Local Transport Plan Refresh

The report comprised two elements, the first relating to the proposals to permanently cease the development of the CAM programme and agree that OneCAM Limited should permanently cease work and the second to the refresh of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP).

The Board's approval was sought for a 'soft' launch for the refreshed LTCP consisting of a programme of initial public engagement for four weeks in November 2021, followed by a six-week formal consultation on the framework document in January 2022. The final Plan would be delivered to the Board in March 2022 for approval. The refresh would be designed to secure growth and ensure that planned developments across the county took place in a sustainable way. The aim was to avoid the need for a further refresh in the short to medium term and to incorporate the recommendations from the Independent Commission on Climate and from initial public engagement. Feedback would be sought on key opportunities and challenges and this would be used to update the document before a further round of consultation began in January 2022.

With regard to the future of OneCAM Ltd, the Monitoring Officer stated that recommendation (a) had been revised to invite the Board to agree that the company be

struck off the register of companies after having been placed into dormancy. The Board was asked to approve the costs associated with the closure of OneCAM Ltd; to agree that the remaining shareholders' funds repaid by OneCAM Limited should be returned to the Recycled Growth Fund as partial reimbursement for the Business Board's £995k investment in the project; and to agree to transfer funds from the Combined Authority's Capital Single Pot to the Recycled Growth Funds to reimburse any shortfall between the £995k invested by the Business Board and the shareholder's funds received by the Combined Authority from OneCAM Ltd. The Board had previously approved the material closedown of the company and as sole shareholder in its closure was a matter reserved to the Board.

Councillor Smith welcomed the extensive consultation which she understood had taken place between Combined Authority (CPCA) officers and their counterparts within the district councils. The timescale for the LTCP refresh was ambitious and she expressed the hope that the consultation element was not the end of the engagement process.

Mr Adams welcomed the greater collaboration with constituent councils, commenting that he would also like to see more work on the implications of transport for key CPCA programmes including housing and the University of Peterborough. He expressed surprise that the Board was not being asked to endorse the CPCA's transport vision before the public consultation. Mr Adams judged that there was a need for the Board's transport aspirations to be properly agreed and asked how it was proposed to develop and agree the Board's transport vision.

Councillor Smart described the innovative public transport solutions he had seen in operation in Strasbourg and his wish to see something similarly innovative and ambitious for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. He asked whether the references in the report to connectivity included digital connectivity. The Mayor stated that to disregard the change in working practices which had taken place in response to Covid would in his judgement be a backward step. Targeting digital connectivity would have an impact on transport use and he highlighted the work being done by Huntingdonshire District Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council in relation to demand responsive transport. Moving forward, he would be looking to the new chief executive to draw together the various elements of the CPCA's business.

Councillor Nethsingha welcomed the proposal to close the OneCAM programme. She understood the disappointment that some would feel at this, but she urged the Board to move forward with funding and supporting those projects which could realistically be delivered. Many local residents had limited access to public transport or active travel options and those were things which the Board could deliver. In her view people's economic lives were being restricted by lack of access to education, training and job opportunities due to transport inequality and she judged the need for an affordable and deliverable transport vision to address this was urgent. The timescales were tight, but Councillor Nethsingha believed there was a need to accept that these were broad principles at this point.

The meeting adjourned from 10.31 to 10.32am.

Councillor Smith commented that the previous Mayor had had a clear vision for his transport priorities, but that this had not been shared by all members of the Board. In

her judgement the CPCA needed to engage with its constituent councils, partner organisations, local business and residents first and listen to their views to inform the development of its transport vision. That vision must also be aligned with other existing and emerging strategies.

The Mayor stated that public transport had been historically under-funded and that in his view not enough thought and care had been given to looking after the public and responding to their needs. His ambition was for world class public transport shaped around buses, rail and active transport, but he had reservations about being too didactic at this stage as he was committed to listening to other voices.

