



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
& PETERBOROUGH**  
COMBINED AUTHORITY

## Agenda item 1.2

### Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Board: Minutes

Date: Wednesday 27 July 2022

Time: 10.00am – 2.46pm

Venue: Civic Suite, Pathfinder House, St Mary's Street, Huntingdon PE29 3TN

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

Councillor A Bailey – East Cambridgeshire District Council,  
Councillor C Boden – Fenland District Council, Councillor S Conboy –  
Huntingdonshire District Council, Councillor W Fitzgerald – Peterborough  
City Council (to 1.12pm), Councillor L Herbert (Statutory Deputy Mayor) –  
Cambridge City Council, Professor A Neely – Acting Chair of the Business  
Board (to 1.44pm), Councillor L Nethsingha (Non-Statutory Deputy Mayor)  
– Cambridgeshire County Council and Councillor John Williams – South  
Cambridgeshire District Council

Co-optees: J Peach – Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner, Councillor E Murphy –  
Fire Authority (joined the Board for Item 2.1: Budget Monitor Report July  
2022 onward) and J Thomas – Integrated Care System (to 12.24pm)

Apologies: Councillor B Smith, substituted by Councillor J Williams and Police and  
Crime Commissioner D Preston, substituted by Deputy Police and Crime  
Commissioner J Peach

### Part 1 - Governance Items

#### 221. Announcements, Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

The Mayor stated that he had been delighted to attend the opening of the new Ralph Butcher Causeway at Kings Dyke earlier in the month. The new layout had cost £32m and had been chiefly funded by the Combined Authority and delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council with the support of key local partners including Fenland District Council and Whittlesey Town Council. The Mayor described this as an example

of what could be achieved when local partners showed belief and worked together. Transport and connectivity were fundamental to delivering sustainable growth across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and the Mayor encouraged as many people as possible to share their views through the public consultation on the Combined Authority's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan before it closed on 4 August 2022.

The Mayor welcomed Gordon Mitchell, Interim Chief Executive, and Edwina Adefehinti, Deputy Monitoring Officer, to their first Board meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B Smith, substituted by Councillor J Williams, and Police and Crime Commissioner D Preston, substituted by Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner J Peach.

Councillor C Boden declared an interest in Item 2.1: Budget Monitor Report July 2022 as a Trustee of FACT, which provided the No.68 bus route in Wisbech on a non-profit basis. Minute 219 below refers.

Professor A Neely declared an interest during the meeting in relation to Item 5.1: Active Travel Cambridgeshire, as a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board. He took part in the debate of the report, but did not vote. Minute 223 below refers.

## 222. Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Combined Authority Board 20 May 2022, Minutes of the Combined Authority Annual Meeting 8 June 2022 and Action Log

The full minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 20 May 2022 were exempt from publication under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to an individual; information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual; and information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). The public interest in maintaining the exemption was deemed to outweigh the public interest in publishing it.

Councillor Bailey stated her belief that two points were missing from the exempt minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 20 May 2022.

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

To exclude the press and public from the meeting for the discussion of the exempt minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 20 May 2022 under Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to an individual; information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual; and information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority

holding that information). The public interest in maintaining the exemption was deemed to outweigh the public interest in publishing it.

The public meeting was adjourned at 10.07am.

[Private Session]

The public meeting resumed at 10.25am.

The minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 20 May 2022 were deferred to 31 August 2022 for approval.

With the consent of the meeting, the minutes of the annual meeting of the Combined Authority Board on 8 June 2022 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor.

The Action Log was noted.

## 223. Petitions

No petitions were received.

## 224. Public Questions

One public question was received from Roxanne De Beaux, Executive Director of Camcycle. A copy of the question and the Mayor's response is attached at Appendix 1.

## 225. Membership of Combined Authority 2022-23

Councillor Murphy left her seat in the public gallery and the meeting room for the duration of this item and the vote.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised the Board of the proposed appointments.

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

- a) Note the appointment by South Cambridgeshire District Council of Councillor John Williams as its substitute member on the Combined Authority Board for the remainder of the municipal year 2022/2023, replacing Councillor Brian Milnes.
- b) Appoint Councillor Edna Murphy as a co-opted member of the Combined Authority Board for 2022/23 representing the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority and Councillor Mohammed Jamil as substitute member.

- c) Appoint Alex Plant as the Business Board member of the Combined Authority Board for 2022/23, and Professor Andy Neely as the substitute member.
- d) Approve the appointment of Councillor Bridget Smith of South Cambridgeshire District Council as the nominated substitute member for the Mayor and Lead Member for Economic Growth for the Business Board
- e) Note and agree the Mayor's nomination to Lead Member responsibilities for Lead Member for Governance as set out in paragraph 2.9 of this report

Councillor Murphy returned to the meeting room and joined the Board.

## Part 2 – Finance

### 226. Budget Monitor Report July 2022 2021-22 Outturn

Councillor Boden declared an interest in this item in his capacity as a Trustee of FACT, which provided the No.68 bus route in Wisbech on a non-profit basis. Minute 214 above refers. He took part in the debate of the report and the vote.

The Board was provided with an overview of the outturn for 2021/22 and an update on the 2022/23 budget and capital programme. This included approved changes which had been made since the medium-term financial plan (MTFP) was agreed by the Board in January 2022 and proposed slippage. Members' attention was drawn to Appendix 4 which provided a detailed explanation of every material variance.

