



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE
& PETERBOROUGH**
COMBINED AUTHORITY

Agenda Item No: 1.2

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: Minutes

Date: Wednesday

Time: 10.30am – 2.41pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Fenland District Council, March PE15 8NQ

Present: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson

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

Co-opted Members: D Preston – Police and Crime Commissioner, J Thomas - Clinical Commissioning Group

Apologies: Councillor Edna Murphy – Fire Authority

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

76. Announcements, apologies and declarations of interest

The Mayor announced that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority was now an accredited Living Wage Employer. This meant that every member of staff would earn a real Living Wage. This commitment applied not only to the Combined Authority's directly employed staff but also to third party contracted staff. The Mayor also offered his congratulations to Austen Adams on his re-appointment to the Business Board for a second term alongside Professor Andy Neely, Tina Barsby and the previous chair Aamir Khalid. This demonstrated that the Business Board was not only continuing to attract members of the highest calibre, but was also retaining them.

Apologies for absence were received as recorded above.

Declarations of interest were made by Councillors A Bailey and L Herbert in relation to Items 3.1 and 5.1, in that Councillor Bailey was a trustee of East Cambridgeshire Community Land Trust and Councillor Herbert's partner was a Director of Cross Keys Homes Limited. Minutes 88 and 97 below refer.

77. Minutes – 25th August 2021

The minutes of the meeting on 25 August 2021 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor. The minutes action log was noted.

An error to the approved minutes of the meeting on 30 June 2021 was noted, whereby a comment on climate change made by Councillor Boden was incorrectly attributed to Councillor Bailey. A note would be placed on the minutes of the June meeting to make this clear.

78. Petitions

No petitions were received.

79. Public questions

One public question had been received after the deadline set out in the Constitution. This would be heard at the October meeting.

80. Annotated Forward Plan – 19 September 2021

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

Approve the Forward Plan.

81. Combined Authority Board and Committee Appointments September 2021

The Board received a report detailing changes to the substitute membership of the Combined Authority Board and the Housing and Communities Committee and the membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Boden asked for clarification of why the appointment of members and substitutes to the Combined Authority Board and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were for noting only and the appointment of a substitute to the Housing and Communities Committee was for ratification. The Monitoring Officer stated that appointments to Executive Committees were a matter for the Combined Authority Board and so the appointment made under his delegated authority required the Board's ratification. Appointments to the Combined Authority Board and Overview and Scrutiny Committee were notified by constituent councils and so were for noting only.

On being proposed by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Herbert, 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 2021/2022.
- b) Note the appointment by Cambridge City Council of Councillor Simon Smith as its substitute member on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- c) Note the appointment by Cambridgeshire County Council of Councillor Michael Atkins as one of its members on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.
- d) Ratify the appointment by Cambridgeshire County Council of Councillor Lucy Nethsingha as its substitute member on the Housing and Communities Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2021/2022.

82. Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel to review Members' Allowance Scheme

The Board considered proposals to establish an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to review the Mayor's allowance. Constituent councils had been consulted and it had been proposed to appoint the chairs of their respective IRPs. However, it had since come to officers' attention that some IRP chairs were shared across constituent councils. To address this the officer recommendation was being revised to recommend that the Board:

Agree that an Independent Remuneration Panel made up of the Chairs of the Independent Remuneration Panels of the Constituent Councils, *or their nominated alternative member*, be constituted to review the Members' Allowance Scheme for the Combined Authority in relation to the Mayor's allowance.

Additional text in *italics*

Speaking to the amended officer recommendation, Councillor Boden commented that he felt the proposed process was excessive both in relation to the proposed size of the IRP and the engagement of an outside organisation to administer it. His preference was to keep the arrangements simple. Councillor Fuller concurred, commenting that members of IRPs were inherently independent and so would not in any case be representative of their respective constituent council. His preference was to appoint the chair of the IRP and let them let them appoint their own panellists.

Councillor Bailey commented that there were already IRPs convened within the Combined Authority area so she would prefer to use one of those to draw on the expertise already available.

Councillor Smith commented that she judged the proposed process to be fair, open and transparent.

The Mayor stated that his wish was for the Combined Authority to make decisions collectively and the process proposed would be representative of the whole of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Councillor Fitzgerald commented that he could not compel the chair of Peterborough City Council's IRP to take part and so he could not support the proposal. He would though be content for a constituent council's convened panel to carry out the review.

Councillor Boden sought advice on whether it was appropriate for the Mayor to vote on this issue. The Monitoring Officer stated that he was unaware of previous practice, but that there was no disclosable pecuniary interest involved and so no reason for the Mayor not to participate in the vote.

Mr Adams commented that this proposal should have been discussed at a Leader's strategy meeting and expressed his frustration at the inefficient use of the Board's time.