Councillor Fuller commented that he had not supported everything which had been done under the previous Administration, but the OneCAM project had been both ambitious and visionary. Other mayors were also embarking on ambitious long-term transport schemes, and if the CPCA accepted it had no such ambitions it would be left behind. He believed it was an untruth to say that a bus service could be delivered which would reach everybody and meet all of their needs as the CPCA did not have the revenue funding needed to subsidise that kind of service. He agreed with the need to integrate skills, transport and housing projects which had been highlighted by Mr Adams but felt the proposals before the Board were not going about this in the right way.

Councillor Bailey refuted the assertion that there had been no collective position under the previous Administration. There had been an agreed Local Transport Plan which in her judgement was clearly aligned to the CPCA's wider objectives around living and working locally and supporting the skills agenda. The calibre of people which the OneCAM project had attracted spoke to their belief in its deliverability and in her judgement the waste of the costs incurred to date on the OneCAM project was due to the current Mayor. Councillor Bailey asked what conversations had taken place with Government around the ceasing of the OneCAM project and commented that she had not yet received the paperwork she requested in July around the decision to cease the CAM programme. She asked that this information should be provided and that it should also accompany the associated referral made by herself and Councillor Fuller to the Audit and Governance (A&G) Committee. She also questioned the omission of details of background papers in the report. The Monitoring Officer undertook to provide a written explanation to the Board around the reason for this delay and to make sure the information was provided, including to A&G. Councillor Bailey further asked for sight of the paperwork relating to innovative approaches to transport delivery in the West Midlands, referenced at paragraph 3.4 of the report and whether there were any costs associated with the remuneration of the Non-Executive Directors of OneCAM Ltd who had resigned, the rescinding of job offers and the £11k on-going monthly costs shown for the project. The Monitoring Officer stated that the OneCAM Board would need to meet to resolve to move into dormancy and to disperse the company's assets. After three months OneCAM Ltd could be struck off the register of companies, the chief executive would stand down and all costs would end. There were no break costs for the directors leaving the company and it was his understanding that there were no onward costs associated with the rescinding of job offers, but he would check and confirm this outside of the meeting.

With regards to the LTCP, Councillor Bailey commented that she wanted to understand what the public was being consulted on at this stage as she was not sure that there was collective agreement on the CPCA's objectives in this area. The Devolution Deal was focused on doubling GVA and she would want to see how any plan aligned with the Devolution Deal commitments. She further commented that there still a lack of clarity about exactly which geographic areas were meant by the references to parts of East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Fenland, with the implication being that parts of those areas were not covered by the proposals.

The Mayor stated that he recognised Councillor Bailey's passion for the OneCAM project. However, whilst she had stated that this was aligned with the CPCA's wider aims it was at odds with the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) objectives, which might have been one of the reasons so little progress was made. The CPCA was looking at the innovative transport solutions being explored in other areas and would work with all partners, and especially with the GCP, to explore these, but whilst he was not opposed to light rail or train options he did not believe that tunnels under Cambridge was the right choice.

Councillor French commented on the need for the Board to work together. She described the Levelling Up agenda and the emerging Fenland transport plan and the need for all the elements to be brought together. The Mayor described this as a laudable ambition and offered his assurance that Fenland was an absolute focus with regards to transport.

Councillor Fitzgerald expressed the view that there was a need for the Mayor to articulate his transport vision and to get people to buy into this. The issue of how subsidised buses would be paid for was a good question and a response should be placed on record. He judged that work had been needed before this point to achieve some consensus around what issues the consultation exercise should be addressing. Councillor Fitzgerald believed that the Combined Authority's transport vision should be innovative and ambitious, but saw no evidence of that in what he had heard so far. The Combined Authority needed to be clear on its purpose and how this would be fulfilled in order to retain the confidence of Government. In his judgement, the appointment of the new chief executive offered an opportunity to reset and move forward positively. Given the substantial sums which Cambridgeshire and Peterborough contributed to the Treasury the area should be at the forefront of Government plans.