Key issues included savings across corporate budgets and treasury management measures resulting in a saving of £1.6m; a ring-fenced underspend on the Adult Education Budget (AEB) which preserved this funding for AEB purposes in future years; a significant underspend on the LAD2 retrofit programme which would need to be returned to BEIS as the sponsoring department and would be the subject of a separate report at a future meeting; and a 32% underspend on capital programmes, rising to 39% when the highways grant passported to the two local Highways Authorities was excluded. Slippage was always to be avoided where possible, but where this was proposed it was largely due to external factors beyond the Combined Authority's control. Internally, enhanced support in the project management office was demonstrating improvements in process. Two significant risks were identified. These related to the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF), where projects which had not started delivery by March 2023 risked the clawback of funding; and the value for money (VFM) concerns highlighted by the Combined Authority's external auditor, Ernst and Young. In response to these VFM concerns the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) had paused funding to the Combined Authority. This did not affect the organisation's ability to deliver projects at the current time.

The Mayor welcomed the comprehensive report, and in particular the detailed explanation of material variances contained in Appendix 4 which responded to a previous request from the Board.

Councillor Boden sought clarification of how the reported underspend on the Kings Dyke project for 2021/22 aligned with the request made at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee for the CPCA to pay its 60% share of the costs to Cambridgeshire County Council. Officers undertook to provide a briefing note on this outside of the meeting. Officers further confirmed that the £2.93m associated with the March Area Transport Study represented a credit variance and undertook to discuss with the external auditor how negative slippage was presented in future reports. With the Mayor's agreement, Councillor Boden raised the issues around the No.68 bus route in Wisbech and asked that a report should be brought on this to the next meeting if it was proposed to terminate the service. Officers were tasked to look at this issue and the Mayor agreed that a report could be taken to the next meeting of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee if the service was to be terminated.

Councillor Fitzgerald expressed concern at the reported underspend of around £12m and asked about the expected year end position, commenting that in his view delivery performance was poor. Officers stated that the business planning cycle would set out the anticipated year end position and it was expected that an update on the in-year budget would be presented at the Board's September meeting.

Councillor Conboy welcomed the clear, succinct format of the report. She suggested that a similarly clear, easy to understand annex or separate update designed to be shared with partner organisations would be a useful addition in future.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that the Board was keenly aware of the issues around LAD2 and was taking this very seriously. She noted that slippage was not uncommon in relation to large capital projects, but asked whether there was an expectation around the likely levels of slippage in budget planning as a better understanding of this could potentially support the funding of more ambitious projects in future. Councillor Boden concurred, commenting that it was important to deal actively with slippage to avoid missing potential opportunities, and that this was something he would want to see as part of the next budget. Officers stated that an overall estimate of slippage was currently factored into the planning process rather than looking at individual projects, but confirmed that this was something which could be revisited. The Mayor stated his expectation that this would form part of future conversations.

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

- a) Note the outturn position of the Combined Authority for the 2021- 22 financial year, including £2m of single pot revenue savings and £1.8m capital savings.
- b) Approve the updated requested slippage of unspent project budgets on the approved capital programme of £51.3m and on the revenue budget of £8.4m

## Part 3 – Mayoral Decisions

### 227. Recycled Local Growth Fund (LGF) Project Funding Awards: MDN 38-2022

The Board was notified of Mayoral Decision Notice (MDN) MDN38-2022 recording the key decision taken by the Mayor on 30 June 2022 to approve funding of £4,397,093 from the Recycled Local Growth Fund to projects recommended by the Business Board.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the timely reporting of this MDN to the Board in accordance with due process, whilst Councillor Nethsingha described this as an example of an MDN being used appropriately.

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

Note Mayoral Decision Notice MDN38-2022: Recycled Local Growth Fund (LGF) Category 2 funding approval.

## Part 4 - Combined Authority Decisions

### 228. Improvement Framework

This key decision was added to the Forward Plan on 19 July 2022 under general exception arrangements.

The minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee (A&G) meeting on 30 June 2022 had been sent to all Board members the previous week at the request of A&G's Independent Chair, to offer an insight into the Committee's debate and conclusions around the external auditors' letter dated 1 June 2022, future improvement activity and the draft Member Officer Protocol ahead of the Board's own deliberations.

The Improvement Framework had also been considered in detail by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&S) on 25 July 2022. The Committee had spent almost an hour and three quarters discussing the proposals and asking questions of the Interim Chief Executive and Interim Head of Governance, and had been supportive of the approach described in the report. The Mayor stated that the Board welcomed this level of scrutiny, and that O&S would have a crucial role to play in the Combined Authority's improvement journey.

The Interim Chief Executive invited the Board to consider his proposals to drive and implement an improvement plan to address the issues identified in the external auditor's letter of 1 June 2022 and in discussion with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), and in light of DLUHC's decision to take a precautionary approach to the transfer of funding to the CPCA until it had sufficient assurance that appropriate plans were in place to address these concerns. Some measures had already been put in place, including the appointment of an interim chief executive and

the drafting of a Member Officer protocol for the Board's approval. However, the degree of challenge which the Authority faced remained significant. It was for that reason that he was seeking the Board's approval of a number of exceptional delegations to allow him to move at pace to enhance leadership capacity within the CPCA. If approved, this would take account of the work done prior to his appointment around the senior management structure and was linked to embedding protective behaviours around staff. Moving forward, he proposed a self-assessment exercise to identify the scale and scope of the CPCA's needs. The Independent Review of Governance and Ways of Working appended as Appendix 1 to the report would be pertinent to both this self-assessment exercise and to the improvement plan. Specialist external expertise would be sought where appropriate, and the outputs from the various workstreams would be incorporated into a single improvement plan.

The Interim Chief Executive emphasised the importance of the Board recognising the scale and scope of the Improvement Plan. There would be costs associated with the work being voluntarily undertaken by the CPCA to produce this plan, and the CPCA would also be required to fund any form of formal intervention should this be required by Government. In response to the exceptional circumstances, he was seeking the Board's approval to allocate the use of up to £750,000 from the CPCA Response Fund to fund the scoping, development and delivery of improvement activity, and a delegation to authorise him to spend these funds. If approved, he would report back regularly on progress to the Board both via its formal public meetings and informally outside of these. The chief executives of the CPCA's constituent councils had been given advanced notice of the proposals contained in the report and the opportunity to comment on these. The proposals had also been thoroughly examined by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee earlier in the week and its members had been supportive of the approach proposed.