With the consent of the meeting, Councillor Fuller proposed a revision to the amendment, seconded by Councillor Boden, that the Board:

Agree to the appointment of a Chair of ~~that~~ an Independent Remuneration Panel made up of the Chairs of the Independent Remuneration Panels of the Constituent Councils, or their nominated alternative member, be constituted to review the Members' Allowance Scheme for the Combined Authority in relation to the Mayor's allowance. The Chair to appoint a Panel which is representative of the Combined Authority area.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that she would have an issue with this proposal if it was proposed that the Mayor should appoint the chair of the IRP which would be reviewing his allowance. She suggested that an alternative might be to make use of the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council joint IRP. The Mayor endorsed this proposal, further suggesting that the Board invite an officer from a constituent council to manage the Independent Remuneration Panel.

On being proposed by Councillor Fuller, seconded by Councillor Nethsingha, it was resolved by a majority of those present and voting to:

- a) Agree that the Independent Remuneration Panel of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council be approached to review the Members' Allowance Scheme for the Combined Authority in relation to the Mayor's allowance.
- b) Invite an officer from a constituent council to manage the Independent Remuneration Panel.

83. Overview and Scrutiny Committee Arrangements - Review of Recommendations from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny

The Board received a report detailing the recommendations and action plan from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CfGS) following its review of the Combined Authority's scrutiny arrangements.

Councillor Bailey, seconded by Councillor Boden, proposed the following amendment:

That the Board:

Note the recommendations from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny and provide any comments or feedback to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Board notes the importance of Overview and Scrutiny Committee scrutinising Mayoral Decision Notices, as those Notices bypass the normal checks and balances of the Combined Authority.

Further, the Board also disagrees with some of the other recommendations from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny and instruct that the comments of the Board are sent to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

(Additional text in **bold**)

Speaking to the amendment, Councillor Bailey commented that it was for the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committee to determine how it conducted its business and what issues it should examine. She was therefore surprised by the extent to which this seemed to have been influenced by the Mayor's wishes. Councillor Bailey asked that the Board's comments on the proposals should be captured and fed back to O&S. She would want to highlight the importance of scrutinising Mayoral decision notices as these bypassed normal checks and balances and she would want to see O&S's role in this recognised. She questioned whether the practice of O&S submitting questions in advance of Board meetings and receiving pre-prepared answers was the best use of its time. She would like to see O&S going back to the fundamental commitments on which the Combined Authority was founded including doubling GVA and delivering affordable housing and jobs. Councillor Bailey considered the proposal of a Mayor's question time being held only once a year as unacceptable, judging that these should be held more frequently in order for the Mayor to be held properly to account. Councillor Boden concurred with these views, commenting that a strong role for O&S would support good governance within the organisation.

The Mayor stated that he had made clear that he was happy to appear at O&S both in his capacity as mayor and as the chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee and to have discussions with the chair and vice chair of O&S around how that was achieved. He also agreed that Mayoral decision notices should be considered by O&S.

The Mayor exercised his discretion as chair to invite the views of Councillor Dupré, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Dupré agreed that O&S had a role to play in relation to Mayoral decision notices and noted the concerns expressed previously by the Committee in relation to the use of general exception notices. She advised that the Committee did not want to give up its right to ask questions at Combined Authority Board meetings at this stage. It would consider any comments from the Board on the proposals, but it would be for O&S to decide how to manage its business.

Councillor Herbert commented that he was more interested in O&S's response to the CfGS recommendations than that of the Combined Authority Board and believed that the response should be guided by the Committee's views. He agreed that O&S should be supported to examine key policy issues.

Councillor Boden suggested that governance issues should be discussed at Leaders' strategy meetings and that governance items should be placed at the end of the Board's agenda. The Mayor stated that the governance review would cover these issues.

Councillor Bailey commented that it was her wish that the differing views amongst Board members should be captured and shared with O&S. As this had been achieved she withdrew the second paragraph of her amendment.

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

- a) Note the recommendations from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny and provide any comments or feedback to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- b) Note the importance of Overview and Scrutiny Committee scrutinising Mayoral Decision Notices, as those Notices bypass the normal checks and balances of the Combined Authority.

84. Corporate Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register

The review of the Corporate Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register was subject to regular review by the Audit and Governance (A&G) Committee. Following its most recent review, A&G had recommended that the Board consider whether the significance of the residual risk for Climate Change had been properly calibrated.

Mr Adams suggested that officers should consider this issue and make recommendations to either a Leaders' strategy meeting or to the Board for consideration.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that the Board was being asked to consider whether it shared A&G's concerns around the calibration of the residual risk associated with climate change. If it did the matter would be returned to A&G for further consideration.

The Mayor thanked A&G for bringing this matter to the Board's attention. He shared the concerns expressed around the risk associated with climate change being so low and would welcome A&G looking at that again. The findings could then be considered at a future Leaders' strategy meeting.