The Mayor stated that the Board had challenged him to move the transport agenda forward. He was not convinced that the CAM project was as popular as some might believe, and the soft launch of the LTCP consultation was designed to find out the public's transport priorities. The Mayor stated that he was committed to doubling GVA without harming the environment and to caring for all of the communities within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, the Board noted recommendations a) to c):

- a) Note progress on the Local Transport Plan (LTP) refresh;

- b) Provide feedback on the development of the Local Transport and Connectivity (LTCP) programme, outlining key areas to be addressed within the Soft Launch engagement, in relation to the overarching vision, aims and objectives as well as key challenges and opportunities;
- c) Note that the Transport and Infrastructure Committee has invited officers to review the relevance of the LTP CAM Sub-Strategy following a decision on the ONECAM SPV, and to report back to a future Transport and Infrastructure Committee;

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, the Board resolved by a majority to:

- d) Permanently stop the development of the CAM programme and agree that One CAM Limited can permanently cease work; and
- e) Agree to a programme of initial public engagement for four weeks in November 2021, followed by a six-week consultation in January 2022 of the framework document, with the Final Plan delivered to Board March 2022 meeting.

In respect of One CAM LTD, to:

- a) Agree that the company be placed into dormancy, followed by strike off from the register of companies;
- b) Approve that the costs associated with the closure of One CAM Limited (as set out in this report) be met;
- c) Agree the remaining shareholders' funds repaid by One CAM Limited be returned to the Recycled Growth Fund as partial reimbursement for the Business Board's £995k investment in the project; and
- d) Agree to transfer funds from the Combined Authority's Capital Single Pot to the Recycled Growth Funds to reimburse any shortfall between the £995k invested by the Business Board and the shareholder's funds received by the Combined Authority from One CAM Limited.

The meeting was adjourned from 11.13am to 11.21am.

## 106. Bus Service Reform

The Mayor welcomed the presence of Peter Blake, Transport Director at the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP), to the meeting as an observer. The transport teams at the Combined Authority and the GCP had been working closely and he felt this was symbolic of the two organisations joint ventures, such as jointly funding the ZEBRA green buses bid.

The Government had announced a national bus strategy in Spring 2021 which consisted of £3bn of investment over three years to grow passenger numbers and to support better and more joined up public transport provision. Local authorities were

invited to submit ambitious bus service improvement plans (BSIPs) to qualify for consideration for funding. The Combined Authority was seeking £100m over three years. Passenger priorities such as punctuality, frequency, personal safety and polite staff had all been taken into account and the proposed BSIP represented a balanced and pragmatic approach as part of an integrated plan. A significant increase in rural routes across the whole of the county was being sought in addition to the existing route network and the BSIP would take account of the transport needs of the new University of Peterborough. Officers had worked closely with local bus operators through an independently chaired forum which included working groups on both fares and passenger transport. There would be a requirement that all buses were cleaned daily and would have CCTV installed. A data driven approach had been taken to route pricing points and there was a recognition of the need for the BSIP to align closely with the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP). Behavioural change was a central issue and incentives would be used to support this. Consideration was being given to the possibility of enhanced partnership working or franchising options. The outline business case was currently subject to external audit and once this was complete there would be a statutory three-month public consultation period.

Councillor Bailey commented that this appeared to mirror what had been done in relation to the Ely Zipper service which had been forward funded to allow time to develop community ownership. Given the finite resources available she asked whether priority would be given to subsidising routes or subsidising fares. Officers stated that this was currently being explored by the fares working group. The Mayor commented it was about finding a balance and that he would want to listen to the outcome of the working group's deliberations and to the public consultation.

Councillor Nethsingha welcomed the work which was being done in partnership with the GCP. In her judgement, working with the GCP would be crucial to getting a good bus network across the wider Cambridge area. It would also be important to work with the County Council on relevant issues such as school transport in order to maximise the public transport offer. There would be variations in need across the Combined Authority area and so it would be important to consult widely and also to look at how bus provision would be integrated into the wider transport network, including transport hubs and active travel solutions. The Mayor stated that he welcomed the opportunity to work innovatively with the County Council and health service providers on the opportunities available and expressed his willingness to work with any constituent council on this.

Mr Adams expressed his thanks to the Bus Strategy Manager and the transport team for what they had achieved in such a short period of time. He commented that it would be good to see the final version before it was submitted, although in his view it lacked ambition in some areas and there was still more work to be done on it. The Mayor stated that he would be working with the new chief executive to establish better co-ordination across Leaders' strategy meetings and email traffic to take this forward between meetings.