Professor Neely welcomed both the Improvement Plan and the Independent Review of Governance and Ways of Working. He acknowledged the scale of the improvement agenda and asked about the balance to be struck between maintaining delivery and the need for reflection and re-structuring. He also asked what additional support might be needed from the Board. The Interim Chief Executive recognised the need to balance these priorities, but judged that action to address the capacity challenge at senior officer level must take priority. He was hopeful that this could be improved quickly. There was also a need to ensure involvement and buy-in to the improvement journey from all key parties including Board members, staff and partners. The Board must take ownership of this process, and he would need Board members to invest time in the discussions around shaping the CPCA's common purpose, relative priorities and ways of working.

Councillor Bailey welcomed the Improvement Plan and the Independent Review of Governance and Ways of Working, describing the latter as comprehensive and reflecting the detailed discussions which had informed the review. She had submitted a number of detailed questions in writing to the Interim Chief Executive the previous day and thanked him for his prompt response to these. In her judgement, the CPCA was suffering from a lack of strategy and policy direction and felt like an officer-driven organisation at present. She felt that the impact of the whistle-blowing complaint which had been made last year should be recognised and referenced in the table included in the report setting out the eight key dimensions which would underpin the Improvement Plan. Councillor Bailey welcomed the commitment to regular reporting to the Board on

activity and spend, but was not clear on how the proposals would speed up policy development and decision-making and would like to see more on that. She also cautioned of the need to be mindful of the potential implications for constituent councils and to recognise that constituent council officers were not CPCA staff. She judged it would be helpful to see an officer response to the Governance Review and how this would be embedded in the improvement journey. The Interim Head of Governance stated that preliminary discussions had already taken place with the newly appointed Lead Member for Governance and there were a number of process-related improvements identified in the Governance Review which could be delivered within a matter of weeks. There was a recognised need to provide better support to the Board outside of formal public meetings and to establish a clear link between the Board and the CPCA's strategic priorities.

Speaking in her capacity as Lead Member for Governance, Councillor Murphy welcomed the range and thoughtfulness of the report, and the concrete examples given of how the Board could seek to improve consensus by focusing on key agreed priorities and establishing a separate policy space to test out ideas. In her judgement, the use of appropriate delegations would also be key as too much decision-making was currently focused at Board level. She expressed the hope that rapid steps could be taken to reduce the number of Board meetings required.

The Interim Chief Executive stated that much of the centralisation which focused decision-making at Board-level was based on the Constitution. To create the time needed for the Board to focus on developing a shared strategy and explore policy options would require some decision-making taking place away from the Board via delegation through proper governance arrangements. A workstream around a re-write of the Constitution would ensure that this would reflect the Board's preferred way of working. He acknowledged that different constituent councils had different capacities and that there was a need to be sensitive to this and to find the right ways of working together. This was something which could be explored further with constituent council chief executives.

Ms Thomas welcomed the report, but emphasised that there would be a lot of hard work to be done and that this would be costly. In her view, there was a need to simplify relations between the Combined Authority Board, the NHS and the local Health and Wellbeing Boards and Integrated Care System and to recognise the four clear themes and strategic priorities which they had identified. She endorsed the proposed delegation to the Interim Chief Executive.

Councillor Conboy welcomed the report. There would be a challenge around Board members' capacity, and she judged there was a need to be clear about what would be needed from them in terms of a time commitment.

Councillor Herbert commented that the Board needed to provide leadership. He supported the proposed delegation to the Interim Chief Executive to strengthen the senior officer team and shared his view that the Combined Authority's committees had previously been under-used. He believed that a significant difference could be made by strengthening senior leadership and assisted by the recommendations contained in the report and the Governance review. There was a need to demonstrate to Government that the CPCA had the capacity and commitment to solve most of its challenges itself,



and the willingness to work with Government to address the rest. Councillor Herbert commented that he would welcome a specific discussion around the Governance review.

Councillor Nethsingha emphasised the exceptional nature of the delegation which the Board was being asked to make to the Interim Chief Executive, the significant public funds involved and the substantial degree of trust in him which this required. She was content to support this recommendation on the basis of his excellent first weeks in post and the pace at which work needed to be done. However, the Board would expect to be kept closely informed of progress. Councillor Nethsingha endorsed the proposal to create a new policy space for Board members. In the short-term, she would want this to feed into the budget-planning process, whilst in the longer term she would like to see it used for co-production between constituent councils and partners.

Councillor Williams described the report as excellent. South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) would want to continue to be closely involved in and supporting the work of the Combined Authority. He judged that there were significant resources available within partner Authorities which the Combined Authority could draw on, such as the award-winning Climate Change team at SCDC.

Councillor Boden described the report as being difficult to read, and highlighting difficult issues. In his judgement there were multiple interlinked problems at the Combined Authority and not all of these could be solved immediately. The Interim Chief Executive had described the challenge around senior staffing capacity that was being faced now, but this challenge had existed for some time although not all members of the Board had been aware of the issues being faced. He felt there had been a defensiveness within the organisation and that there was a need for more openness and transparency. Councillor Boden reiterated the exceptional nature of the delegation proposed to the Interim Chief Executive, but felt that there was no alternative in the circumstances. It would though be important for the Board to have oversight of the work being undertaken, and he suggested a weekly update on progress filling vacancies. He further noted the reference in the letter of 1 June 2022 from the CPCA's external auditor which had stated that the safeguarding of staff was of paramount importance and invited the Interim Chief Executive to comment on this point. He did not recognise the external auditor's further comment that trust and respect between some senior officers and elected representatives had broken down, and asked that the Interim Chief Executive should bring this to the individual attention of Board members if that was the case.