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

- a) Consider, in the light of a request by the Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee, whether the significance of the residual risk for Climate Change has been properly calibrated.
- b) Provide any comments arising to the Audit and Governance Committee.

85. Business Plan 2021-22 Mid-Year Refresh

The Board was invited to approve the 2021/22 Business Plan Mid-Year Refresh, in line with the process agreed by the Board on 27 January 2021.

Councillor Bailey commented that the Combined Authority was now four months into a new mayoral term and that she could see nothing new in the organisation's priorities. She was troubled by the lack of any new asks for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough from the comprehensive spending review and sought confirmation of whether the Mayor was personally committed to every one of the 18 key projects identified in the report, including A10 junctions and dualling and Soham Station Phase 2.

Councillor Nethsingha welcomed the concise summary of the 18 key projects, but felt that in future more detail was needed around individual business cases and budgets in addition to this summary.

Councillor Herbert suggested that there might be value in inviting each constituent council to identify the top three priorities for its own area as the basis for further dialogue.

Councillor Smith agreed that a conversation around each constituent council's priorities was needed. She also judged that a wider discussion was needed around roads projects and active travel and carbon zero transport options.

Councillor Boden welcomed the debate. Whilst the Mayor might not yet be in a position to identify his priorities this would be needed to enable the Board to understand the context in which it was working. There would not always be consensus between Board members and so the Mayor's leadership and direction were important.

Ms Thomas commented that the Board as a whole faced a real challenge in identifying how best to improve the health and wellbeing of the population in the widest sense of levelling up. She suggested it might be helpful to look at the facts relating to the local population at a Leaders' strategy meeting and work from those.

Councillor Fuller commented that district councils were required to deliver housing and jobs and that the Combined Authority was also a delivery authority.

The Mayor stated that he would be meeting with all of the constituent council leaders and their chief executives in October to discuss these issues together. They had every right to talk about the priorities for their own areas, but as a Board they must look collectively at the priorities for the Combined Authority area as a whole in the context of compassion, co-operation and community. Against that background the key priorities were public health, the thirty one recommendations from the Independent Commission

on Climate Change and culture. How these would be put into practice was for the Board to decide together.

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

Approve the 2021/22 Business Plan Mid-Year Refresh.

86. Local Assurance Framework Annual Review

The Board was asked to review and approve the revised Local Assurance Framework. The revised Framework had been reviewed by MHCLG (now DLUHC), the Audit and Governance Committee and the Business Board and both a clean copy and a version showing tracked changes from the previous iteration were included as appendices to the report. Revisions included some clarification around the Green Book and valuations and updated references to the first Gateway Review.

Councillor Boden suggested that future iterations should expand the reference to portfolios in the final paragraph of 3.2 and remove tracked formatting changes so that substantive changes are more easily identified.

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

Approve the revised Assurance Framework.

The meeting was adjourned from 11.31 – 11.39am.

87. Budget Monitor Update

The Board received an update on the Combined Authority's financial position as of 31 July 2021. Members were advised that the table at paragraph 3 should have updated to reflect the increase in forecast income of c£400k bus service operator grant shown at Appendix 1. Attention was also drawn to the recommendation from the Business Board to increase the Growth Hub budget in accordance with the additional funding available and for the requirements of the award to be delivered via the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Business Growth Company (Growth Co.). Key variations again related to the impact of Covid on apprenticeships, the Covid-related underspend on the Adult Education Budget and the CAM project. Since publication, notification had been received of additional grant income of £18.7m for the Affordable Housing Programme. Slippage of around £3.5m was reported in relation to the CAM project and A10 dualling. Officers confirmed that the figure for the Mayor's allowance included on-costs.

Clr Nethsingha asked what progress was being made on spending monies associated with the national bus strategy and what conversations were taking place around this. Officers stated that additional funding had been received from the Department for Transport (DfT) to keep buses running at a minimum 97% of usual service levels, but that this funding would run out at the end of March 2022. The final set of data relating to the national bus strategy was expected the following day.

Councillor Bailey commented that she would like to see the Bus Task Force re-instated. The Mayor stated that this could be discussed at a future Leaders' strategy meeting.

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

- a) Note the financial position of the Combined Authority for the year to date.
- b) Note the award of an additional £424,116 to the Combined Authority by the Department for Transport
- c) Note the increase in the Growth Hub Funding of £290.5k.
- d) Approve the recommendation from the Business Board to increase the Growth Hub budget in accordance with the additional funding and for the requirements of the award to be delivered via the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Business Growth Company (Growth Co.)

88. Implementation of the revised Affordable Housing Programme

Declarations of interest were made in this item at the start of the meeting by Councillors A Bailey and L Herbert, in that Councillor Bailey was a trustee of East Cambridgeshire Community Land Trust and Councillor Herbert's partner was a Director of Cross Keys Homes Limited. Minute 76 above refers.