In response to a question from Councillor Smart around the voting requirements shown in the report the Monitoring Officer confirmed that only recommendation b) was subject to special voting arrangements.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that the GCP might be doing good work in other parts of the county, but this had not been shared with him. He did though remain open to such a conversation. Peterborough City Council welcomed more buses and greener transport solutions and he had tasked his officers to look urgently at the plans by Stagecoach to electrify their fleet. He welcomed the plan before the Board, although expressed a slight concern around funding. Whilst electric buses would not resolve air pollution he considered them to be a step forward. The Mayor noted that the Transport Director at the GCP was observing the meeting and had signalled that he would be happy to meet with Councillor Fitzgerald.

Councillor Fuller welcomed the report and the recognition of the importance of bus infrastructure. He had raised a question around fully costed proposals for bus service improvements in St Ives at a Leaders' strategy meeting, but so far had received no response. He also mentioned a quote attributed to the Mayor in a local publication which wrongly stated that one of Huntingdonshire District Council's (HDC) committees would be reviewing responses to a wider St Ives Transport Study, whereas HDC was in fact a member of the consultation group. The Mayor offered his apologies if the requested information on St Ives had not been provided and asked that officers should resolve this. He was also happy to clarify the reference to HDC and for this to be corrected if needed. Councillor Fuller asked to be copied into any correction.

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

- a) Delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer, to submit the Authority's Bus Service Improvement Plan to the Department for Transport no later than 29th October 2021;
- b) Delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer, to progress at the earliest opportunity the designated BSIP activities should the funding from Department for Transport (DfT) be approved; and
- c) Approve public engagement on the Bus Reform proposals following completion of the independent audit of the Outline Business Case.

The vote in favour of recommendation b) included at least two thirds of all Members (or their Substitute Members) appointed by the Constituent Councils present and voting, including the Members appointed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council, and the Mayor.

## 107. OxCam Arc Spatial Framework Position Statement

The Board was advised that Government was planning a spatial framework for the OxCam Arc which would have the status of national planning and transport policy. The consultation was aimed primarily at the public rather than local authorities, but the Combined Authority had submitted a short officer response following consultation with



Leaders. The Government response to the consultation was expected in the spring with the following phase involving Government developing options and policies for the spatial framework. The Board was invited to mandate the Mayor, Lead Members and officers to engage proactively with these discussions alongside constituent council representatives.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that the key issue was to be actively involved in the detailed discussion stage of the process in order to make sure the views of local communities were represented.

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

- a) Note the response to the government's consultation attached at Appendix 1;
- b) Note the issues raised by constituent authorities, parish councils and other respondents to the consultation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough; and
- c) Mandate the Mayor, Lead Members and officers to engage proactively in discussions with government as it enters the next phase of developing its proposed spatial framework.

## 108. Strategic Water Issues

The Board was familiar with the significance of water issues for the region and its approval was sought for the Combined Authority to become more involved in conversations around this subject. Water Resources East (WRE) represented the formal element of water plans development whilst the Future Fens Integrated Adaptation Initiative would be focusing on economic impacts as well as climate adaptations.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she believed it to be crucial for the Combined Authority to be involved in this work in order to deliver green growth. In her view this was not just about delivering new housing, but also about the flood defences and mitigations needed to protect existing communities and the local environment. Should the Board agree to the proposal that a senior officer be nominated to represent the Combined Authority on the WRE she would be interested to know who this would be and whether it had to be a Combined Authority officer. The Mayor stated that, if approved, the chief executive would reflect on who was best placed to discharge this role.

Councillor Smith asked how the £7,500 subscription cost of WRE membership had been calculated. Officers stated that this was an equivalent contribution to that of the existing partners.

Councillor Bailey expressed her support for the proposals. She cited the significant concerns which East Cambridgeshire District Council had around the perceived lack of maintenance of the Ouse Washes defences and the difference in local residents'

perception of what was needed and that of the Environment Agency. The Mayor stated that it would be important to draw on Leaders' local knowledge in progressing this work.