The Interim Chief Executive stated that a baseline report on vacant positions had been shared with Board members in June. Some progress had been made since then, and going forward he had asked that recruitment activity updates to both himself and the Board should include timelines for all posts. The Board would receive an update the following week summarising the position. The safeguarding of staff was first and foremost a senior management responsibility. Clarification was required around how concerns were raised and poor conduct needed to be consistently identified. Subject to its adoption by the Board, the Member Officer protocol needed to be translated into behaviours and practice and an exercise would take place to allow the sharing of individual perspectives. It was noted that a challenge could be perceived as an attack, regardless of how it was meant.

Councillor Fitzgerald described the Governance report as excellent and voiced his support for the direction of travel towards improvement. He commented that he did not enjoy the adversarial nature of Board meetings and emphasised the importance of consensus, relationships and leadership.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner stated that he was aware of some underlying problems and expressed the hope that the Interim Chief Executive would resolve these.

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

- a) Note the recommendations of the Audit & Governance Committee set out in paragraph 2.7 to 2.12 of this report and provide a response as requested.
- b) Delegate authority to the Interim Chief Executive for the recruitment and appointment of additional resources, including interim Chief Officers and interim Statutory Officers (as defined within the constitution) as set out in paragraph 3.5 to 3.15 of this report.
- c) Delegate authority to the Interim Chief Executive to finalise the senior management structure of the Authority as set out in paragraph 3.16 to 3.18 of this report.
- d) Acknowledge the scope and scale of the intended self-assessment exercise set out in this report and recognition of the scale of the current issues facing the Combined Authority.
- e) Support the self-assessment exercise set out in this report and provide comment on its content, noting the intention to conclude this work and report back to Board at its scheduled meeting on 21 September 2022.
- f) Allocate the use of up to £750,000 from the CPCA Response Fund to enable that money to be utilised on scoping, developing and delivering work relating to CPCA Improvement Activity, and delegate authority to spend to the Interim Chief Executive.
- g) Note the review of governance and ways of working attached at Appendix A.
- h) Request that the Board, and the Chairs of Audit & Governance Committee and the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, receive regular updates on all improvement action

The Mayor thanked Board members for their unanimous endorsement of the Improvement Framework and Independent Review of Governance and Ways of Working. The Board was putting considerable trust in the Interim Chief Executive, and he believed this to be the right thing to do.

The meeting adjourned from 11.58am to 12.05pm.

## 229. Change to the order of business

The Mayor exercised his discretion as Chair to vary the order of business from the published agenda to consider recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee before Councillor Fitzgerald needed to leave.

### Part 5 - Transport and Infrastructure Committee recommendations to the Combined Authority

## 230. Active Travel (Cambridgeshire)

Professor Neely declared an interest in this item in that he was a member of the Greater Cambridge Partnership Board. He took part in the debate of the report, but did not vote. Minute 214 above also refers.

The Board's approval was sought for the drawdown of funding to support active travel measures in Cambridgeshire. Tranche 2 projects related to long-term measures to support walking and cycling. Following a cost review, it was identified that further funding was needed to complete the programme. There were currently 32 projects within the Active Travel programme. The recommendations before the Board were endorsed unanimously by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee at its meeting on 13 July 2022.

Councillor Boden commented that part of the discussion at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee had been around the challenges faced in relation to capital projects. Against that background, he asked about the resilience of the cost estimates in the report and whether there were any concerns that the problems experienced in relation to Tranche 1 might recur. Officers stated that Cambridgeshire County Council had provided their latest costs estimates for the projects and these were included in the report.

Councillor Bailey commented that the schemes were described as relating to Cambridgeshire, but that in her view they appeared to be focused on Cambridge. She asked whether those schemes being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) were also being funded by the GCP, rather than the CPCA, as she would find it difficult to support the recommendation without that information being available. She expressed frustration that the geography of East Cambridgeshire made it difficult to obtain active travel funding for the area and expressed the hope that the Mayor would lobby Government on this issue. Councillor Boden also expressed concern that the CPCA was being recommended to invest c£250k into active travel schemes within the GCP's area when the GCP had substantially greater resources already at its disposal. The Interim Head of Transport stated that officers would be reviewing the list of active travel schemes and processes with constituent council colleagues and partners to learn where improvements might be made. The Transforming Cities Fund which would be brought to the Board in August would include active travel and sustainable travel projects across the CPCA's geography, including in East Cambridgeshire and Fenland. Consideration was also being given to having an active travel advocate to look at the full range of CPCA projects, and conversations were taking place with Sustrans.

The Mayor noted that both the A10 and A14 BP Roundabout schemes were within East Cambridgeshire and emphasised the commitment of the Combined Authority and his own personal commitment to that area.

Councillor Nethsingha acknowledged the frustration around attracting support for active travel schemes in rural areas and shared the view that it would be helpful to lobby on this. However, she also wanted to move away from looking in isolation at particular schemes or geographic areas. The projects proposed were all Tranche 2 projects which would be delivered either by the County Council or by the GCP. There were constraints around the way Tranche 2 funds could be used, and the projects which would be delivered by the GCP would impact across a wider area than Cambridge City. On that basis she was content to support the proposals, although she would also want to see projects covering a wider geographical area in the future.

Professor Neely declared an interest in this item in that he was a member of the GCP Board representing the University of Cambridge. For that reason, he would refrain from commenting on the specific projects which it was proposed would be delivered by the GCP. He agreed that the CPCA should be looking at active travel schemes across the region, but noted too the challenges of high traffic levels in cities and urban areas and expressed reluctance to hold up a set of schemes that was already in progress to tackle this issue.