The Board was advised that the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (since renamed the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities - DLUHC) had approved the top 18 affordable housing schemes for 2021/22 which had been approved by the Housing and Communities Committee. A further £18.7m Government funding would be provided to fund these schemes. This information had been shared with delivery partners and work on 111 units had started on site. However, six of the 18 schemes would not now meet the March 2022 deadline and a substitution process had been agreed with DLUHC. Officers had asked about the prospects for further funding beyond March 2022 and had been directed to the Homes England 2021-26 programme. It appeared clear at that stage that there would be no new money from DLUHC, but given the subsequent change in Minister this decision was something which the new Chief Executive might wish to revisit.

Councillor Smith commented that she did not hold officers responsible for the work which had been carried out under the instruction of politicians. However, she judged the situation to be a disaster. Her predecessor had supported the affordable housing programme on the basis of that housing being shared across the constituent council areas. However, South Cambridgeshire would not now be getting the £26m expected which equated to 584 affordable homes being lost to the area. Councillor Smith called for an investigation of how this situation had occurred, which she judged to be scandalous. Looking to the future, she commented that the £45k intervention rate was bad news for South Cambridgeshire where property prices remained high.

Councillor Boden commented that in his judgement now was not the time for decisions to be made, but that the Board did need to begin considering its role in relation to housing. He acknowledged that each constituent council would make representations on behalf of its residents, but commented that South Cambridgeshire remained the least deprived area of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough whilst some of the affordable housing schemes delivered in Fenland had transformed lives.

Councillor Herbert commented that it had been agreed that the bulk of the funding received through the Devolution Deal would be used to address the need for affordable housing in Greater Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. In his judgment, the £40m revolving fund had prevented this. He paid tribute to Peterborough and the north of the county for the affordable housing schemes which had been delivered there. In his role as Chair of the Housing Committee he would continue to meet with Government officials and Homes England to seek further funding. He agreed that it would be useful to review the Combined Authority's housing role going forward. The Mayor expressed his thanks to Councillor Herbert for his hard work alongside officers to rescue the affordable housing programme and offered an assurance that he would be standing up for every part of the Combined Authority area the following day when he would be meeting the new Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

Councillor Nethsingha endorsed the suggestion of an independent review of what had happened previously and potentially some independent advice on how to move forward with housing policy and delivery. The Mayor indicated that he was open to this suggestion, but that it was something he would want to discuss with the new Chief Executive.

Councillor Fuller commented that the key issue in his view was that it had now been confirmed that there would be no second phase of the affordable housing programme. He agreed that it was a scandal that money had been lost, but in his view the greater scandal would be if there was no further housing programme. He felt that there was a need for frank conversations around this as the delivery of affordable housing was a key expectation of the Devolution Deal. He also asked for sight of the MHCLG correspondence stating why the Combined Authority would not be receiving any more funding for affordable housing. The Mayor stated that he shared these frustrations. The facts were clearly stated in the report, but the Combined Authority was a different organisation now with a different focus and he would do his best to work with Government to make sure it moved forward.

Councillor Bailey commented that in her judgement the £40m revolving fund was a correct principle and that it did not make a difference to the ability to deliver 2000 affordable homes. She believed that the only thing which had caused a problem was the initial delay of a year to the programme caused by MHCLG. Initially, MHCLG had expressed concern around the delivery timescale, but the report showed that the revised programme was still on course to deliver 1188 units by March 2022 despite this delay. MHCLG had also subsequently raised the issue of value for money, but the average subsidy per unit outside of Cambridge City was around £36k compared to the cap of £45k which was subsequently set. All of the constituent councils had had the opportunity to put forward proposals for affordable housing schemes. Councillor Bailey commented that the shared ownership scheme on the former Ministry of Defence site in Ely was progressing, so that loan funding would be returned. The same applied to the

Haddenham scheme. In her judgement, the Combined Authority did not have anything to add in terms of accessing Homes England support as district councils were already skilled at this. Instead, she believed that it should focus around additionality, speeding up delivery and un-blocking sites. East Cambridgeshire District Council was continuing to support community land trusts and would share that expertise with the Combined Authority. As the Combined Authority had lost its housing remit post 2022 she considered there were questions to be answered around its role and the on-going costs for its housing team.

Councillor Herbert acknowledged the need to consider the Combined Authority's role going forward. Additionality would be part of that, but there would still also be 1000 homes under construction in 2022/23.

Councillor Fitzgerald encouraged the Board to be positive about the future, to work collectively with the new chief executive to re-build Ministers' trust and to continue to press the case for the money which had so far been withheld. The Government's thinking on affordable housing had changed, but the Board could continue to do its best to seek funding for the county however that might be delivered.

The Board noted the outcome of the Ministers decision for the CPCA 2021/22 Affordable Housing Programme and the implications for any CPCA aspiration for an affordable housing programme beyond March 2022.