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

- a) Agree that the Combined Authority should send a senior representative to the Sponsor Group of the Future Fens Integrated Adaptation Initiative, and approve a financial contribution of £40,000 in 2021-22 from the Non-Strategic Spatial Framework budget line to support the initiative in developing a business case for investment in water management and climate change adaptation in the Fens;
- b) Agree that the Combined Authority should join the Water Resources East (WRE) Board and approve the expenditure of £7,500 in 2021-22 from the Non-Statutory Spatial Framework budget as a subscription to WRE membership; and
- c) Subject to recommendation (b) being approved, delegate authority to the Chief Executive to nominate a senior officer to represent the Combined Authority on the Water Resources East Board.

## 109. Net Zero Compliant Policies: Making an Immediate Difference

The Board was reminded that the Independent Commission on Climate had made thirty-one recommendations to the Combined authority, other organisations and residents. The proposals contained in the report related to recommendations to the Combined Authority and, if approved, these would be complemented by future refreshes of other policies within the organisation. The Commission had recommended that organisations should work both individually and collectively to address climate issues. This would be supported by an officer group which would include lead officers for climate from the constituent councils. With regards to the Combined Authority, it was proposed to adjust procurement policies to take more account of climate issues. The Business Board's feedback on this would be sought to ensure that the organisation continued to support local businesses, within the relevant guidelines.

Councillor Smith commented that it was understood that the Commission's recommendations were difficult and ambitious, but they were also in her view non-negotiable and vital. She emphasised the crucial part to be played by local government in responding smartly, quickly and cost effectively to the climate emergency. Local authorities should in her view lead by example and speak to their local residents and business as they knew them and had their trust.

The Mayor thanked Councillor Bailey for giving prior notice of her intention to move an amendment to the recommendations and invited her to speak.

Councillor Bailey, seconded by Councillor Fuller, proposed that recommendation a) be amended such that the Combined Authority Board:

- ~~a) Endorse the proposed Action Plan setting out the Combined Authority's actions to implement the first recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate;~~
- a) **Endorse the proposed framework for an Action Plan as set out at Appendix 1, and ask the Climate Working Group to prepare by 28 February 2022, for subsequent consideration by the Board on 30 March 2022, a more ambitious, comprehensive and public friendly Action Plan setting out how the Combined Authority will take action to implement the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate; and thereafter, ensure an updated Action Plan is brought to the Board before the end of March each year.**

(Removed words shown as ~~struck through~~, additional text in **bold**)

Speaking to the amendment, Councillor Bailey commented that it was her wish to push the action plan harder and faster. The Board had not agreed to all of the Commission's work and she felt that her previous comments on this had been badly represented. In her view little progress had been made since discussions in June and she expressed disappointment at this. She had not yet received the information around the waste fleet at South Cambridgeshire District Council which had been offered some months ago. East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) had adopted an environmental supplementary planning document, generated the most renewable energy of the constituent councils and had 500 net zero homes on the Kennett Garden Village site. In her view, Appendix 1 to the report provided a useful breakdown, but it looked like an internal project management tool. She judged there was a need to engage the public and wider stakeholders in order to bring them along on the net-zero journey. There were already good examples of climate-related action plans in place amongst the constituent councils.

Councillor French commented that the amendment seemed a pragmatic way to give partners more time to consider the Climate Commission's recommendations.

The Mayor welcomed the amendment in principle, but stated that he would prefer to include a reference to partners on the Working Group. He would also want to acknowledge that if agreement between all partners could not be reached that outstanding issues should still be reported back to the Board. He therefore proposed a further amendment, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, to:

- ~~a) Endorse the proposed Action Plan setting out the Combined Authority's actions to implement the first recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate;~~
- a) **Endorse the proposed framework for an Action Plan as set out at Appendix 1, and ask the Climate Working Group to prepare by 28 February 2022, for subsequent consideration by the Board on 30 March 2022, a more ambitious, comprehensive and public friendly Action Plan setting out how the Combined Authority and the partners on the Group will take action to implement the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate, or if agreement cannot be reached**

**among partners by that time, to report on the outstanding issues; and thereafter, ensure an updated Action Plan is brought to the Board before the end of March each year.**

(Removed words shown as ~~struck through~~, additional text in **bold**. Additions to Councillor Bailey's amendment underlined)

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that it was in order for the Chair to permit two or more amendments to be discussed together (but not voted upon) if circumstances suggested that this course would facilitate the proper conduct of business. The Mayor opened both amendments to discussion.