Ms Thomas reminded the Board of the four shared priorities of the CPCA, Integrated Care System (ICS) and local Health and Wellbeing Boards (HWBs) which included creating an environment to enable people to be as healthy as they could. She felt there should be a focus on how to get people more active and consideration of whether the schemes being proposed were those which actually maximised active travel or were those which could be most readily delivered. She suggested that the four shared priorities of the CPCA, the ICS and the local HWBs should be referenced in CPCA reports, and further suggested a focused piece of work around rural issues.

[Ms Thomas left the meeting at 12.24pm]

Councillor Williams commented that his own division was within a rural area and that this was true of many parts of South Cambridgeshire. These areas were also currently unable to attract active travel funding. His belief was that a modal shift would happen first in urban areas where population density was highest, so there was a need to deliver active travel options in those urban areas initially to maximise the impact of the funds available. Once this was established in urban areas like Cambridge City it could be progressed to more rural areas, but not everything could be done at once.

Councillor Conboy spoke of the Board's shared passion to do more in relation to active travel, including bringing forward schemes in more rural areas in the future. She did though also see merit in seeking to join up what was already there.

Councillor Fitzgerald shared the view that the underlying problem was that more money was needed to improve active travel schemes across the county. He questioned why the CPCA had not received more funding for this, and stated his belief that there was a need to be more ambitious in the schemes which were put forward.

Councillor Herbert commented that there was a need to take a CPCA-wide view of issues. The GCP had funded almost all of the projects within its area. The projects which had been put forward were deliverable, and he encouraged Board members with rural geographies to discuss with the Transport team how best to bring forward projects for those areas.

Councillor Bailey commented that she had no objection in principle to active travel projects in urban areas, but the GCP was explicitly funded to deliver this type of project and had substantial resources available to it to do so. She therefore proposed that the Board should agree the schemes contained in the report which would be delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council, but defer a decision on the schemes to be delivered by the GCP and seek more information on why these could not be funded by the GCP.

The Interim Head of Transport confirmed that the projects described in the report were all CPCA schemes which formed part of the overall package of Tranche 2 programmes across Cambridgeshire, but that some would be delivered by the County Council and some by the GCP. Informal feedback from Government on previous CPCA applications suggested the need for project proposals to be more innovative and ambitious. There was a need to build a pipeline of these types of schemes which might be funded a variety of ways. Officers confirmed that the deliverability of the schemes which would be delivered by the GCP would not be impacted if a decision on these was deferred to August.

Councillor Neely stated his intention to abstain from the vote, but noted the underspend on capital projects discussed earlier in relation to the budget monitor report (minute 219 above refers) and the feedback from Government that the CPCA was missing out on active travel funding because it was not delivering its current programme. Against that background the Board had now spent considerable time discussing the merits and possible deferral of a relatively small amount of funding for a recommended and deliverable project within its area.

On being proposed by Councillor Bailey, seconded by Councillor Boden, it was resolved unanimously by those present and voting to amend recommendation a) to:

- a) Approve the drawdown of the **relevant share of the £753,000** of Active Travel Funding from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to complete a programme of active travel improvements in Cambridgeshire, **as delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council**.

(additional text shown in **bold**)

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

- a) Approve the drawdown of the relevant share of the £753,000 of Active Travel Funding from the Medium-Term Financial Plan to complete a programme of active travel improvements in Cambridgeshire, as delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council.
- b) Delegate authority to the Interim Head of Transport in consultation with the Chief

Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to conclude a Grant Funding Agreement with Cambridgeshire County Council to enable work to progress.

The vote in favour 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.

## 231. Transport Model Replacement

The current transport model had been produced around 2013 and reflected the pre-Covid position. The use of different approaches raised issues around both consistency and costs, so it was proposed to develop a single transport model. The discussion at the Transport and Infrastructure Committee had welcomed the proposed shift in approach from the CPCA working unilaterally to an integrated partnership approach with constituent councils. The main risk was around gaining a good quality dataset to inform the new model. Officers would manage that risk by setting a number of trigger criteria. The recommendations before the Board were endorsed unanimously by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee at its meeting on 13 July 2022.

Councillor Boden supported the proposal, but highlighted the issue of the baseline and the need for data which was valuable and helpful to the CPCA. He emphasised the importance of getting the data right, and requested that Officers should not be constrained by the end of the 2023 financial year target if it would take a little longer to achieve that. Officers acknowledged the likelihood of a potential overrun on this timeframe to allow time to look at all transport movements in spring.

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

- a) Agree the change in delivery for a new transport model with Cambridgeshire County Council being commissioned to lead the delivery of the model on behalf of all partners;
- b) Agree the changes to the spending objectives for the initial transport model budget. Previously approved budget will now be committed to modelling activities of:
  - i. Collection of data to populate current and future transport models; and
  - ii. Preparation of a full business case for the design and build of a new transport model.
  - iii. Retention of residual to be put towards model development (together with additional funding identified within the 2022/23 MTFP).
- c) Note the future arrangements for the review of the model, full business case, and sign-off of medium term financial plan (MTFP) funds (subject to approval) at a future date.

The vote in favour 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.

## 232. Peterborough Electric Bus Depot

The existing Peterborough bus depot was surrounded on three sides by residential properties and offered insufficient space to accommodate the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate electric buses. It was recommended that alternative locations should be investigated in order to best meet current and future need and to offer equity of opportunity to a number of bus operators. The recommendations were considered by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 13 July 2022 and had been endorsed unanimously.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner welcomed the ambition of the proposals, but questioned how long they might take to deliver. There was a significant crime issue in the area and any measures to help address this would be welcome.

Councillor Fitzgerald expressed the wish to move at pace on this, noting that it was not just the size and location of the current depot which was an issue but its unsuitability for the infrastructure needed to support electric vehicles. Peterborough City Council welcomed the joint work with CPCA officers which had taken place in relation to this scheme.