The meeting was adjourned from 12.30-1.00pm.

89. Change to the order of business

The Mayor exercised his discretion as chair to vary the order of business from the published agenda to take Item 3.4: March Area Transport Study as the next item of business, followed by Item 4.3: Transforming Cities Fund, Item 4.1: Zero Emission Bus Regional Area (Zebra) Phase 2, Item 4.2: Cambridge South Station and Item 4.4:E-Scooter and E-Bike Update

90. March Area Transport Study - September 2021

The Board considered a report summarising work on the March Area Transport Strategy (MATS) and outlining next steps. The current phase of work was due to finish in October. The project had been accelerated due to delivery efficiencies of around £250k by Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council's success in securing funding through the Future High Streets Fund (FHSF). Work on Broad Street would be included as part of the regeneration of the town centre. The Mayor stated that it was fitting that the Board was meeting in March to celebrate this positive news for the town.

Councillor Boden thanked the Board for its generosity in supporting the Future High Streets funding, noting the need to meet the March 2024 deadline for the funding to be spent.

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

- a) Note the progress of the March Area Transport Study;
- b) Approve the use of £180,000 from the existing approved budget agreed previously by the Combined Authority Board in August 2020 to be used to commence detailed design for Broad Street.

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

By recommendation to the Combined Authority Board

Recommendations from the Transport and Infrastructure Committee

91. Transforming Cities Fund

The Board received a position paper on the Transforming Cities Fund while a review of budget was on-going. If the anticipated efficiencies within the Fund were confirmed the intention was to look at these being used to support active travel, cycling and walking schemes and work on alternatively fuelled vehicles and passenger transport improvements.

The Mayor stated the report had been well-received when it had been presented to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 8 September 2021.

The Board:

Noted the contents of the report to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 8 September 2021.

92. Zero Emission Bus Regional Area (Zebra) Phase 2

The Board was advised that a funding bid for Zero Emission Bus Regional Area (ZEBRA) Phase 2 had been submitted and that the outcome was awaited. The Board was invited to approve allocation of £1.963m for the delivery of ZEBRA buses, subject to funds being available following a review of existing Transforming Cities Fund commitments, and to delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation of the Mayor, to deliver the ZEBRA buses subject to the DfT application being approved.

Councillor Boden referenced the detailed comments he had made at a previous meeting in relation to the importance of ensuring that appropriate infrastructure was considered alongside the buses themselves. In his capacity as Lead Member for Public Health he draw attention to the increase in particulates from increased wear on brakes, tyres and road surfaces due to the heavier weight of electric buses. Non-exhaust emissions (NEE) had an impact on public health and were now considered more significant than exhaust fumes from non-diesel vehicles. There was no single solution

from a public health perspective. To reduce particulate emissions in the long term would require reduced journey times and changed habits in relation to vehicle use, but he wished to raise this as an issue to be taken into account going forward.

Councillor Nethsingha acknowledged this perspective, but commented that it would be unfortunate if the real benefits to air quality in cities and to cyclists should be ignored because of this. Electric vehicles did not offer a perfect solution, but they did in her view offer an improvement.

Councillor Smith endorsed the comments of both previous speakers. The Combined Authority had been challenged by the Chair of the Independent Commission on Climate Change to show leadership and she suggested that the issue of NEEs and the impact of car use in comparison to buses in relation to particulate emissions might be raised with the Minister. The Mayor stated that he would be happy for a joint letter from himself and the Lead Member for Public Health to be sent to Ministers on this issue. He would also be happy to raise it with his mayoral colleagues.

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

- a) Recommend the CA Board approve allocation of £1.963m for the delivery of ZEBRA buses, subject to funds being available following a review of existing Transforming Cities Fund commitments
- b) Recommend the CA Board delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation of the Mayor, authority to deliver the ZEBRA buses. This is subject to the DfT application being approved.

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

93. Cambridge South Station

The Board was advised that a recommendation to allow Network Rail to retain a £250k underspend on the previous planning phase of the Cambridge South Station project to support future work had initially been considered by the Transport and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee in July 2021 where it had been supported unanimously. Officers drew attention to an error in the published report which stated that the station was due to open in December 2021. An assumption had been made that the Combined Authority contribution to the project could be reduced once Government funding was committed. Since the T&I meeting it had been identified that this was not the case, so this would be addressed as part of the budget review. The Board would wish to consider whether to approve Network Rail being allowed to retain the £250k underspend in light of this development.

With the consent of the meeting, the report recommendation was revised to make approval of Network Rail retaining the £250k underspend on the previous phase of the

projects subject to the funds being available following a review of existing Transforming Cities Fund commitments.

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

Approve the retention by Network Rail of the retention of the underspend on the previous planning phase in order to support future work, subject to funds being available following a review of existing Transforming Cities Fund commitments.