Councillor Bailey commented that she was concerned that the Mayor's amendment was trying to force other Board members into a particular position. ECDC was progressing its own action plan and in her judgement the recommendation before the Board should focus on what the Combined Authority was doing.

Councillor Fuller commented that he did not feel that the Mayor's amendment was practical and that he was concerned about setting up false expectations around both deliverability and accountability, noting that the constituent councils were not accountable to the Combined Authority. He judged that the Board should focus on the Climate Commission recommendations that were within the Combined Authority's ability to deliver. The Mayor acknowledged that it was not for the Combined Authority to dictate to its constituent councils, but felt that it should foster a collective approach. If constituent councils were experiencing challenges with particular issues this should not be a source of criticism but should be recognised and supported by working together.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that he understood the Mayor's good intentions, but different constituent councils were at a different places on this. They were though all signed up to the climate change agenda.

In response to the discussion, the Mayor amended his amendment to remove the words, 'and the partners on the Group'. Councillor Nethsingha seconded this change.

Mr Adams commented that it was important to recognise the opportunities presented by the response to climate change as well as the challenges. For example, there were currently no large scale heat pump manufacturers in the UK. He further commented that it should be acknowledged that the response to the Climate Commission's recommendations was on a best endeavours basis.

Councillor Smith emphasised the importance of the Board working together to move things forward and show the ability to deliver at pace. On that basis she would be supporting the Mayor's amendment.

On moving to the vote, the amendment proposed by Councillor Bailey and seconded by Councillor Fuller was lost.

On moving to the vote, the amendment by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, was carried by a majority vote in favour.

The Mayor opened the report and amended recommendations to debate by the Board.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that there was considerable expertise available around the table and called on the Board to work closely and in partnership.

Councillor Bailey expressed her unhappiness at what she considered to be the hi-jacking of her amendment, commenting that she did not consider this to demonstrate collective working. Councillor Fuller concurred, commenting that he judged it to be both unnecessary and divisive. Councillor Nethsingha disagreed, commenting that in her judgement the additional sentence added by the Mayor would make a positive difference. The Mayor stated that he agreed that Councillor Bailey's had proposed a good amendment, but that he believed it had needed a slight adjustment. He would have been content for the revised wording to have been moved in her name.

Councillor Smart asked whether aiming for net-zero carbon emissions was enough. Officers stated that the Climate Commission's recommendations mapped out a potential path to net-zero. This included the sequestration of carbon as it was recognised that there would be some carbon emissions which could not be reduced by 2050. Whilst net-zero was the legal target set by Government, there would be opportunities to go beyond that via compensatory measures to take carbon out of the atmosphere.

Councillor Fitzgerald commended the report, commenting that all members of the Board were committed to using their best endeavours to address the challenges of climate change.

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

- a) Endorse the proposed framework for an Action Plan as set out at Appendix 1, and ask the Climate Working Group to prepare by 28 February 2022, for subsequent consideration by the Board on 30 March 2022, a more ambitious, comprehensive and public friendly Action Plan setting out how the Combined Authority will take action to implement the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate, or if agreement cannot be reached among partners by that time, to report on the outstanding issues; and thereafter, ensure an updated Action Plan is brought to the Board before the end of March each year.
- b) Note the setting up of the Climate Working Group to bring partners together to provide system-wide leadership in implementing the wider elements of the Commission's recommendations;
- c) Mandate officers to take forward actions with CPCA budget implications through the Medium-Term Financial Plan refresh process and in line with the Assurance Framework requirements for expenditure decisions;
- d) Mandate officers to review the Assurance Framework and project management guidance to ensure that future Board decisions at project gateways can take into account evidence of their climate impact; and

- e) Mandate officers to prepare a procurement policy for consideration by the Board that would set out criteria for applying climate change considerations to the procurement of goods, services, and to future funding agreements with delivery partners.