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

- a) Note the current position in relation to the Peterborough Bus Depot Relocation.
- b) Support the proposal to investigate alternative options for the provision of a bus depot in Peterborough.
- c) Agree a £40,000 drawdown from the £150,000 in the STA revenue budget, to progress this project in a timely manner.

The vote in favour 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.

## 233. A141 St Ives Outline Business Case

A number of studies had highlighted capacity challenges in the area. It was proposed that £6m should be released across 2022/23 and 2023/24 for the delivery of an outline business case on how these might best be addressed. The CPCA would work in

partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies across the project. The recommendations had been discussed by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 13 July 2022 and had been endorsed unanimously.

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

- a) Approve the release of £6m funding for the delivery of the Outline Business Case.
- b) Delegate authority to the Interim Head of Transport and Chief Finance Officer to enter into Grant Funding Agreements with Cambridgeshire County Council.

The vote in favour 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.

## 234. East Anglian Alternative Fuels Strategy (EAAFS)

The East Anglian Alternative Fuels Strategy (EAAFS) would form part of the work undertaken by the CPCA to mitigate against climate change. Subject to the Board's agreement, the next step in the process would be open the strategy to public consultation. This proposal had been endorsed unanimously by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 13 July 2022.

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

Approve a six-week public consultation on the EAAFS.

[The meeting adjourned from 1.12 to 1.34pm]

[Councillor Fitzgerald left the meeting at 1.12pm]

## 235. Climate and Strategy Business Cases July 2022

This key decision report was added to the Forward Plan on 19 July 2022 under general exception arrangements.

The project proposals before the Board had been subject to an evaluation which had involved them being scored against the six capitals approach, evaluated for affordability and approved by the CPCA's internal policy and resources committee and they were compliant with the Treasury's Green Book approach to project selection.

Councillor Boden spoke of the longstanding concerns around soil condition in the Fens and the age of the data that was available. It was appropriate that the local farming community was engaged in this discussion, but his impression was that some members



of that community did not feel that their views were being represented and this was something which he planned to explore further. Questions around independence had been raised in relation to partnerships with large business interests in the area, and whilst he would not object to the report proposals this was something which he would want to look at in more detail. The Strategic Planning Manager stated that the engagement process was designed to capture the voices of the farming community, business and academics and offered to assist with following up these points outside of the meeting.

Councillor Conboy endorsed the Huntingdon Biodiversity For All project and voiced her wish to see the learning from this shared across the CPCA area.

Councillor Bailey asked that Officers review the wording in 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 for future reports as she felt this was not entirely accurate in relation to the bids made by East Cambridgeshire District Council and Fenland District Council. Reference was also requested to the change in process halfway through which meant that some bids were not progressed.

The Mayor stated that he had been involved in a recent walkover of Fens farmland and had been profoundly impressed by the passion and ambition of the members of the farming community he had met there and their level of engagement.

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

- a) Approve the Business Case for the Huntingdon Biodiversity For All project and approve £1.2m CPCA capital investment and £150,000 revenue from subject to approval line in the MTFP.
- b) Approve the Business Case for the Fenland Soil project and approve drawdown of £100,000 from the subject to approval line in the MTFP for Climate Commission.
- c) Note the progress of the Waterbeach Renewable Energy Network project

[Professor Neely left the meeting at 1.44pm]

## 236. Shared Prosperity Fund Investment Plan

The final draft of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF) Local Investment Plan had been developed collectively and at pace with local authority partners including the Cambridgeshire Public Service Board (CPSB) during the previous two months. It was focused on social and economic investment with an indicative allocation of c£9.8m to the CPCA. A six capitals analysis had been applied to deliver outcomes to areas of highest need across the Combined Authority's geography. The Skills Committee and the Business Board had also been consulted.

Councillor Boden expressed his thanks to the Mayor for his personal intervention in relation to the Fenland element of the proposals which had allowed the Board to move

forward collectively. He requested a note outside of the meeting on the needs assessment in relation to Multiply and the geographical split.

Councillor Bailey commented that the SPF settlement was not great and that there was a need to maximise its use. Officers stated that an independent appraisal would be carried out across the projects which would focus on value for money and meeting the SPF criteria. Discussions would also take place with partners around how it would be delivered. A collaborative approach would be taken, and Officers would speak to local authority partners if problems were identified with any of the projects.

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

- a) Approve the final draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Investment Plan.
- b) Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to make minor final refinements to the Local Investment Plan and to submit that final version to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities before the 1 August 2022 deadline.
- c) Delegate authority to Chief Executive Officer in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to make amendments to the Local Investment plan based on any feedback from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and after consultation with the Cambridgeshire Public Service Board.

## 237. North Cambridgeshire Training Centre Infrastructure Funding

The Board's approval was sought for a business case for additional infrastructure works relating to the North Cambridgeshire Training Centre (NCTC) and the award of a grant of £347k from the Transforming Cities Fund. This would enable access from the A141 junction in Chatteris to the new NCTC. A comprehensive transport assessment of this proposed mitigation had been undertaken with Metalcraft Ltd, the project lead, and Cambridgeshire County Council as the local Highways Authority. The original project plan had envisaged minimal works being required as there was an existing junction, but it had subsequently become clear that modifications were needed in relation to safety. Based on a review of the project with partners, transport modelling data and additional contingency funding of 10% which had been made available by Metalcraft Ltd the Business and Skills team was satisfied that the business case for the scheme remained strong.

Councillor Conboy welcomed confirmation that learning from other projects was being applied in this case.

Councillor Williams asked whether the NCTC would be served by public transport. Officers confirmed that this would be the case, and that the education provider was drawing up a transport plan for the site.

Councillor Boden expressed his thanks to the Mayor and to the CPCA for their

continued support for this project. The delays around the project and the late identification of the need for this additional mitigation was a matter of regret, but he was pleased to see the project progressing. He judged that a nimble response would be needed if different or additional training needs were identified in the future and sought confirmation that the Mayor would support these if needed. The Mayor stated his expectation that the Board would want to support the skills agenda.