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

94. E-Scooter and E-Bike Update

The Board considered a proposal to extend the Department for Transport e-scooter trial in Cambridge city centre until March 2022 and expand the e-bike network across the region. If approved, officers would work with constituent councils and cycle groups to agree the locations for electric bike sites. The trial had proved popular so far, although some challenges had been experienced. The supplier had done quite a good job at resolving these, but it was acknowledged that further work was needed to address issues like pavement riding, street clutter and the illegal use of private e-scooters.

The Mayor stated that there had been positive feedback about the trial when this proposal was discussed by the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 8 September 2021, although some circumspection in relation to e-scooters.

Councillor Boden commented that the proposal was to be encouraged from a public health point of view. The problems associated with the misuse of e-scooters was a national issue and more work was needed on this as many pedestrians had concerns which needed to be taken into account.

Councillor Herbert commented that there was a real issue in Cambridge City in relation to the number of accidents involving e-scooters and their being used by some in an unacceptable and intimidatory way. Their use was currently unregulated and this was an issue which the Mayor might want to discuss with his mayoral colleagues. Councillor Fitzgerald concurred, commenting that in his opinion the lack of regulation was a real problem.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that there was a need to recognise that both e-bikes and e-scooters were here to stay and there was a need to create spaces where they could be used safely.

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

- a) Approve the extension of the e-scooter trial from October 2021 to March 2022 to continue our learning.

- b) Approve the expansion of the current E-bike network region wide and to work with officers in constituent authorities and cycle groups to agree the exact location for the installation of the electric bike sites.

95. Consultancy Cost Review

The Board was advised of the actions taken by the Combined Authority's procurement team in relation to the use of external consultants. An additional step had been added to the gateway process whereby any use of external consultants must be subject to a make or buy analysis.

Mr Adams welcomed the intent which lay behind the proposals, but expressed disappointment that the report did not contain an analysis of previous expenditure on external consultants or how this was managed. His expectation was for a process whereby appropriate delegations would be put in place around the use of external consultants rather than an expectation that the Mayor would approve operational requests himself. The Mayor stated that following his election his sense was that the organisation's spending on consultants was out of control. He accepted that he might not remain personally involved in the approvals process in the longer term, but in his judgement he needed to take control of the issue now.

Councillor Bailey commented that no data or evidence had been provided around previous expenditure on consultants to enable the Board to take a view. It was well known that the previous mayor had preferred a lean organisational structure for the Combined Authority and to buy in additional expertise where it was required. As such, this seemed more an issue of the approach to how the organisation was staffed. In her judgement it was inappropriate for individual operational requests to be considered by individual members of the Board.

Councillor Smith commented that all Board members ran lean organisations which made use of external consultants. Her interest was focused more specifically on the amount of work done by consultants which was not subsequently progressed. Whether there was value to examining that or a decision should be taken to just move forward she left to the Mayor's discretion.

Councillor Boden commented that in his view there was a place for the use of consultants in a lean organisation. However, he considered the appointment of consultants to be an operational matter rather than one which required a bureaucratic sign-off process by five people including the Mayor. Councillor Fitzgerald concurred, commenting that he did not believe that the Mayor needed to be personally involved in the process. In his view, the Board should set the policy and protocol for the use of external consultants and anything outside of that would be referred to a political level for approval.

The Mayor stated that he was not opposed to the use of consultants, but that there was a need to ensure good value for money in relation to their use. He welcome the Board's feedback on the proposals and would discuss how this issue should be progressed with the new chief executive.

The Board:

- a) Noted the contents of this report and appendix.
- b) Note that the procurement manager will include the External Consultancy Need Assessment form as part of the procurement process.

96. Intra Group agreement between the Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company Limited (Growth Co)

The Board was invited to approve an intra group agreement between the Combined Authority and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company Limited (Growth Co). The Combined Authority was the main shareholder in Growth Co and this proposal was designed to ensure that all funding obligations, requirements and restrictions flowed down to Growth Co and vice versa. The agreement had been developed in consultation with the Combined Authority's finance and legal teams.

Councillor Boden commented that the report raised a wider question around whether the Combined Authority had a strategy in relation to corporation tax. Officers stated that the Growth Co was not designed to make a profit, but confirmed that there was no strategy at present to ensure that none of the CPCA's subsidiaries made a profit and so became liable to corporation tax. The Director of Business and Skills undertook to consider this with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer.

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

Approve the draft intra group agreement included as Appendix 1.

Recommendations from the Housing and Communities Committee

97. £100k Homes Policy Closure

Declarations of interest were made in this item at the start of the meeting by Councillors A Bailey and L Herbert, in that Councillor Bailey was a trustee of East Cambridgeshire Community Land Trust and Councillor Herbert's partner was a Director of Cross Keys Homes Limited. Minute 76 above refers.