This policy to include:

- a. appropriate scoring criteria for climate change in tendered goods and services;
- b. any minimum standards to be applied for suppliers;
- c. an assessment of impacts on supply chain.

## 110. OxCam Arc Environment Principles

The Board was invited to endorse a set of Environment Principles which would form a shared statement of ambition for the Ox-Cam Arc. These aligned with the Combined Authority's doubling nature vision.

Councillor Smith commented that the Principles demonstrated an approach which treated the region with thought and care. They had been drawn up by experts from Government, the third sector and partners and had been adopted by the OxCam Arc leadership and many of its constituent councils. At the outset of the OxCam Arc's work environmental issues had not featured on its agenda, but it was now widely recognised as the one workstream which had delivered.

Councillor Fuller commented that Huntingdonshire District Council was using the Principles to inform a refresh of its environmental strategy. He noted that there had been some misrepresentation of the position locally with the suggestion that these Principles were being imposed by Government, rather than generated by the Arc with a challenge to Government to sign up.

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

Endorse the OxCam Arc Environment Principles.

## Combined Authority Governance Reports

### 111. Annotated Forward Plan

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

Approve the annotated Forward Plan.

## 112. Appointment of Independent Persons

The Board was reminded that under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 all relevant authorities were responsible for deciding how to deal with standards issues at a local level, including adopting their own local code and determining the arrangements to deal with complaints. The Act required that the Authority must appoint an Independent Person to assist in discharging these responsibilities. The Board had approved the recruitment process in July 2021 and interviews took place on 18 October 2021. It was proposed that the lead Independent Person would be paid £1,000 per annum and the reserve £500 per annum, plus travel costs. Two appointments were recommended with the expectation that the Independent Person would lead on most cases and that the reserve Independent Person would only be used in the case of a conflict of interest. The Act set out those who were excluded from acting as Independent Persons and both of the recommended candidates had confirmed that these were not applicable to them. It was not unusual for Independent Person's to act for several local authorities.

Councillor Fuller commented that whilst it might be permissible for Independent Person's to act for more than one authority he did not believe it was healthy. The Deputy Monitoring Officer stated that there was no prohibition on this in legislation and that it was a model adopted by other combined authorities. Three candidates had been interviewed for the role and the two preferred candidates had been recommended to the Board for approval. The Monitoring Officer stated that he had been concerned at the gap in provision relating to the appointment of Independent Persons and that it would be for the Proper Officers to be vigilant and to ensure that the role was being discharged effectively. The interview process had included the chair of the Audit and Governance Committee and officers would not be recommending the appointments if they were not satisfied that they were appropriate.

The Police and Crime Commissioner asked whether the reserve Independent Person would have any duties to carry out for their £500 remuneration. The Monitoring Officer stated that the level of annual remuneration was fixed irrespective of the number of cases they were involved in.

Councillor Smith asked whether there would be an advantage to having an overlap in the terms of the two appointments. The Monitoring Officer stated that Officers would manage key dates, but that the suggestion would be noted.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to all those who had put themselves forward for consideration for these important roles.

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

- a) Approve the appointment of David Pearl as the Independent Person for the Combined Authority for a four-year term; and

- b) Approve the appointment of Gillian Holmes as the reserve Independent Person for the Combined Authority for a four-year term.

### 113. Information Governance: Updated GDPR Policies

Revised GDPR policies had been reviewed by the Audit and Governance Committee on 24 September 2021 and a number of additions had been recommended which were set out in paragraph 2.6 of the report. The Combined Authority had a service level agreement (SLA) with Peterborough City Council for GDPR support. At present 79% of Combined Authority staff had completed GDPR training and further training would be delivered on the updated policies subject to their approval by the Board.

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

- a) Approve and adopt the new GDPR policies set out at Appendix 1 to 7; and
- b) Delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer to make consequential amendments to the GDPR policies as required.

(Mayor)