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

- a) Approve the Business Case for North Cambridgeshire Training Centre additional Infrastructure works and approve £347,000 Grant from the Transforming Cities Fund.
- b) Note formal commitment by project Lead to increase outputs by at least 10% across all learners using the centre per year until 2030 secured by a revised grant funding agreement.
- c) Seek a financial contribution from Metalcraft towards the infrastructure costs.

## 238. Cambridgeshire Peterborough Growth Company Limited (Growth Co) Allotment of New Shares to the Combined Authority

The Combined Authority Board had, on the recommendation of the Business Board, authorised the investment of £400k of recycled local growth funds into Growth Co. Approval was now sought for Growth Co to issue £400k of shares to the CPCA. Officers confirmed that the investment in Growth Co represented base capital and that this was part of the full business case.

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

Give approval to the Cambridgeshire Peterborough Business Growth Company Limited (Growth Co) to issue 400,000 additional £1.00 shares to the Combined Authority in return for investment of the £400,000 of Recycled Local Growth Fund.

## Part 6 - Business Board recommendations to the Combined Authority

239. Members were reminded that when the Combined Authority Board took decisions as the Accountable Body for the Business Board it was committed to acting in line with the CPCA's assurance framework in the interests of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area as a whole, and to taking decisions based on the recommendations of the Business Board.

## 240. Growth Works Management Review July 2022

The report set out Growth Works programme performance for Q6, which covered the period from 1 April to 30 June 2022. The overall progress was solid with job outcomes and apprenticeships ahead of profile, although there was a close focus on coaching as this was part of the revenue underspend on growth. Grant offer letters were on track, but the receipt of claims from businesses that had completed their training was below profile. A six-month cycle had been anticipated for this process, but currently it was taking around eight to nine months. There were 18 months of the programme remaining, and the Senior Responsible Officer for the Business Growth Service remained confident that all grants would be fulfilled.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to Nigel Parkinson, the Chair of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Growth Co., for making himself available to the Board to answer questions if needed.

The Board resolved to:

Note the Growth Works programme performance up to 31 May 2022 (Q6 is April 2022 to 30th June 2022).

## Part 7 - Governance Reports

### 241. Member Officer Protocol

The Board had agreed at its Extraordinary meeting of 20 May 2022 (resumed on 8 June 2022) to follow the principles set out in the draft Member Officer protocol pending its formal adoption following review by the Audit and Governance Committee.

The Audit and Governance Committee (A&G) had reviewed the draft protocol on 30 June 2022. The Committee recommended that an additional element should be added in relation to Members' use of email addresses, that a social media protocol should be developed, and that the Member Officer protocol should be reviewed within six months of its adoption.

Board members expressed their thanks to A&G and to the Interim Head of Governance for their work in relation to the Member Officer protocol.

Councillor Boden commented that Members had a democratic right to voice legitimate concerns in relation to CPCA business, and that he would be concerned if the provisions around maintaining the reputation of the CPCA should be seen to infringe on that right. He welcomed the decision not to require Members to adopt a CPCA email address, commenting that it was his understanding that all elected Members had official email addresses with their home Authorities. Councillor Boden described difficulties he experienced opening some CPCA documents sent to his official Fenland District Council email address and officers undertook to raise this issue with the IT team.

Councillor Herbert voiced his support for the principles set out in the Member Officer protocol. He too had on occasion experienced CPCA documents being rejected by his official Cambridge City email address and would welcome this being explored and a

simple solution identified. Councillor Herbert emphasised the importance of respecting confidentiality, commenting that he had felt undermined as a Chair when the content of confidential meeting documents had been leaked. He spoke of the importance of mutual respect and of improving relationships between Members as well as between Members and Officers. The recent months had been a difficult time for the CPCA's staff, and he thanked Officers for their work.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that many of her County Council emails were forwarded to her personal email account. The County Council's information governance team were comfortable with this arrangement so she hoped the same would be true for the CPCA, but she would like this confirmed. Councillor Bailey commented that District Council emails were forwarded to her personal email account. This was not popular with her own Authority, but she had found signing into multiple email accounts unworkable. The Interim Head of Governance undertook to clarify baseline CPCA security requirements around the use of email, and to confirm whether email protocols approved by constituent councils were considered to meet CPCA email security requirements.

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

- a) Agree the Member Officer Protocol attached at Appendix A for adoption into the Constitution.
- b) Note the intention to review the Protocol within 6 months.
- c) Note the intention to develop a Social Media Protocol to support the Member Officer Protocol.

## 242. OneCAM Ltd Audit Report

The Independent Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee had been invited to join the meeting for this item, but was away. At the Board's previous meeting, Mr Pye had mentioned the lack of clarity around a process for referring matters to the Audit and Governance Committee for consideration. Officers had subsequently confirmed that this would be considered as part of the review of the Constitution that would be taking place as part of the response to the Improvement Framework.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to the Independent Chair of the Audit and Governance (A&G) Committee and to committee members for their thoroughness and diligence in reviewing the issues raised.

The report was introduced by Anna O'Keefe, Senior Manager at RSM UK Risk Assurances Services. RSM UK was commissioned by A&G to carry out an independent audit of governance and decision-making following the cessation of the OneCAM project in response to a request from two members of the Combined Authority Board.

Ms O'Keefe stated that RSM UK had carried out an advisory review with a specific scope. No evidence was found that the decision to terminate the OneCAM project was not carried out in line with the Combined Authority's Constitution or the Shareholder Agreement of OneCAM Ltd. A timeliness issue was identified in relation to the decision taken in May 2021 to terminate task orders where Members were not briefed until 2 June 2021. The officer decision notice (ODN) was then not reported at the Board's next meeting on 30 June 2021, but at the following meeting on 28 July 2021. A few actions had been identified which would be incorporated into the planned review of the Constitution.