The Board was invited to approve the cessation of the promotion and closure of the £100k Homes policy. The recommendation had been considered by the Housing and Communities Committee on 6 September 2021 where it had been endorsed by a majority of members present and voting.

In June 2021 the Government had introduced the new First Homes policy as a mandatory requirement for local authorities. As this policy was very similar to the £100k Homes policy it was recommended that the £100k Homes policy should be closed.

Councillor Herbert emphasised the importance of communicating this change to those people who had registered their interest in £100k Homes.

Councillor Bailey expressed her disappointment at the proposal and her intention to vote against the recommendation. She considered it positive that much of the £100k Homes policy was reflected in the new First Homes policy, but felt that the decision to recommend closure of the £100k Homes policy was driven by the Mayor's pre-election commitment on this issue. East Cambridgeshire District Council had adopted its own allocation policy for £100k Homes until the First Homes policy was up and running and considered this to be part of a balanced portfolio of tenancies. Councillor Bailey commented that the £100k Homes at Fordham had been delivered at nil cost to the tax payer and challenged the Mayor to confirm whether he supported affordable home ownership.

The Mayor stated that he was working with the Combined Authority's housing team to develop the thinking around affordable housing provision and that he would not offer comment at this point.

Councillor Boden commented that he also wanted to record his disappointment at the recommendation. Whilst recognising the Mayor's right not to share his views at this stage the Board would need to know what those were as it moved forward.

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

- a) Approve the cessation of promotion of the £100k Homes policy, and implement its closure.
- b) Communicate with all those who have registered an interest in the £100k Homes scheme and advise of the affordable housing schemes already being supported by the CPCA with contact details.

Recommendations from the Skills Committee

98. Adult Education Budget Reserve Fund and Innovation Fund for 2021-22

The Board was invited to approve the allocation from the Adult Education Budget (AEB) Reserve Fund for the 2021/22 academic year to the thematic programmes identified.

The reserve fund had been accumulated from recycled funds from the first two years of the programme. Prior to devolution this sum would have been returned to Government, but it could now be recycled to support further work locally in support of the skills agenda. If approved, the funding would be used amongst other things to encourage greater collaboration and capacity building within local providers, to fund over-delivery of the adult Level 3 qualification offer to increase individuals' employability and resilience in the labour market and to retain a modest reserve. In addition, the Innovation Fund for the 2021/22 academic year would support innovative engagement with atypical learners and employer responsiveness.

The Mayor stated that this area offered an engine of opportunity across the whole of the Combined Authority area. He asked that his thanks to the Senior Responsible Officer for Adult Education and the Director of Business and Skills be placed on record for their ambition in this area.

Councillor Nethsingha commented that the proposals had been considered by the Skills Committee on 13 September 2021 where they had been endorsed unanimously by those present and voting.

Councillor Boden welcomed the innovative engagement processes being proposed, but commented that it was important to recognise the disparity in skills levels in different areas within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. In his judgement there was a need to target areas with skills gaps.

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

- a) Approve funding to be allocated from the Adult Education Budget (AEB) Reserve Fund for the 2021/22 academic year to the thematic programmes as set out below:

TABLE A: Reserve Fund Thematic Programme	Allocation
1. Commissioning carry-forward for 2022/23	£ 500,000
2. Provider Capacity Building	£ 250,000
3. Strategic Partnership Development	£ 250,000
4. Reserve for over-delivery of Level 3 Adult Offer	£ 250,000
5. Unlock with Level 3 Marketing Campaign and Publications	£ 30,000
6. Contingency (for unforeseen programme expenditure)	£ 220,000
TOTAL	£ 1,500,000

- b) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, to enter into grant funding agreements with providers on behalf of the Combined Authority, for projects under the themes;
- c) Delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer to enter into grant funding agreements for the Innovation Fund, with existing AEB providers, as required;
- d) To note the approach to the Innovation Fund for 2021/22.

Recommendations from the Business Board

99. Format of Business Board Meetings

The Mayor reminded the Board that when the Combined Authority took decisions as Accountable Body it was committed to acting in line with the Combined Authority

Assurance Framework in the interests of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area as a whole, and to take decisions based on the recommendations of the Business Board.

In March 2021 the Audit and Governance Committee had expressed concern about the presumption that Business Board meetings would be held in private. On 24 March 2021 the Combined Authority Board resolved to refer this concern to the Business Board for consideration. The Business Board's recommendation that the format of meetings should remain unchanged was considered by the Combined Authority Board on 30 June 2021 and was rejected. Following that meeting, the Chairs of the Business Board and Audit and Governance Committees met to discuss the issue. Following this discussion, the Business Board resolved unanimously on 14 September to recommend that, 'All other meetings of the Business Board shall be open to the public unless determined otherwise by the Chair'.

Mr Adams commented that the democratic process had given rise to the recommendation before the Board and that he was respectful of that. There had been a lengthy debate of the proposal by the Business Board and the compromise identified in his discussion with the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee was deemed to be workable, albeit that it relied on the exercise of the discretion of the Business Board's Chair. The proposal offered a workable solution to address the concerns expressed around transparency whilst maintaining the efficiency of the Business Board. The Business Board had placed its trust in Mr Adams to manage this arrangement and he asked the Combined Authority Board to do the same.

Councillor Smith welcomed the recommendation which she felt brought the Business Board more in line with other LEPs. She voiced a slight concern at the implied veto of the Business Board Chair and expressed the hope that it would be for the Business Board to approve decisions around meetings being held in private on the recommendation of the Chair. Whilst she did not consider this to be the end of the matter she did deem it to be a good start.

Councillor Bailey commented that the Chair of the Business Board's description of the proposed arrangements as 'workable' meant that it was not optimal. In her judgement, this would adversely impact the Business Board, place an additional burden on its Chair and the majority of Business Board items would still remain exempt due to commercial confidentiality. Her understanding was that no members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Audit and Governance Committee had taken up the invitation to attend a Business Board meeting to observe it at work. Councillor Bailey suggested that the wording of the recommendation should be amended to make explicit exactly what change was proposed. She commented that she would not be supporting the recommendation and that if it was approved she would like to see a review carried out in six months' time. To reflect this, Councillor Bailey, seconded by Councillor Boden, proposed an additional recommendation that:

The arrangements be reviewed in six months' time.

Councillor Smith commented that she did not see the point of reviewing the move to public meetings. However, she would not be averse to a review of the functioning of the Business Board and its membership at an appropriate time. The Mayor

commented that he was already in regular conversation with the Business Board and that there was a growing, symbiotic and positive relationship.

On being put to the vote the amendment was defeated.

With the consent of the meeting to was agreed to expand the recommendation to add the wording, '*...at paragraph 1.6.*'

Mr Adams commented that the Business Board was currently in the process of issuing its annual report for the past year and that this spoke to the performance of the Business Board. There had been a ten-fold increase in efficacy of the investments in comparison to the previous regime which he judged would probably place it within the top three LEPs in the country during a period which had included the challenge of the Covid pandemic. He therefore took exception to the comments made by some elected members about the Business Board and the way it operated.

Councillor Boden commented that he considered the Business Board to be the jewel of the Combined Authority and that the contrast with the previous LEP could not be greater. He would be concerned about anything which would impact on the efficiency of the Business Board. He respected the Chair of the Business Board's advice that the proposal before the Board represented a workable arrangement, but he regretted him having been placed in this position. He was also concerned that this change might cause some members of the Business Board to leave. Councillor Boden's preference would be for the current arrangements to be unchanged and he expressed regret at the pressure which he felt had been put on the Business Board to make the change. For these reasons he would be voting against the recommendation.

The Mayor stated that he had opened the meeting by congratulating Mr Adams and three other members of the Business Board on their appointment for a second term and he saw this as a demonstration of members having confidence in the new arrangements. He wished to place on record that he too considered the Business Board to be prized asset. He was proud of the Business Board and was enjoying being a member, but he did believe that this was a positive step forward.

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

Approve the proposed format change for future Business Board meetings and to ask the Monitoring Officer to make the changes to the constitution described in this report at paragraph 1.6.

The vote in favour contained two thirds of Members present and voting, including the Mayor.

99. iMET Investment Update and Recovery Recommendations

The Board was invited to approve the Business Board's recommendation to accept an offer of £3.15m from a local company for the freehold of the iMET building in Alconbury Weald. The Board had decided against making an offer for the building for its own use

at the meeting on 25 August 2021. The Business Board recommendation had been sought under urgency procedures and was approved by a majority vote in favour.

Mr Adams commented that it was incumbent on the Board to take responsibility for the actions of the previous LEP and to make the best of it. Officers were working hard to learn lessons to ensure that the same issue would not be faced again. It would be difficult to carry out a full investigation of what had taken place under the previous LEP as little documentation was available, but he did feel that the question of how a developer was paid £10m for a building which was now valued at around £3m should be looked at. The Mayor stated that he was taking advice on this issue.

Councillor Bailey commented that she supported releasing the iMET building to a local company. She understood that the sale would return around £2.6m to the Combined Authority which could be put to its intended use.

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

- a) Accept the offer of £3.15m from a local private company and delegate authority to the Director of Business and Skills, in consultation with the Section 73 Officer, the Monitoring Officer and the Mayor, to finalise the completion of all legal and financial aspects of the sale.
- b) Release Cambridge Regional College from the original Grant Funding obligations in return for foregoing any income from the sale in favour of the Combined Authority.
- c) Agree that the Combined Authority should enter into a new agreement with Cambridge Regional College in relation to the equipment to continue delivery of learner and apprenticeship outcomes to the relative value of the equipment being retained by them.

(Mayor)