Councillor Bailey commented that she was one of the two Board members who had asked A&G to look into this matter. She expressed herself to be astonished that no finding of a conflict of interest had been made in relation to decisions made by an Officer who was both a joint chief executive of the CPCA and a co-director of OneCAM Ltd. In this particular case the desired outcomes of both the CPCA and OneCAM Ltd were the same, but she felt it was wrong that an Officer had been placed in this position. Councillor Bailey stated her wish to be clear that she placed no blame on the individual concerned, but was critical of the position in which they had been placed. She judged this to be a clear case of a conflict of interest, and she was very concerned that neither A&G or the independent auditor had identified it as such. She commented that the decision to cease task orders had been widely reported before the ODN was completed, and she asked that these issues should be taken back to A&G. Whilst the Officer concerned may have consulted others, they took the decision themselves. In her judgement, this decision should have been tasked to a deputy and she would like A&G to consider this point also. Ms O'Keefe stated that the independent review had been carried out to the scope agreed. They were satisfied in terms of the decision that was made that there was no conflict of interest, but the review had not looked at the possibility of wider conflicts of interest due to the way that OneCAM Ltd had been set up, or any other subsidiary companies.

Councillor Nethsingha expressed the hope that an Officer would never be placed in such a position in the future.

The Mayor stated that whilst the signing of the ODN had been done by a single Officer, there had been more than one person involved in the decision to move towards the position reflected in the ODN. His observation at the time was that the people who had come together from different parts of the OneCAM organisation had taken the decision themselves, and that this had been done for what they thought were the best reasons, for the public purse and their own organisation.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer stated that the process for referring matters to the Audit and Governance Committee would be clarified as part of the planned review of the Constitution. The concerns expressed in the meeting, including around potential Officer conflicts of interest, would be raised with the Audit and Governance Committee.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the One CAM Audit Report.
- b) Note the key findings and actions in the report.

## 243. Performance Report

An exempt appendix to the report which was not listed on the face of the published report was circulated electronically to Board members on 21 July 2022 with the agreement of the Deputy Monitoring Officer. This appendix was exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, in that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information. The public interest in maintaining the exemption was deemed to outweigh the public interest in publication. The Mayor asked whether any Board member wished to discuss the exempt appendix. No Member expressed the wish to do so.

New performance indicators had been developed as part of the Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement, and these new indicators would be brought to the Board in September. The previous RAG ratings had been refined following the identification of some clear optimism bias and these were subject to internal review on a monthly basis. The risk audit report would be considered by the Audit and Governance Committee at its meeting later in the week, and work was underway to look at risk in more detail.

It was resolved to:

Note the latest performance report.

## 244. Calendar of Meetings 2022-23

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

Approve the Calendar of Meetings for 2022/23 (Appendix 1).

## 245. Annotated Forward Plan July 2022

Councillor Bailey asked when proposals around the future shape of the Housing team would be brought to the Board as she was unsure of the team's current role and considered the matter to be urgent. Councillor Herbert, Lead Member for Housing and Chair of the Housing and Communities Committee (H&CC) stated that this had been discussed at the H&CC's July meeting. It was hoped that a further update on progress and future arrangements would be brought to the Committee's next meeting. However, it was right that this work was taken forward in the context of the wider review of the CPCA committee structure which would be taking place as part of the response to the Independent Review of Governance and Ways of Working which would be considered by the Board in the autumn. The modelling of the housing budget would also need to be reviewed during the next few months.

The Interim Chief Executive stated that this was amongst the issues around internal structures currently being considered. He had spoken to the Director of Housing and Development, but had nothing to add at this stage around the detail.

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

Approve the Forward Plan for July 2022.

(Mayor)



# Appendix 1

|    | Question from:                                      | Question to:  | Question:  |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1. | Roxanne De Beaux<br>Executive Director,<br>Camcycle | Mayor Dr Nik<br>Johnson                             | <p>We are pleased to see that the Combined Authority is looking to progress more Active Travel tranche 2 schemes across our region with the additional funding needed and we urge the board to support the drawdown of these funds.</p> <p>However, the progress of tranche two further highlights the failed bid for £6 million for Tranche 3 of Active Travel funding from the Department for Transport and what could have been achieved with that extra funding.</p> <p>Can the Combined Authority share more information about why the bid was unsuccessful and advise how the Combined Authority, along with the support of Camcycle and our partner organisations including Peterborough Cycle Forum, Ely Cycling Campaign, Milton Cycling Campaign and Hunts Walking and Cycling Group will ensure that the bid for Tranche 4 Active Travel Funds is successful.</p> <p><i>Supplementary question/ comment:</i></p> <p>Making progress on this the sooner the better would be great.</p> |
|    | Response from:                                      | Response to:  | Response:  |
| 1. | Mayor Dr Nik Johnson                                | Roxanne De Beaux<br>Executive Director,<br>Camcycle | <p>Thank you for your offer of help.</p> <p>The Combined Authority is committed to improving the active travel offer across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. We are currently awaiting detailed feedback on why we did not secure the funding through Tranche 3. When this information becomes available the Combined Authority will be working with partner organisations to</p>  |

|  | Question from: | Question to: | Question:  |
|--|----------------|--------------|--|
|  |                |              | <p>ensure that the lessons are learned ahead of the next round of funding bids.</p> <p>The Combined Authority is looking to engage with active travel interest groups, such as Camcycle, to improve our work in this area. This includes the implementation of a clear governance process to ensure that active travel needs are thought about proactively. We will be looking to employ an active travel advocate and explore the potential to establish an independent active travel scrutiny group that will examine future funding opportunities and ensure these have a strong alignment to the strategic direction outlined in our Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p> <p><i>Response to supplementary question/ comment:</i></p> <p>I agree.</p> |